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ABSTRACT

APALACHEE AGENCY ON THE GULF COAST FRONTIER

Patrick Lee Johnson

After 1704 attacks by the British and their Native American allies, some Apalachee fled their homeland to French Mobile, Spanish Pensacola, and Creek areas. Primary research indicates that those Apalachee who chose to ally politically with either the French or Spanish maintained social connections with both nations as well as the Lower Creek, and through the Creek enjoyed an economic connection with the British. At the same time, by consistently referring to the groups as Apalachee, documents imply some maintenance of Apalachee tradition during the eighteenth century. Comparisons of ten tightly-dated ceramic assemblages quantify material shifts through time and space and augment the historical record. This synthesis illustrates that Apalachee refugees had sufficient resources to play Europeans against each other yet adopted new ceramic traditions. Political and material maneuvering thus allowed them to maintain their social identity.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Careful study of eighteenth-century European-Native American alliances, including differing strategies and resources, sheds light upon shifts within Spanish Florida and French Louisiana. More specifically, by examining Spanish and French documents as well as archaeological evidence in the form of Native ceramic assemblages, I explore how the Apalachees decided to ally with either the French or Spanish and how these groups responded differently to each other.

Several scholars (Jackson and Castillo 1995; Lightfoot et al. 1998; Lightfoot 2005; Ginn 2009; Worth 2010a, 2010b) have recently described the emergence of new social connections and materials during contact between Native Americans and Europeans. The terms “transformation” (Lightfoot 2005; Hall 2009; Worth 2009a) and “transculturation” (Deagan 1996; Worth 2006) usefully outline how changing situations forced constant re-adaptation at the local level on both sides of interaction, replacing the false dichotomy of either selection (also termed “acculturation” or “accommodation”) or rejection (also termed “resistance”) of particular materials. Put briefly, people interpret and use materials according to their sensibilities (for discussion see Sahlins 1985, 2000; Gosden 1999; Meskell 2001; Pauketat 2001a, 2001b; Silliman 2004:9, 2005a:67, 2010a, 2010b; Loren 2005; Worth 2010a).
The sequence of Pensacola’s missions and garrisons, as well as the nearby French settlements, offers a rare opportunity to trace responses to changing social, economic, and political situations by synthesizing the historical and material records. Ceramic traits and documentary evidence demonstrate Apalachee efforts at maintaining tradition during the eighteenth century. Documents detail specific efforts at recruiting Indians and otherwise maintaining settlements. Previous research into Spanish Florida and French Louisiana (Surrey 1916; Coker 1979; Bushnell 1994; Dawdy 2008) has demonstrated the economic, social, and political interplay inherent in colonial alliances.

In this thesis, comparisons of pottery type data from various sites occupied by the Apalachees (Harris 1999, 2003, 2007; Silvia 2000; Waselkov and Gums 2000) demonstrate the effects of changing alliances in the Mobile and Pensacola areas. Use of data from Creek sites (Mason 1963:218; Wauchope 1966; Nelson et al. 1974; DeJarnette 1975; Smith 1992; Pluckhan 1997) reveals potential influence on Apalachee pottery. Such a synthesis illuminates Spanish, French, and Native perspectives. Qualitative and quantitative analyses show how the Apalachees shifted production of particular ceramic types at the community level to supplement French and Spanish influences on, and responses to, shifting alliances. Spatial and temporal comparisons show how communities shared tastes with regard to the appropriate combination of clays, tempers, forms, finishing techniques, and decorations (Ginn 2009:242-243).

Daily practices, including changing combinations of material culture, expressed social identity as individuals consciously or unconsciously identified with a particular group (Upton 1996; Lightfoot et al. 1998; Loren 2001a, 2005, 2010; Orser 2004, 2007; Lightfoot 2005; Ginn 2009). Following this perspective, potters in certain circumstances
broadcast feelings of similarity rather than difference (Ginn 2009:244-246). Examination of social distance between groups by comparing connections evident in the historical and material records demonstrates the extent to which individuals balanced traditions and regulations with frontier realities to create and maintain communities.

**Practice Theory Perspective**

The term practice theory derives from Bourdieu's (1990:53) view that individual moments of daily practice serve as “structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures.” Since the 1960s, Bourdieu and Giddens have published about this duality of structure, consistently demonstrating that individuals shape and are shaped by larger structures. Both thus criticize structuralism, which emphasizes an over-arching grammar at the expense of individual agency (Giddens 1981, 1987; Fowler 1997:174-180). Bourdieu (1983:2) emphasized the interplay of individuals and social determinants via the amount of subjective belief as well as various forms of capital (Fowler 1997:176). Social networks involve the social capital of friends, family, and other supporters; symbolic capital of reputation; cultural capital of skills and qualifications; and economic capital of wealth (Fowler 1997:31; Orser 2007:59-61). Individuals and groups produce and maintain social relationships via these forms of capital as well as through the habitus: internal “systems of schemes…of perception, thought, appreciation, and action which are durable and transposable” (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990:35), thereby connecting ritual meanings to material experiences and subjective perception (Fowler 1997:18-19, 31).

Bourdieu’s (1984:156) approach to evaluating changing modes of social reproduction and constant structural instabilities offers an appealing perspective for studying the past, similar to Braudel’s (1972, 1980) consideration of the interplay of
individual, social, and geographic factors. While useful to archaeology, these researchers do not analyze transformations (Fowler 1997:5, 37), forcing archaeologists considering cultural change to adapt their ideas. Archaeologists using such a practice theory approach maintain that analysis of potential transformations will demonstrate cultural change via the reshaping of traditional and foreign cultural characteristics—the resulting ethnogenesis involved constant negotiation of fluid identities. Within these negotiations, material culture serves as a social action, mechanism, and medium for developing and maintaining relationships by showcasing individual responses to social structures. Ginn (2009:295) states that “the recursive nature of structure and agency allows people to create new ways of being in the world, but the existing cultural structures always guide and inform those new behaviors and ideas.” In other words, structures of interaction between society and individuals affect the degree to which freedom to produce and reproduce those structures exists. As such, cultural continuity occurs only in the sense of cultural heterogeneity (Jones 1997; Gosden 1999; Meskell 2001; Pauketat 2001b). This heterogeneity in practice means potential for change always exists; practices echo the past and shape the future via the continuation and/or reshaping of tradition (Pauketat 2001a). This approach seems well suited for viewing the mundane, habitual actions of everyday life in the past as well as the present (Ginn 2009:19-20) because “people constantly challenge cultural rules through daily practice” (Ginn 2009:309). Both constraints and opportunities drive social action, as individuals make both deliberate and routine choices to reproduce social norms (Pauketat 2001b; Silliman 2005b).

Jones (1997) maintains that individuals, strategically seeking their own interests, continuously reproduce and transform their identity. Thus, shifts occur as a result of
manipulation of identity in part due to social, economic, and political tensions. Material culture justifies and manipulates relationships; it both contributes to and is structured by identity formation. Individual action, embodied in material culture, leads to intersections of meaning in new cultural contexts and thus contributes to cultural change. The recognition of common practice and experience in particular contexts leads to social or group identity. Interpretations of material culture must account for heterogeneous, even conflicting, constructions of cultural identity (Jones 1997). People actively negotiate both their own and foreign cultural traditions by selecting particular practices, with the resulting ethnogenesis involving constant and creative negotiations of fluid identities (Pauketat 2001b; Loren 2005; Silliman 2005a, 2005b).

As individuals shaped their society, that society dictated interactions as reflected in stylistic diversity (Worth 2010a:11). Hybridized design elements lose traditional meanings (“citation” or “indexicality”) as images become dissociated from biographies and create new itineraries. Extensive, continuous reconstruction and reproduction of design elements thus likely disembody an image by removing the links previously indexed by the image (Wallis 2010, 2011). In short, tradition or habitus, the frequently subconscious ideas manifested in behavior and materials, contrasts with a conscious demonstration of social or political boundaries (Silliman 2004:9). Design elements merely serve as concepts familiar to a particular individual, household, or community, rather than even an unconscious agenda (Worth 2010a:1-2). Following Bourdieu (1984), individual designs fit within communal designs of taste, indicating social networks rather than simple benchmarks of cultural affiliation. Potters combined methods and styles of their past generations with those of contemporary peers—each subsequent generation
shifted cultural expressions (Worth 2010a:10). Objects are constituents of practice—symbols and meanings do not exist without consideration of the biographies or histories of those objects (Silliman 2009a; Wallis 2011). Following the “routes not roots” approach clarifies reconstruction of community persistence (Silliman 2010a). Loren (2010:10) states that “objects constrain and influence the lives of the people with whom they come in contact.” Clear comparisons in a temporal order illustrate particular shifts to study actions within social contexts of “remembering and forgetting” (Silliman 2009a:226) to determine, among other things, how people of different contexts make use of the same or similar items.

Several researchers (Stoler 1989; Jackson and Castillo 1995; Upton 1996; Gosden 2005) have attempted to examine economic and social organization to evaluate the process of re-contextualizing materials into a new cultural system. Individuals invented new traditions by choosing particular elements of past traditions. Analysis of this process requires integration of multi-scalar considerations to illustrate tensions between individuals and the collective culture (Stoler 1989; Lightfoot and Martinez 1995; Upton 1996; Gruzinski and Wachtel 1997). Examining the genealogy of materials will demonstrate how individuals combine objects and traditions of different origins in a new yet coherent whole. Analyzing new combinations of material culture will in turn inform new social relationships (Gosden 2005). Ethnohistorical research into economic and political interests will also explore those shifts in the perception and expression of identity (Jones 1997). In short, simultaneous utilization of documents and material culture will shed light upon the construction of new social relations, political affiliations, and world views.
Within the material record, individual broadcasting of social connection partially explains certain changes in daily consumption and use of space (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995). Evaluation of materials must consider the process of cultural construction, in which individuals actively re-interpreted practices and traditions by forming and experiencing their own identities. Practices involving collective labor, such as the construction of architecture, likely create and memorialize a sense of community. By changing the landscape, such practices offer the public a glimpse into the creation and maintenance of a particular identity (Jones 1997; Pauketat and Alt 2005).

Studying communities can illustrate how these “loci of cultural production and history” (Orser 2004: 136) make use of common practice and experience to construct a group identity (Jones 1997; Ginn 2009:296). Processes of identity construction often seem conflicting because material culture influences and transforms social relations, and also because of the palimpsest nature of multiple identities (Sahlins 1985:153; Haas 1995:9; Jones 1997; Bailey 2006; Loren 2008:3). Only careful synthesis of historical and material evidence can offer insight into fluid colonial relations (Upton 1996; Loren 2008).

**Applying Practice Theory to Colonial Frontiers—the Transformation Concept**

While Wallerstein's (1974, 1980) approach assumed a form of cultural hegemony in core-periphery relations, Stein's (1998:229) distance-parity approach posited that the core region's influence diminishes according to distance. Following that perspective, more symmetrical exchange relations occur as people in core and frontier areas interacted in very different ways and thus demonstrate varying social relations. Bourdieu (1961:118) described the “transmutation of values” in peripheries as the careful balance
between pride and criticism of core areas (Fowler 1997:15, 60, 162). Distinct groups often held complementary economic roles that frequently maintained and reinforced ethnic boundaries, but extensive everyday interaction leads to a sort of cultural heterogeneity in which the social relations of different ethnic groups strayed from official standards or traditions (Usner 1992, following Barth 1969). Identity transmission occurred constantly, particularly in frontier areas, as changing demographic, economic, and political situations drove Native Americans and Europeans alike to re-adapt. Worth (2006, following Deagan 1996) echoes the definition of the term “transculturation” as a bidirectional, fluid interplay that guides such interaction. Lightfoot (2005) similarly uses the term “transformation” to describe how Euro-Indian relations cut across prehistoric boundaries and created a “generalized sense of Indianhood” (Lightfoot 2005:237-8, following Hass 1995; Lightfoot et al. 1998). As such, Indians gained a “transformed world view” (Jackson and Castillo 1995:19) by using their indigenous *habitus* to interpret European practices to “fashion an understanding of, and gain conceptual mastery over, a changing world” (Comaroff and Comaroff 1991:31).

Silliman (2005a:67) uses concepts of hybridity (Bakhtin 1981; Bhabha 1994) and ethnogenesis (Hill 1996; Deagan 1998) to emphasize the fact that objects do not demarcate cultures; instead, indigenous peoples interpreted and used foreign material according to their sensibilities. Various researchers describe identity using a variety of terms—invention (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983, Handler and Linekin 1984), creation (Sollors 1989), imagination (Anderson 1991), reconstitution (O’Brien 1991), construction and negotiation (Barth 1969; Keefe 1989), and transformation (Roosens 1989; Lightfoot 2005; Ginn 2009). Whatever the term, the cultural rules and sensibilities of individuals
and communities always inform such actions. Change can thus maintain communities, as when individuals use “foreign” goods to accommodate traditional ideas (Sahlins 1993:16-17; Haas 1995; Lightfoot et al. 1998; Lightfoot 2005; Silliman 2000, 2004, 2005a, 2009a:16-18, 2009b, 2010a, 2010b; Stahl 2001:7; Ginn 2009:11). Rather than merely categorizing artifacts or cultural practices as “foreign” or “traditional,” the perspective summarized here attempts to describe the indigenous translation of European cultural practices.

As these practices transformed, individuals adjusted and renegotiated colonial structures according to local conditions. Thus, new cultural formations dictated identity formation in colonial frontiers (Worth 2010a:4). As such, groups became new because of new practices and new social settings (Ginn 2009:291). Within this context, the daily production of ceramics allowed indigenous peoples to participate in community making and regularly reinforce emerging social identities; they produced and reproduced social identities in light of the variety of alternatives available in the Spanish colonial system (Ginn 2009:2, 5). Multiple ceramic communities led to the blending and transformation of diverse styles that have often been viewed as demonstrating cultural diversity. However, objects of various styles frequently crossed fluid social and political boundaries (Ginn 2009:18).

The manipulation and recreation of traditional ideas, which established and maintained socioeconomic relationships, occurred due to everyday shifts in dress, diet, architecture, and other materials (Loren 2001a, 2001b, 2005, 2010). In other words, large-scale trends provided external forces for change, yet the most significant changes in certain Native American groups occurred internally (Worth 2000). Because of irregular
supplies to frontier areas, the French and Spanish both relied upon Native Americans for perishables and other trade goods (McEwan and Mitchem 1984, following Brown 1980 and Deagan 1983). The Spanish provided rations to encourage Native American settlement, while British and French political networks encouraged new alliances. The material and ethnohistoric records reflect such political, social, and economic conditions.

**Specific Research Questions**

Scarry and McEwan (1995) describe the Apalachee as maintaining a fairly static identity for hundreds of years, while Marrinan and White (2007) as well as Ewen (1996) challenge this assertion. However, research has not yet synthesized Apalachee settlements after the 1704 British attacks. After the 1633 establishment of Spanish missions in the Apalachee province, the Apalachee became a critical component of Spanish Florida. They provided labor and corn as well as a buffer zone against British-allied Indians. San Luis de Talimali, established as the province’s capital in 1656, initially had over 1,400 Christian Apalachee in its jurisdiction in addition to a few Spaniards (Scarry and McEwan 1995). The 1704 British attack in Apalachee territory killed or enslaved most, though survivors joined Creek towns, St. Augustine, Pensacola, or Mobile (Hann 1988; Worth 2008). By 1706, Spanish Florida included essentially only St. Augustine and Pensacola, neither of which possessed the financial resources to tempt many Native American groups to their side, even as goodwill towards the English waned (Crane 1929; Ramsey 2008). The Spanish desperately needed Native American allies and coaxed such settlements by providing rations, while the British and French had more extensive political networks that potential allies would find more attractive. As such, one Apalachee chief, Juan Marcos, ultimately led his people from Creek territory to
Pensacola, eventually to mission San Joseph de Escambe, while other Apalachee sought refuge in St. Augustine, Mobile, or among various Creek towns (Worth 2008). Further research remains necessary to investigate the idea that “for the majority of those forced to leave Apalachee in 1704, the path to extinction as a people was a short one” (Hann 1988:265).


Following this practice theory perspective within social archaeology (Orser 2007:10-14), identity (termed “ethnicity” in Orser 2004, 2007) can be defined as how people see themselves and their environment, with style serving as a learned social phenomenon that leads to the (re)creation of identity. Because trade goods served as economic and diplomatic tools to create and maintain social networks, the emergence of stylistic similarities might signify any number of responses. In the case of the eighteenth-century Apalachees, evidence exists for a communal response to outside European pressures. In this context, Apalachee that lived with the Creek for about a generation before allying with the Spanish would have made use of a variety of ceramic designs. Elements symbolized either “Apalachee” or “Creek,” but soon the exact context of that meaning disappeared (Wallis 2010, 2011). Indigenous synthesis of ideas in the form of
hybrid ceramics shows a shift from refugee microstyles due to the daily interaction of potters raised in the same location despite varying tribal affiliations. As such, polyethnic individuals succeeded in creating a new communal identity (Lightfoot 2005; Card 2007, 2010; Voss 2008).

In other words, rather than “acculturating,” individuals persisted in new material realities by blending traditions and practices across so-called ethnic boundaries (Silliman 2009a, 2009b). Following perspectives of social memory and object biography, which emphasize who used objects and how rather than where objects originated, I will consider how Native ceramic types were shared across ephemeral ethnic boundaries. More specifically, the persistence of Apalachee motifs after their migration from Creek villages can be examined following Silliman’s (2009b) examination of reincorporation of stone tools by the Eastern Pequot. Exploration of practices and social relations through careful synthesis of material evidence will continue to move beyond false dichotomies such as colonizer versus colonized (Voss 2005; Silliman 2010a). Put briefly, analysis of political, social, and economic shifts within the context of the French Louisiana and Spanish Florida frontier demonstrates cultural change via the reshaping of traditional and foreign cultural characteristics.

Following this perspective, I describe transformation and tradition at the community level in the field of interaction between Native Americans, Spanish Florida, and French Louisiana. I attempt to shed light upon several specific questions: How did various political, social, and economic structures develop in the colonial era? How did individuals apply these structures in Mobile and Pensacola, and what shifts can be discerned at the local level? How and why did Native Americans and Europeans pursue
particular alliances? To what extent are social connections visible in Native ceramic assemblages? To what extent did Apalachee ceramic traditions survive the British destruction of their homeland?

Chapter 2 provides a brief chronology of the area and an extensive outline of colonial structures relevant to the eighteenth-century Southeast. By synthesizing secondary sources, I demonstrate changing configurations of political, linguistic, social, and economic connections. The resulting understanding of shifts within Creek, British, French, and Spanish networks provides a context for comprehending the Louisiana-Florida frontier.

Chapter 3 synthesizes largely primary sources to address local strategies at Pensacola and Mobile. The larger context, particularly with regards to socioeconomic reforms, allows for a consideration of shifting interaction between Pensacola, Mobile, and local Native Americans. More precisely, I demonstrate French accomplishments and Spanish efforts to mimic those accomplishments, allowing for insight into why Native Americans, such as the Apalachee, chose to ally with either group.

Chapter 4 starts by utilizing largely secondary sources to outline seventeenth-century Apalachee strategies. British presence in 1685 Apalachicola, just north of the Apalachee homeland around Tallahassee, led to Spanish overreaction that set the stage for the 1704 decimation of that area by the British and their allied Indians. About 1,300 free and about 1,000 enslaved Apalachees joined the British-allied Creeks, while others fled to St. Augustine (Hann 1988:269, 294). Some 800 Native Americans—Chacato and Yamasee in addition to Apalachee—sought refuge in Pensacola, though all but roughly 50 soon continued to Mobile (Higginbotham 1977:191-193; Worth 2008). In 1718,
Apalachee individuals left British South Carolina and were joined by French-allied Apalachee near Pensacola (Worth 2008). By considering English, French, and Spanish documents, I present the Apalachee as middlemen on the eighteenth-century social landscape.

In Chapter 5, I compare Native American ceramic assemblages from sites occupied by or closely engaged with the Apalachees—at San Luis, Patale, Old Mobile, Dog River, Santa Maria, Santa Rosa, Mission San Joseph de Escambe—as well as Creek sites of Jackson (1Br35), Tarver, and Fort Toulouse. By making individual comparisons through diversity statistics rather than a lump factor or principal correspondence analysis, I evaluate specific variation (Van Pool and Leonard 2010:303). In doing so, I follow Rice’s (1989:116) guidelines for comparisons by demonstrating temporal and geographic links between assemblages with large sample sizes. By attempting to quantify Native communication of sameness in material culture, I move away in some respects from the strictly evolutionary and ecological approach of quantifying cultural change more typically seen in archaeological use of diversity statistics (Leonard and Jones 1989) in an attempt to quantify the flow of ideas and people (Dickens 1980; Ginn 2009; Roberts 2009). While ceramic diversity alone certainly does not signify ethnic diversity (Worth 2009a, 2010b), these comparisons offer another source of evidence to examine how both the Apalachee and Creek Indians responded differently through time.

Chapter 6 combines these different insights into interaction between the Apalachee, other Native Americans, and Europeans to shed light upon the eighteenth-century Louisiana-Florida frontier. Such a synthesis also reveals potential for further
research—additional archival research, archaeological excavation, and statistical analysis would certainly provide new insight.
CHAPTER II
HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND CERAMIC TRADITIONS

The complementary socioeconomic roles held by distinct ethnic groups often maintain and reinforce boundaries, though extensive everyday interaction often instead encourages a sort of cultural osmosis in which the social relations of different ethnic groups stray from official norms (Usner 1992:214, 278, following Barth 1969). Usner (1992:189-190, 1998:33) details the complexity, diversity, agency, and versatility inherent in informal, daily, small-scale trade, describing the Louisiana frontier exchange economies as containing intercultural relationships due to necessity and/or convenience, leading to a mixture of tradition, innovation, resistance, and adaptation in the form of military alliances through trade. In short, the French and Spanish both often looked past trade restrictions and enjoyed informal trade that led to a unique situation and offered neutrality to certain Native American groups (Bienvile et al. 1719; Bienville 1721; Usner 1992:30; Loren 1999:101,189).

This informal trade echoed the fact that frontier individuals largely ignored “beautiful fictions” (Allain 1988:71) such as the fluid caste system that allowed for navigation through social ranks (Cope 1994). Economic interdependency and gender imbalances linked colonial social castes and thus encouraged constant and extensive change (Crowell 1997). Local leaders shaped and controlled frontier settlements, where they balanced the official desire to impose European structures and ideas with the need to
adapt to frontier realities. In doing so, local officials often rejected economic regulations for both their own gain and for the sake of their community (Deagan 1995). At the same time, officials used prestige and rank to pursue wealth, rather than the other way around (Allain 1988:xiii). Both conscious and unconscious choices with regard to social relations and material objects thus led to the formation of frontier community identities, occasionally in the form of noticeable shifts or transformations (Sahlins 1985, 2000).

**Spanish Bureaucracy**

Far from monolithic, bureaucracy in colonial Latin America drew from medieval Iberia’s loose confederation of heterogeneous peoples by means of a carefully constructed system of competing jurisdictions, regulations, and traditions (Yannakakis 2008:14, 118). Constant repetition of these various regulations in royal decrees demonstrates that the Crown had considerable problems in maintaining an ideal level of control over distant provinces (Haring 1947:131). By 1600, municipal offices were essentially hereditary pieces of private property that allowed for social distinction (Haring 1947:154-155, 163).

The Council of the Indies included councilors, secretaries, fiscales, and clerks that worked with the Councils of State, Finance, War, and other bureaucratic organizations (Haring 1947:95-97). Councils often deliberated for up to several years, sending requests for information to distant parties as well as referrals to the King, all of whom sent correspondence back to the Council, which in turn sent a final referral to the King (Haring 1947:99-100). Subordinates were expected to send for fresh instructions rather than creatively rework orders, which certainly occurred, as exemplified by the common reply “I obey but do not execute” (Haring 1947:72, 114).
The Viceroy ruled directly over presidencies and vaguely supervised captaincies-general such as Guatemala and Havana, which only answered directly to the King and Council (Haring 1947:71). The Viceroy was always overworked and too remote, and while Spanish officials discussed establishing a new Viceroyalty for the Northern New Spain frontier, they ultimately decided the significant financial investment would not offer sufficient benefit (Haring 1947:79-80).

Governors, judges, and financial officials were appointed and removed by the King and/or the Council of the Indies. Such appointments, coupled with the fact that audiencias were more permanent and continuous than the Viceroy's that presided over them, meant that extensive overlap of administrative duties occurred regularly and deliberately. While costly, particularly considering the prevalence of corruption, this practice offered a degree of security due to competing bureaucrats keeping each other in check (Haring 1947:111-113, 126).

Such an overlap (Table 1) extended into Pensacola, which only survived due to its flexibility. Due to Florida’s isolation, the Spanish enjoyed royal funding and Native support in varying degrees depending on situations. Both St. Augustine and Pensacola served as “coastal presidios” (Bushnell 1994) that protected shipping between ports in New Spain, Peru, and Spain, particularly Veracruz, Havana, Cartagena, Seville, and Cádiz in that they protected valuable, contested coastal areas. For example, the Spanish barely beat the French to Pensacola in 1698, and the French ended up at Mobile in 1702 as the British virtually annihilated Spanish Florida from 1659 to 1711.
Pensacola received friars from St. Augustine, which in turn received supplies from Havana (Figure 1). Pensacola’s supplies arrived more directly from the coffers of Veracruz, which administered the finances of Windward presidios. Among these, the military personnel of Presidio de Carmen in Campeche, Mexico—as well as Texas presidios such as Los Adaes—overlapped most notably with that of Pensacola’s third presidio, San Miguel (1752-1763). The Audiencia and Viceroyalty at Mexico City administered the port of Veracruz, which relayed political correspondence to a variety of Gulf Coast ports. Due to ocean currents, Havana relayed correspondence directly with Spain, despite being under the administration of Mexico. St. Augustine’s location,
Figure 1: Eighteenth-century Gulf Coast connections
convenient for discussion with officials in Spain, allowed them generally to communicate directly with the Council of the Indies by placing correspondence on ships from Havana to Spain. Trade also occurred with French Louisiana—capitals Mobile and New Orleans (established in 1718) traded directly with Veracruz. Such French settlements capably traded with Native Americans and Spaniards alike.

Indian communities were allowed to maintain customs that did not contradict Catholicism. Tradition thus emerged from the daily practices of the people, even as Spanish officials appropriated the term *costumbre* (tradition) as a legal concept to serve the Crown. The Crown recognized that *alcaldes mayores* (royal representatives at the local level) often proved abusive but also recognized the necessity of the office, so the Crown positioned itself as defender of the Native Americans against abuses. Due to realities of distance, Spaniards had to rely on native elites for cultural mediation among alliances that too-often proved temporary and utilitarian (Haring 1947; Yannakakis 2008).

These elite Native intermediaries answered to both Spanish and Native society, and made colonial systems work by creating and recreating hybrid cultures. Native elites defined themselves through lineage, status, and honor rather than wealth or class. In New Spain, Tlaxcalans in particular, as well as other officially recognized conquerors and their descendants, enjoyed the highest privileges, even over those that described themselves as loyal vassals and Hispanized Christians (Yannakakis 2008:2-17). While respected over those considered barbaric, the “good Indians” fell short of Spanish ideals. The Spaniards found themselves in a “colonizer’s quandary,” as they needed to enculturate their subjects yet maintain those differences that legitimized colonization (Yannakakis 2008:61,
following Dean 1999:47). Within this context of constant negotiations, the ability of revolts and wars to transform the political and social structure heightened (Yannakakis 2008:64).

**Spanish Society**

“Perception defined core and periphery as much as distance and resources” (Yannakakis 2008:19, quoting Altman et al. 2002:55)—the lack of “civilization” in peripheries was balanced with more autonomy and less scrutiny. Even in core areas, community identity and pride developed slowly due to poverty, unemployment, crime, disease, and poor public works (Haring 1947:159). The wealthiest cities in New Spain—including Mexico City, Puebla, and Xalapa—stood above the essential ports of Havana, Veracruz, Cartagena, and Acapulco that in turn enjoyed protection by frontier settlements. A lack of trade restrictions between European powers allowed the French and Spanish to compete commercially through use of enormous profit margins (Higginbotham 1977; Roberts 2009). Individuals relied on their skills and abilities to shape dynamic situations (Yannakakis 2008:7). Europeans participated in alternative illicit economies to support their particular self-interest. The diverse ceramic assemblage at all three Pensacola presidios indicates the variable levels of success that different social classes possessed largely due to their ability to interact with the Native Americans (Roberts 2009).

Demographic and economic pressures led to the long process of social recognition of *castas*, the third major sector in colonial Latin American society between the Republic of Spaniards and the Republic of Indians (Cope 1994:50-51). By the seventeenth century, officials ranked ethnic groups from European Spaniards, American Spaniards, mestizos,
mulattos, blacks, Asians, and Indians. This ranking was based on behaviors including dress, hairstyle, honor, language, and religion in addition to genealogy and appearance. However, the social structure more accurately related to economic ranks—royal officials, other elite, small business owners, artisans, workers, and the homeless (MacLachlan and Rodriguez 1990:23-27; Cope 1994:52-55; Yannakakis 2008:51, following Scott 1985:184-185). People claimed Spanish status to the point that in the eighteenth century the Crown established the *Cedula de Gracias de Sacar* that granted white status in exchange for a sum of money. Even before this point, the caste system (*regimen de castas*) became dependent on money rather than appearance or behavior. The greatest social mobility occurred in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as by the eighteenth century population growth and increased immigration from Spain had reduced the opportunities for social mobility (MacLachlan and Rodriguez 1990:201). In short, “a person’s race might be described as a short-hand summation of social network” (Cope 1994:83).

Central officials created the caste system based on previous Iberian traditions of blood purity (*limpieza de sangre*) to maintain social exclusivity and allow for the “cream” to rise to the top after a few generations, as some degree of racial mixing would certainly occur (Yannakakis 2008:15). These “projections of social distinction” (Yannakakis 2008:36) offered imagined stability, enforcing boundaries by solidifying blurred racial ideologies. Central officials thus created a specific vision that expressed either perceived or imagined economic and political power over other members of the colonial population (Loren 1999, 2008, 2010; Carrera 2003; Katzew 2004; Voss 2008). The *casta* rankings (Figures 2 and 3) offered a way to categorize the populace, but more
importantly, attempted to reduce the potential ability of certain “mixed-bloods” to take over the colony while allowing certain mestizos to, over time, become Spanish (Loren 1999:138). However, these visions and ideals had limited hold on reality, particularly on the frontier. The non-elite rejected the notion of a racial hierarchy and instead demonstrated their creativity by redefining “race” in a way that served their own purpose (Cope 1994:84-85). Seed (1982) demonstrates such efforts by the population of Mexico City in 1753 (Table 2). Individuals could effectivel y change their identity via behavior, including the selective abandonment or retention of outward elements such as dress (Jackson 1999; Amaral 2010; Loren 2010). In other words, new cultural practices emerged because the laws created in distant centers never emerged intact on the frontier—official discourse on tastes and ideals conflicted with daily practices (Loren 1999:11-12).

**Bourbon Reforms**

By 1700, the authority and prestige of Spanish Councils had noticeably declined (Haring 1947:100). As part of an effort to reduce abuses and otherwise manage colonial holdings, Spanish officials implemented a variety of reforms. Spanish King Felipe V was familiar with attempts to centralize French power thanks to his grandfather King Louis XIV, and Felipe proved receptive to reformers that aimed to modernize Spain (MacLachlan and Rodriguez 1990:253). Cultural, political, and economic reforms under this new Bourbon dynasty attempted to subordinate officeholders and gain more profit through use of new labor regimes, mines, taxes, and mercantilist practices (Yannakakis 2008:161-162). French administrative experience and practices, such as having a single
Minister of the Indies, emerged in Spain during the mid-eighteenth century (Haring 1947:107). Even before the late eighteenth-century height of reforms, royal decrees and jurists gradually took power from the Church and Viceroy (Yannakakis 2008:127-129). Soon, the Church became subordinate to the Crown, and several offices were thus introduced to counter Viceregal authority. Reforms occurred as officials in Spain began to recognize that abuses and geographical difficulties increased. Additionally, a general “spirit of economic and political reform” emerged in the seventeenth and eighteenth
Figure 3: Miguel Cabrera 1763 paintings “Heathen Indians” and “From mestizo and from Indian; coyote”

Table 2: 1753 Racial Composition of Occupations in the Mexico City Colonial Center (Adapted from Seed 1982:583)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Elite</th>
<th>Shop Owner</th>
<th>Artisan</th>
<th>Laborer</th>
<th>Servant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peninsular</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
<td>(17.2%)</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creole</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(82.0%)</td>
<td>(78.1%)</td>
<td>(55.8%)</td>
<td>(9.1%)</td>
<td>(14.1%)</td>
<td>(53.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castizos</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.7%)</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
<td>(5.9%)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mestizos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.7%)</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(22.1%)</td>
<td>(10.8%)</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulattoes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>(22.1%)</td>
<td>(9.6%)</td>
<td>(56.6%)</td>
<td>(20.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
<td>(53.9%)</td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
<td>(7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>5,347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
centuries (Haring 1947:92-93). A variety of social reforms—likely in part influenced by French New World ideas—policed behavior, including reordering urban space as well as regulating marriage and other practices. Such actions proved particularly difficult for peripheral groups that previously enjoyed significant autonomy (Yannakakis 2008:163-165).

**French Colonial Economic and Political Structures**

France’s obsession with European affairs led to a late entry into the race for American empires as well as a general colonial policy that restricted the exploration, establishment, and development of Louisiana (Allain 1988:1). French colonial leaders saw the need for a consistent, comprehensive plan to combat British success and considered cooperating with the Spanish if absolutely necessary (Crane 1929:67-71). The French-Spanish rivalry, even after Philip V ascended the throne of Spain, affected colonial efforts, but distrust of England persisted (Allain 1988:1). French efforts in the New World extended centralized monarchical power yet depended on Native Americans (Loren 2008:40-41, following Sokolow 2003:142).

Early sixteenth-century French exploration efforts began with the express intention of settling present-day Canada, but such efforts quickly shifted to trade. By the 1540s, French sailors regularly contacted Northeastern groups such as the Algonquins. Soon Jesuits offered their services as intermediaries and translators. Long-term settlement occurred next, with the French consciously mimicking British and Spanish mercantilist practices within the fur trade (Loren 2008:39). The King and Minister considered economic activity, particularly quick circulation of money, the most essential benefit of colonial contribution to national well-being (Allain 1988:15). This emphasis on economic
growth started in the late sixteenth century with a focus on Canada until Minister Richelieu shifted focus southward during the first half of the seventeenth century (Allain 1988:4).

However, the Crown proved unwilling to commit finances at a level significant enough to encourage private investment, and sent orphans and criminals to colonize. Insufficient royal funds led the Minister of the Marine to rely on trading companies, following the example of the Dutch East India Company. However, powerful merchants protested the trade monopoly. Minister Colbert’s trading companies represented a first step toward long-term settlement, while the merchants merely pursued short-term trade (Allain 1988:x-21).

Law’s policy for immigration into Louisiana, starting in 1717, led to 6,488 new immigrants by 1721. Despite such growth, and extensive strongholds from the St. Lawrence River to the Gulf of Mexico (Figure 4), the British had roughly 50 times the population size (Waselkov 2009:616).

Figure 4: Select French colonial settlements in North America
French Colonial Society

King Louis and his ministers attempted to transport French civilization to the New World, but with new regulations to prevent abuses. As such, Royal social policy echoed economic policy: to create a new overseas society that would improve France itself (Allain 1988:6-7, 28). However, colonial realities led to social organizations that differed from official decisions (Allain 1988:28). In particular, colonial ideals fell apart due to the necessity of marrying Native Americans, which brought the French face-to-face with Native American customs and traditions, transforming them into “Indian husbands, fathers, and brothers” (Nassaney 2008:312, following Sleeper-Smith 2001:42). Such a situation, rather than creating “French” Native Americans, led to genial treatment of the Indians, who also enjoyed gifts of gunpowder and gun maintenance at Fort St. Joseph (Nassaney 2008), Fort Toulouse (Thomas 1960), and other settlements.

As with the colonists of colonial Latin America, culturally distinct areas of France led to the creation of distinct identities in Acadia, New France, Illinois, Louisiana, Haiti, the Lesser Antilles, and Guyane (Waselkov 2009:624). Women were sent from France’s lower classes to populate colonial Louisiana. Despite officials’ concerns with regard to their low status in French society, these women helped forge a “viable society in a wilderness environment” by the 1740s (Allain 1988:87).

Officials manipulated particularly public displays of material culture, such as dress (Loren 2010). Even French officials wore tattoos, as Henri de Tonti recorded in 1697 (Sayre 1997:170-171). Dress, manner, and conduct caused complaints as “even elites and officials were at odds with colonial ideologies of proper dress” (Loren 2008:97). Commanders were the most likely to present “Frenchness” as they faced
contexts such as official negotiations where those distinctions mattered most (Nassaney 2008:311). Artifacts at Fort St. Joseph, Michigan demonstrate European material culture as well as the presence of Native American practices, if not Native Americans themselves. The lack of clear differentiation between the two sets of material culture indicates a lack of key social boundaries (Deagan 1996). Evidence at St. Joseph and other French sites suggests “syncretic cultural and material practices” (Nassaney 2008:314).

Ethnogenesis occurred as a result of changing relationships influenced by colonial realities rather than official policies. For example, the heterogeneous community at Fort St. Joseph had a shared political purpose in defending against British-allied Indians. They did so by creating alliances and used material culture to communicate “sameness” to cement these alliances. The French did not “go Native” and Indians did not become “Frenchified.” Instead, social interactions between the two groups made conscious and unconscious choices with varying consequences that altered each group’s conceptions and perceptions (Nassaney 2008:314). As such, social interactions at these and other colonial sites created a unique community identity.

Creek Indians

The term Upper Creek refers to regional affiliations of the Abihka, Alabama, Tallapoosa, and Okfuskee. The Abihka along the Coosa River and Talladega Creek consisted primarily of remnants of the sixteenth-century Coosa chiefdom. The Alabama, near the headwaters of the Alabama River, lived in eastern Mississippi in the mid-sixteenth century. The Tallapoosa seem to have always lived in the lower Tallapoosa River Valley. Swanton (1922) considered the Okfuskee, just upstream, to be related to the
Abihka, but the ceramic assemblage appears more similar to that of the Tallapoosa (Waselkov and Smith 2000). Within the Lower Creek, the early seventeenth-century Apalachicola lived in the lower Chattahoochee Valley, and despite the arrival of numerous refugees, late eighteenth-century ceramics appear to represent a stylistic evolution from the circa 1650 phases of Abercrombie and Blackmon (Worth 2000:207). A chief, council, and officials administered the towns or talwas. A moiety, or confederation of towns, largely dealt with Europeans. During the late eighteenth century, a National Council had some clout with these groups, particularly against outside threats; otherwise towns generally participated as free agents. Divisions between Upper and Lower Creeks paved the way for the 1783-1793 Creek Nation under Alexander McGillivray. The Creek thus represented a collection of smaller groups, including long-established Muskogee and Hitchiti speakers as well as relative newcomers the Yuchi, Alabama, Shawnee, Natchez, and Chickasaw. Political organization existed, though the groups were not a true confederacy; core towns possessed ceremonial deference and peripheral “daughter” towns, including groups from the core as well as refugees and adopted communities (Knight 1994a, 1994b:373-388).

The Upper Creek fled English-sponsored slavers in the seventeenth century from eastern Tennessee, northwestern Georgia, and Mississippi to central Alabama (Waselkov and Smith 2000:242). Eighteenth-century Abihka joined remnants of Kymulga phase groups in present-day Talladega County, Alabama (DeJarnette and Hansen 1960; Waselkov and Smith 2000:248-249, following Knight and Mistovich 1984; Knight 1985; and Waselkov 1989). The Alabama invited the French to settle at Fort Toulouse (Thomas 1960; Waselkov 1984, Waselkov et al. 1982), and trade between the Alabama and
Spanish Florida was likely mediated by the Apalachee (Smith 1987; Waselkov 1989). After the 1704 British attacks on Spanish-allied Apalachee, the Alabama warred with Mobile and Pensacola (Waselkov and Smith 2000:248-249). By the mid-eighteenth century, Alabama potters had for the most part abandoned earlier shell-tempered pottery in favor of the sand-tempered wares of the Tallapoosas, yet a significant minority contained a mixture of sand and shell temper. Such hybridization might reflect a transitional period (Waselkov and Smith 2000:249, following Waselkov 1984:26-27; Waselkov et al. 1982:27). Knight (1994a) suggests that this shift might represent a social coalescence, though this might merely represent the movement of trends rather than social or demographic shifts (Worth 2010b).

Hann (2006:102) sees a prototype Confederacy among the seventeenth-century Lower Creek based on the power of Caveta and Casita’s chiefs over other Chattahoochee River towns, the mid-1680s policy of neutrality among European powers, and negotiations they made with the Upper Creek. Europeans certainly recognized the power of Lower Creek Emperor Brims by 1715, if not as far back as the 1680s, as affecting the entire Southeast (Márquez Cabrera 1682; Ayala y Escobar 1717; Hann 2006:102). Brims’ legacy as Caveta chief and Lower Creek Emperor led to the 1718 Coweta Resolution that established a policy of neutrality with European groups for generations (Crane 1929; Hahn 2000, 2004; Oatis 2004; Hann 2006; Ramsey 2008). Peripheral areas possessed a great deal of diversity, including groups referred to by William Bartram as “stinkards.” Muskogee groups included the Upper Creek foundation towns of Tukabatchee, Abihka, Kasita, and Coweta, while the Hitchiti-speakers at Apalachicola were core to the Lower Creek (Knight 1994b:374; Figure 5). As such, the division between core and periphery
towns has some correlation between Hitchiti and Muskogee languages (Knight 1994a, 1994b; Hann 1996:66-67; Foster 2007). The Lower Creek expanded from the Lower Chattahoochee Valley, and despite the acceptance of refugees such as Yuchi and Westo, late eighteenth-century Lower Creek material culture, particularly ceramics, evolved fairly directly from the Abercrombie/Blackmon phases (Worth 2000).

A vast market for slaves coupled with an ample supply of weapons led to “fundamental changes in the very fabric of social organization” (Worth 2009b:297). This
long period of trade led to the gradual development of a confederacy that in turn facilitated assimilation of refugee tribes. Dramatic cultural reorganization thus occurred without direct colonialism. As the Creek became more dependent on the British, they creatively altered tradition by selectively adopting European materials and behaviors, “according to their own customary self-conceptions and interests” (Waselkov 1994:195, quoting Sahlins 1985:138). As such, the Creek incorporated European and Native American artifacts and activities on their own terms into a distinct, new, and synthetic material culture (Waselkov 1994:194, following Mason 1963; Waselkov and Paul 1981:316; and Miller and Hammell 1986:326). Waselkov (1994:194) cites such creative reuse in the form of placing brass bells around individual burials at Ocmulgee (Kelly 1939: Plate 18), at the Law’s site in the Guntersville Basin of the Tennessee Valley (Webb and Wilder 1951:141), and at Fusihatchee on the lower Tallapoosa River. Other examples include the emergence of pipes crafted in European forms and certain marine shell ornaments, as well as the disappearance of many traditional vessel forms in favor of hybridized designs (Waselkov 1994:194). Population stability and limited growth occurred during the late seventeenth century, segueing to incredible demographic growth during the eighteenth century. This growth resulted from, in part, a steady influx of refugees due to demographic, political, and social instability. The increased frequency of archaeological sites provides some indirect evidence in support of this demographic growth (Knight 1994b:384-385).

Identifying ethnic, linguistic, or material affiliation within the Creek regions offers a unique challenge. Apalachicola, even before its 1691 migration to the Ocmulgee River area, shared the position of lead town with Kasita and Coweta (Swanton 1922:129-
Spanish authors often merely noted the “Uchise” or “Appalachicole” without specifying towns. By 1709, the British noted 11 Indian towns of 600 men and only distinguished several “Appatalchy” on the Ocmulgee River (Salley 1947:208).

Following concepts of “sameness” (Ginn 2009), this assimilation is “evident archaeologically in the gradual simplification and homogenization of Creek ceramic traditions” (Waselkov 1994:194, following Waselkov and Cottier 1985; Knight 1994a). Individuals and even social groupings of multiple villages moved long distances either voluntarily or as slaves, and that led to close associations between groups that previously demonstrated distinct languages, material culture, and social organization. This in turn resulted in a hybrid, shared identity as demonstrated in new, homogeneous forms of material culture (Waselkov 1994:194, following Rice 1987:314-315, 452-454, 460-463).

The Upper and Lower Creek had separate yet similar pottery traditions. Upper Creek ceramics have ties to local prehistoric pottery series (Mason 1963:193 following Heimlich 1952:27; Knight 1994a; Jenkins 2009). Lower and Upper Creek ceramics contain similar forms, such as the cazuela bowl, and decorations, including particular patterns of incising and brushing, that did not exist earlier in Alabama. These elements likely represent diffusion from Lamar and Ocmulgee Fields into the Upper Creek region of Alabama (Mason 1963:193 following Heimlich 1952:50). The geographical position of Lower Creek towns led to ceramic similarities with Apalachee to the south and Upper Creek to the north (Mason 1963:193). Similarly, shell-temper in Lower Creek territory (Foster 2007; Jenkins 2009) might be explained by migration from the Abhika region.

As the missionized chiefdoms of the Timucua, Guale, and Apalachee collapsed, Creek groups began social transformations. Attacks by various other Native American
groups led to the long-term decimation of Native Americans within Spanish Florida, who at that time maintained a degree of tradition. In contrast, a new social order within the Creek groups set the stage for more egalitarian and fluid confederacies. However, even when dealing with demographic catastrophe, the chiefdom political structure survived much longer within the missionized Indians when compared to non-missionized Indians of the interior. The Spanish in fact reinforced chiefly power and prestige among their allied Native Americans by satisfying Native desire for luxury trade goods as well as military backing. In contrast, groups such as the Apalachicola, Tallapoosa, and Abhika enjoyed only indirect trade until the late 1680s, at which point English trade needs shifted their agricultural economy to one of commercial deer and slave hunting. During the seventeenth century, social and demographic instability led these groups to relocate, aggregate, and assimilate. In other words, adaptation and evolution allowed these chiefdoms to become new social formations more befitting their situation (Worth 2002).

At a general level, Creek groups all used similar techniques for pottery construction: sand as a natural or artificial inclusion, with the outside of a pot smoothed by mussel shell and the inside smoothed with a small stone, and perhaps incised, brushed, or painted (Foster 2007:74, following Swanton 1946:551-553). However, continuities from Lamar to Ocmulgee Fields phases likely represent similarities at merely a broad, general level (Knight 1994a:182, following Sears 1955). The three sub-traditions of the Coosa, Tallapoosa, and Chattahoochee Rivers represent “area co-traditions” that demonstrate a “degree of stylistic borrowing and interaction” when compared to the non-Lamar areas to the north and west (Knight 1994a:183). In these three areas, local ceramics persist throughout the historic era and account for much of the ceramic variation
during that period (Knight 1994a:183). Common trends include early seventeenth-century loss of complicated stamping in favor of brushed decorations coupled with the rare appearance of corncob stamping “and progressive reduction in incised line width and line spacing from the sixteenth through the eighteenth century” (Knight 1994a:185). Many eighteenth-century sites in the lower Tallapoosa area include such ceramic assemblage components, supporting the idea of in situ development. Tukabatchee, Vickers Gravel Pit, Huithtewali, and Atasi echo shifts through time at Big Tallassee (Knight and Smith 1980:71-72).

Within the Lower Creek, however, Foster (2007:92) sees a “significant amount of spatial variation in the Lower Creek ceramic assemblages” and thus sees no reason to examine regional differences. Comparison of linguistic and ceramic affiliations at the town or talwa level leads him to conclude that the prevalence of shell tempering might represent areas dominated by Hitchiti-speakers and that the diminished frequency of shell-tempering in the Lawson phase occurred due to the migration of Hitchiti towns into Florida (Foster 2007:92-94; following Swanton 1922; Hann 1988; and Worth 2000). While intriguing, such a correlation remains tentative, as Foster’s work is statistically biased against Hitchiti-speakers due to a very low sample for correspondence analysis (n=635) and the particularly small amount of shell-tempered ceramics considered within that sample (Foster 2007:94-95). Further investigation of the correlation remains necessary because most Hitchiti-speaking proto-Seminole assemblages do not include shell-tempered vessels (Buffington 2009).

The perseverance of ceramic traditions lends credence to the idea that women more capably maintained custom than men (Ramsey 2008:41). A relative continuity in
ceramic assemblages through time might also echo the domestic, utilitarian function of ceramics rather than a gendered response to social shifts. The dramatic increase in demand for deerskins beginning in 1685 likely led to shifts in Creek domestic architecture (Waselkov 1994:195). Such shifts, including the loss of winter housing, altered the physical and social landscape and led to new southern towns with new patterns of family life and gender relations (Ramsey 2008:71). For example, in 1691, the Chattahoochee Lower Creek moved eastward to the Ocmulgee and Oconee Rivers (Hahn 2000, 2004).

**English Trading Practices and the Yamasee War**

Rather than utilizing the Spanish strategy of conversion or the French methods of pacification, Carolinians quickly saw the profit in attacking and enslaving rather than assaulting enemies directly (Gallay 2002:197). Within this strategy, traders largely worked with a single town and often used Native Americans or the children of Native Americans and Europeans as packhorse men or assistants. Both Native Americans and the British considered Native wives of British settlers to be diplomatic tools (Ramsey 2008:17). By the zenith of the slave trade (1670s), the British perceived Native Americans as commodities, buffers, and allies (Mason 1963:7; Worth 2009b:295). “Indians were increasingly obliged ‘to goe to war and a’hunting to pay their debts,’ with very little to show for their exertions afterward” (Ramsey 2008:25, quoting McDowell 1955:11). South Carolina officials initially deferred to Native American decisions about trade, but did not address the patterns behind particular complaints, and instead attempted to gain tighter control (Gallay 2002:208-256; Ramsey 2008:31-32). British traders used their power of credit to make increasingly specific demands, while the Creek attempted to
alter their habits to meet those demands. The delicate balance fell apart frequently, and the slave raids themselves dramatically reduced the population of South Florida from 1707-1712, which contributed to the outbreak of the 1715 Yamassee War (Worth 2009b).

Trade lists (Tables 3 and 4) detail shifts within European-Native American interactions. Native American taste dictated much of the trade (Knight 1985:177; Waselkov 1989:129-130, 1994:194; Pluckhan 1997:370) and included guns, powder, shot, glass, knives, toys, hatchets, hoes, axes, scissors, hats, coats, girdles, beads, paint, and shirts. By 1751, trade lists included fine shirts, handkerchiefs from India, gartering, and worsted caps (Mason 1963:83, following Courtenay 1907:175; McDowell 1955:89, 146). As such, Native American tastes grew from earlier traditions to include a wider variety of personal possessions.

Table 3: 1716 Price of Goods in Skins (Adapted from McDowell 1955:89, 104)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skins</th>
<th>Goods available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 skin</td>
<td>12-18 flints, 30-50 bullets, 1 Rum mixed with 1/3 Water, a steel, a knife, a yard of cadis, 2-3 string beads, or a scissors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 skins</td>
<td>A red girdle, a hatchet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 skins</td>
<td>A yard of half thicks, a hatchet, or a narrow hoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 skins</td>
<td>An axe, a broad hoe, or a shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 skins</td>
<td>A yard strouds or a cutlass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 skins</td>
<td>A sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 skins</td>
<td>A calico Petticoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-16 skins</td>
<td>A white Duffield blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 skins</td>
<td>A pistol or a half thicks coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 skins</td>
<td>A laced Broadcloth coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 skins</td>
<td>A gun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Yamasee emerged as a group of refugees from early slave raids along the South Carolina-Georgia border around 1660, fled to the coast around 1685, and became principal agents of the British-sponsored slave raids (Worth 2004). From there, they
Table 4: 1718 Price of Goods in Skins (Adapted from McDowell 1955:269)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skins</th>
<th>Equivalent Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 skin</td>
<td>1 lb poudre, 4 lbs bullets or shot, 50 flints, 2 knives, 24 pipes, or caddice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 skins</td>
<td>1 Yard Plains or Half Thicks, 1 lb red lead, 1 plain hat, or a hatchet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 skins</td>
<td>1 lb of brass kettles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 skins</td>
<td>A laced hat, yard wide cloth, coarse linen shirt, 1 lb beads, or a broad hoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 skins</td>
<td>A Yard Strouds or course flowered Calicoe, or a gallon of rum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 skins</td>
<td>A blue or red Duffield blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 skins</td>
<td>A white Duffield blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 skins</td>
<td>A gun, not laced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 skins</td>
<td>A half thick or plain coat, gartering laced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 skins</td>
<td>1 lb vermilion, double striped cloth coat, or 3 yds broad scarlet Tinsey laced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 skins</td>
<td>16 lbs red lead, mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

negotiated their options within shifting structures and started the Yamasee War against the British in 1715 (Gallay 2002; Ramsey 2008). Individual attacks struck at larger social values, demonstrating the interplay of many divergent agendas (Ramsey 2008:16).

Ramsey (2008:46-50) discusses a Native American known as Cuffy, who while nominally a member of the Yamasee Nation, soon allied himself with the British. Such informal diplomacy at the personal level dominated interaction, as traders also worked for themselves rather than for Carolina. The British attempted to reduce a series of interlocking Native American alliance networks into a unified Native front (Table 5), and such regulation among other conditions sparked the Yamassee War (Ramsey 2008).

As conflict emerged, individuals balanced their local concerns with a large-scale powerful movement toward war advocated by the core nations and thus attempted to preserve local autonomy as well as beneficial relations with powerful neighbors (Ramsey 2008:127, 155-162). Native American unrest began in 1711 due to traders’ abuses, use of Native American land by whites, and the fact that the number of available slaves had
Table 5: Selection from 1715 Census of Indians of South Carolina and Nearby (Adapted from Gallay 2002:206)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yamasee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apalachicola</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apalachee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savano</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuchi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>[270 women and children]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochesee or Creek</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abihka</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taliboossee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

plummeted (Crane 1929:164-167; Hahn 2004:76; Worth 2009b:305). Similarly, Florida Governor Corcoles y Martinez (1715) traced the revolt’s origins to 1712 due to English insistence on the use of Native American slaves as the primary currency, including seizing the families of debtors (Hann 2006:139; Worth 2009b:305). Certainly, pressures exerted by English traders and administrators over the next three years led to the 1715 rebellion (Hahn 2004:75; Worth 2009b:306). Rumors began circulating regarding British plans to enslave the Creek, and when agents John Wright and Thomas Nairne conducted a census in the spring of 1715, many perceived the action as threatening (Hahn 2004:78). The Spanish and French had ample time to prepare for the revolt, and in 1707 and 1709 respectively those countries received overtures of peace (Hahn 2004:79, following Vargas 1710; Ponchartrain 1709).

The Yamasee War marks the division between European trade through use of Indian burdeners and trade via packhorses (Ramsey 2008:194). After the War, Carolinians utilized the Creek along the Chattahoochee River rather than the Ochese Creek as the first stop to westward trade (Mason 1963:22). The Cherokee began to assert
themselves with ever-increasing confidence (Ramsey 2008:183) and the 1718 Coweta Resolution led individual Creek talwas to ally with the French, Spanish, or British (Figure 6).

Trade goods demonstrate exclusively British trade activity at Big Tallassee (also known as Tulsa), a major Muskogee town, despite the fact that Fort Toulouse stood only 38 kilometers away (Knight and Smith 1980:71-72). Gunflint ratios alone might demonstrate such a distinction; excavations at Yuchi Town found 10 British gunflints to 1 French (Braley 1998:102), with Mount Pleasant possessing a similar ratio of 4 French gunflints to 30 British (Elliot 1991). However, because French as well as English gunflints appear at the eighteenth-century Fort Christanna in Virginia (Stevenson et al. 2007), the origin of material alone does not demonstrate the ethnic affiliation of particular trade networks. Regardless, the critical 1718 Coweta decision grew out of French and Spanish failure to meet Creek market requirements and likely apprehension of re-entering a British-driven monopoly (Ramsey 2008:217).

Understanding the structures inherent within the Southeastern colonial frontier allows for clearer illustration of the transformations that occurred during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In turn, such illustration sheds new light upon the various individual motivations and actions within the areas of Mobile and Pensacola, discussed in the subsequent chapter, as well as efforts by the Apalachee in particular, discussed in Chapter 4.
Figure 6: Selection from map by Mnsr. Lt. Baron de Crenay (1733)
CHAPTER III
ETHNOHISTORY-- DEVELOPMENT OF PENSACOLA AND MOBILE

The frontier of Spanish Pensacola and French Louisiana offers an excellent window for elaboration of those Spanish, French, and British colonial efforts discussed in the previous chapter. Founded in response to potential French aggression and British destruction of Spanish Florida, Pensacola Presidio Santa María de Galve (1698-1719) enjoyed limited success when compared to French Mobile (founded 1702). Most Apalachee migrated to Pensacola only briefly before moving on to Mobile, at least until the establishment of Apalachee Mission Nuestra Senora de Soledad y San Luis (1718 to 1740). Officials in France largely focused on the areas to the north and west; local officials established Fort Toulouse (1718-1763) and Fort Tombecbe (1736-1763) to solidify relations with the Upper Creek and Choctaw, respectively. After struggling with the French for control of Santa María, the move to Santa Rosa Island (1722-1756) succeeded roughly as well as Santa María, until a hurricane led to the formal establishment of Presidio San Miguel (1756-1763) on the mainland. Viceregal documents from the National Archives in Mexico imply that royal investment increased in 1754 due to alliances with Apalachee and Yamasee. Examination of these and other events, coupled with varying responses, allow for a brief synthesis that will in turn allow for analysis of the eighteenth-century Apalachee response.
Early Pensacola and Mobile: Spanish Failure and French Success

Spain ignored Pensacola Bay after Tristan de Luna’s failed colonization attempt in 1559 and Pedro Menendez de Aviles’ success at St. Augustine until the 1682 French exploration of the Gulf Coast (Charles II 1684; Márquez Cabrera 1684, 1686; Asorga 1685, 1686; Astina 1685; Palacios 1685; Munibe 1685, 1686; Junta de Guerra in Madrid 1686a, 1686b, 1686c; Paredes 1686; Toledo 1686; Talamantes [1780]). Spaniards colonized Texas in 1690 in response to French aggression (Cerda 1689b). The Spanish colonized Pensacola partially because of Andres de Pez’s 1689 manifesto that described possible profit via lumber, crops, and Native American labor but maintained that the increased security would pay for itself. Although any direct economic benefit would be limited, occupation of the area would protect Spanish shipping and add to profits and protect other holdings (Pez 1689; Arriola 1698; Autos Concerning Santa Maria de Galve 1698). However, Pez’s descriptions of economic potential never occurred—Pensacola remained reliant on the situado, a subsidy that supported garrisons (Cerda 1689a, 1693; Fiscal of Spain 1690; Junta de Guerra in Madrid 1690; Torres y Ayala 1693; Bushnell 1994:20).

By the 1698 establishment of Pensacola, no extensive local Native American population remained (Charles II 1697, 1698a, 1698b, 1699, 1700; Reyna 1698; Junta de Guerra Mexico 1699; Clune et al. 2003; Hann 2006; Worth 2008). While other areas of Spanish Florida attempted some degree of economic self-sufficiency through agriculture, Pensacola became a remote garrison in a depopulated area, constantly struggling with British violence and competing with the French for Native alliances (Crane 1929; Vega 1699a). Retez Salazar (1708) described the population of Presidio Santa María de Galve...
as 41% mestizo, 34% Spanish, 21% mulatto, and 4% zambo. As early as September 1699, local officials began requesting relief shipments and defense patrols (Sarmiento y Valladares 1699; Torres y Ayala 1699; Vega 1699b). Extensive illicit trade emerged as local officials attempted to improve their own standing above that of the community.

Johnson (2003) describes Pensacola as reliant on the French at Mobile from 1702 to 1763, yet local relations clearly shifted based on shifting supplies and politics. While early on officials discussed a Spanish-French alliance (Ubilla y Medina 1701), and the Mobile-Veracruz trade route emerged quickly (Junta de Guerra in Madrid 1705a), several documents demonstrate hostility. For example, Iberville in 1701 noted the Spanish inability to defend themselves and Nicola de la Salle in 1703 described the Spaniards’ inability to provision themselves (Higginbotham 1977:111; Allain 1988:62). While the Spaniards recognized their tenuous hold on the region (Council of the Indies 1702b), they refused French assistance on more than one occasion (Junta de Guerra in Madrid 1705b). These and other examples of hostility and aggression as demonstrated in the documents indicate that alliances in Europe often had limited effects on frontier interactions (Allain 1988:65; Johnson 2010).

French-Spanish alliance along the frontier was only maintained due to the overwhelming British threat. British-allied Creek Indians devastated Santa María de Galve in 1707 (Junta de Guerra in Madrid 1707), leading to plots for revenge (Autos Mexico 1708; Corcoles y Martínez 1708; Junta de Guerra in Madrid 1709). However, when British aggression cooled, officials in Spain attempted to dodge debt with France (French Ambassador to Spain 1739), and Florida officials refused French weapons (Philip V 1725) while also discreetly receiving French supplies (Montiano 1740).
Renewed British aggression in the 1740s led to French support (Vessel Report in Havana 1742; Güemes y Horcasitas 1742, 1743; Montiano 1747). Spanish currency was officially allowed to pass between Pensacola and Mobile in 1758 (Rochean 1758), although that occurred much earlier (Valdes 1712).

In 1702, Iberville ordered settlement of the Mobile River, about 18 leagues from the sea, connecting the French more directly with the local Native Americans and the Spanish of Pensacola (Surrey 1916:24-5). River systems in French Louisiana provided over 16,000 miles of navigable area, not including minor rivers, streams, or canals (Surrey 1916:32). The Mississippi offered valuable connections to New Mexico and New France (D’Artaguette 1710; Surrey 1916:34). Variations of the bark canoe and pirogue emerged as early as Iberville’s 1700 proposal of light flatboats (bateaux plats) that would carry wool and hides from the interior to the gulf (Surrey 1916:59). The Spanish at Pensacola possessed no such navigation scheme (Arriola 1699). While taking advantage of the geography, French officials also made use of Spanish smuggling via outrageous profit margins while simultaneously using Pensacola as a buffer against the British (Surrey 1916:155-156, 419; Higginbotham 1977; Roberts 2009).

French colonists were mostly interested in mining and trading rather than guaranteeing self-sufficiency through agriculture. The first Louisiana officials applied 160 years of experience with Native alliances in Canada. Bienville’s strategy involved gifts to the Choctaw and Chickasaw, use of Native languages, offering guns for English scalps, and other methods to tempt Native groups away from Pensacola (Bienville 1706, 1708). One official described the French network as “10,000 Indians who breathe nothing but war,” with the British unable to push through and the Spanish unable to compete.
Various Spanish officials saw the benefit of this strategy, but their inability to mimic this idea led Bienville to consider Pensacola to be another of his buffer nations against the British (Higginbotham 1977:92, 213).

Few missionaries existed in Louisiana, as La Salle and other French officials recognized that the polite disbelief Native Americans displayed toward Christianity did not affect the success of political alliances (Allain 1988:71, 77). Few fortune-seekers or exiles possessed abilities suitable for creating a settlement. France sent foodstuffs to keep Louisiana alive, leading to the construction of the Dauphin Island storehouse. From 1702-1706, French colonial officials, on their own initiative, removed 47,807 livres of merchandise to sell for a 600% profit to the Spanish. Profits largely went to Iberville and his family rather than their hungry compatriots, restricting the success of the colony (Surrey 1916:155-6, 419).

After the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht, Spain closed her ports to the English, giving the advantage to the French. Nevertheless, illegal trade continued (Surrey 1916:445). In 1712, Antoine Crozat gained a trade monopoly and responsibility over Louisiana, and his concern for the trade monopoly over the colony prevented much development. He gave Louisiana back to the Crown in 1717, who granted the Company of the West the same privileges. Trade with the Spanish, particularly toward the west, emerged as a primary concern, leading to the 1714 establishment of Natchitoches, the 1717 founding of New Biloxi, and the 1718 settlement of New Orleans (Surrey 1916:26, 157-9).

Surrey (1916:250) describes famine in Louisiana between 1699 and 1712 and Crozat’s erratic management of the province from 1712-1717. At that point, the companies sent out many more vessels. By 1710, French settlers produced more than
they consumed and sold 8,140 *livres* and 18 *sols* of foodstuffs to French officials for the maintenance of the garrison (Surrey 1916:250). In contrast, from 1710 to 1714, Santa María cost over 100,000 pesos per year and needed outside supplies three times a year (Alencastre Noroña y Silva 1714; Cueva Enríquez 1703). Unlike Pensacola sand, Mobile’s fertile riverine soils allowed for growth of tobacco, barley, rye, oats, flax, indigo, plum, peaches, grapes, corn, as well as feed (Mandeville 1709).

Iberville frequently pressed for open trade, feeling that without it the colony would remain stagnant (Surrey 1916:156). Strict definitions of official trade began in 1712 under Crozat and only fueled the illicit trade, as the official price for Native American goods removed the possibility of profit (Surrey 1916:342; Ramsey 2008:136). Such efforts continued to hide behind official requests; in 1713 a Mexican merchant was allowed into Louisiana in exchange for a French ship being allowed each year to dock at Veracruz for foodstuffs. Each ship carried under-the-table merchandise, such as deerskins. In 1717, the Company of the West began sailing for Villa Rica, Mexico, and the port of Veracruz and began allowing Spanish ships into Mobile starting on November 25, 1718 (Surrey 1916:390-392).

French trade relied upon their Native American allies. Cadillac’s late 1715 refusal to smoke calumet with Mississippi River groups from Illinois to Mobile was a huge insult, was recognized as such by Bienville, and was soon met with violence. This insult occurred as Native Americans feared the resurgence of British trade, which began in 1716 with Cherokee initiatives after the beginning of the Yamasee War (Ramsey 2008:153-154). The 1715-1716 Yamasee War, anticipated by at least a few Spanish and French officials (Hahn 2000, 2004), destroyed British control of Native alliances. In
contrast to groups located to the south, the Catawba, Cherokee, Upper Creek, and Choctaw took longer to decide before attacking British traders in their areas, sending a clear political message to their allies, enemies, and their own people (Ramsey 2008:126, 146). The French established Fort Rosalie in 1716, Fort Toulouse in 1717, and New Orleans in 1718. This geographic expansion, coupled with exponential increase in migration, allowed for a brief domination of Native alliances and facilitated conquest of Pensacola in 1719. Within the year, the Spanish regained control only to lose it again to the French.

After the official end of hostilities was declared, the French burned Santa María de Galve and left. Recognizing the vulnerability of the mainland to European and Native American attack, Spaniards moved the presidio to San Joseph farther east before returning to Santa Rosa Island, and soon referred to that garrison as Presidio Isla de Santa Rosa, Punta de Sigüenza. Officials recognized that while settling on the island reduced the vulnerability of the presidio, the location largely prevented economic success. The Santa Rosa presidio thus relied even more heavily on subsidies from New Spain, although more capably defending the harbor. Trade continued among port towns, but interaction with Native American allies suffered. All the same, the Apalachee established a new mission in 1741, Yamassee refugees from St. Augustine and the Creek established a settlement in the mid-1740s, and the Tawasa established a settlement farther north in 1738 (Tijanape Valero 1738:6). In 1740, Spaniards noted “one hundred and twenty domesticated Indians that enter and leave” (Castro Figueroa y Salazar 1740:62v) at the presidio; most likely, the majority of these were Apalachee.
Also in 1740, the Royal Company of Havana gained a royal monopoly over tobacco, slaves, and commerce with Spain. This company redistributed the situado and provisions from New Spain to the presidios of Florida, Galveston, Puerto Rico, Santo Domingo, and Cumana (León 1996:105-106). Within this context, Pensacola Governor Pedro Primo de Rivera requested troops from either San Juan de Ulua or Campeche and briefly mentions increased commerce with Indians and New Orleans (Philip V 1729)

**Presidio San Miguel: Transformation via Economic Investment**

As eighteenth-century Bourbon reforms transformed central Spanish structures, frontier officials in Pensacola attempted to mimic French success. Presidios Santa María and Santa Rosa remained “reluctant colonists” even when compared to the French at Mobile. Despite significant monetary investment, defenses against British aggression and French alliances proved fruitless. However, after the 1752 hurricane, and perhaps also due to conflict in Europe, the Viceroy realized the value of a concerted effort and sent a variety of orders to increase Pensacola’s success, largely relating to more regular trade with Native Americans and subsidy shipments. He also ordered 50,000 pesos and 12 cannons for the fort, 50 cavalry and associated effects, 100 women, and 200 convicts including brick layers and carpenters (Gorraes 1756; Ahumada y Villalón 1756b:1-2, 1756d, 1757a). Additionally, he and his successor ordered the maintenance of the 2 infantry companies, totaling 112 infantrymen, including 3 officials and supplies (Ahumada y Villalón 1758a; Montserrat 1762). In 1756, the Royal Officials of Veracruz sent 49,994 pesos, 2 tomines, and supplies—including hardtack (bizcocho), pork, beans, beef, salt, iron cauldrons, chickens, and gunpowder—to Pensacola (Gorraes 1756; Marina Vol. 11 1756:287). Certain monthly salaries were increased by 25% in 1756 (Ahumada y
Villalón 1756c). Also in the 1750s, Dauphin Island became a more critical site for redistribution of goods to New Mexico and Cuba. While under the jurisdiction of French Mobile, ships passing from Veracruz to Havana enjoyed use of this port. As a direct result of these developments, Pensacola became a “complicated axis of exchange” that largely escaped Royal control and throughout the eighteenth century had Royal Officials “with the highest levels of fraud” (León 1996:106).

The increased status of the San Miguel garrison of Pensacola led to a variety of economic activities. Residents of St. Augustine and Pensacola traded resin, pitch, tar, medical herbs, and lumber to Veracruz, Havana, and Campeche. Ships leaving Pensacola often carried only these supplies (León 1996:106). For example, 292 barrels of tar were sent from Pensacola in November 1759 (Ahumada y Villalón 1759b), compared to 208 barrels of tar sent from New Orleans to Veracruz the following year (Royal Officials of Veracruz 1760). In 1759, the small schooner Nuestra Señora de la Victoria carried supplies of Don Miguel Chapuz to sell in Pensacola from Campeche (Urriola 1758, 1759). From August 1759 to March of 1760, a variety of contraband trade between Pensacola and Havana included chinquinto (a type of rum), metal pins, iron nuts and bolts (fierro de perneria), and ships nails (Ortiz 1760). León (1996:107) describes this web of illegal trade between New Orleans, Pensacola, Havana, and Veracruz as dominating the Gulf and decreasing the value of Havana’s arsenal.

By the 1750s, French and Spanish territories enjoyed a close connection. New Orleans purchased supplies from Veracruz in 1762 (Billouart 1762). In 1757, Veracruz cannons were sent to the French in exchange for helping Spanish presidios, and demonstrated a mutual defense against the British (Ahumada y Villalón 1757b). Other
items, such as “flour, cotton, wool, iron, steel, tavon (olive oil dregs), twine, gunpowder, woolen cloth, rug, [and] rope” were traded between Louisiana and Texas presidios in 1759 (Ahumada y Villalón 1759a).

After the British occupation of Havana in 1762, the number of slaves sent to Pensacola, New Orleans, and Veracruz increased. León (1996:106, following Castilla et al. 1761) estimates between 3,000 and 10,000 slaves were sent in that year alone. The 1762 Native American ration at Pensacola—50 barrels of rum, 12 tomines of flour, 12 tomines of beans, 6 tomines of fava beans, and 3 tomines of jam—reflects their high value (Soto 1763). However, 60 pesos alone paid for the annual gifts in addition to the rations (Ahumada y Villalón 1758b).

In addition to other economic shifts, private investment increased substantially after the 1754 royal funding of Presidio San Miguel. In 1763, private lots were valued at 10,090 pesos (Parilla 1763). In 1761, at least four forzados stayed in Pensacola rather than returning to Mexico, due to the economic potential offered by Pensacola’s three haciendas—San Antonio, La Trinidad, and La Luz (Ullate 1761:252v). Pensacola’s total cost by 1763—4,565,823 pesos 5 tomines 10.5 granos (Montserrat 1764) included, per year, far more money for Presidio San Miguel than for the other three presidios (Table 6).

Clear differences existed between the military of Presidios Santa María and San Miguel. Initially soldiers were Mexicans serving sentences for light offenses (Clune et al. 2003: 26-27), yet by 1760, it was not uncommon for soldiers to be nobles rather than criminals (Senior Inquisitor of the Holy Office Against Jose Miguel Reyes 1760). While Santa María soldiers included many convicted bigamists, in San Miguel only one soldier
Table 6: Pensacola’s Expenses (Adapted from Soto 1764)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidio Santa María (1698-1719)</td>
<td>971,763 pesos 4 tomines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio Santa Rosa (1722-1753)</td>
<td>572,505 pesos 7 tomines 1 grano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio San Miguel (1754-1763)</td>
<td>1,544,269 pesos 3 tomines ½ granos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration after French occupation (1719-1722)</td>
<td>1,070,284 pesos 5 tomines 2 granos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to Veracruz after 1763 Treaty of Paris</td>
<td>177,371 pesos 5 tomines 6 gramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rations (1722-1763)</td>
<td>970,866 pesos 2 tomines 5 granos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Munitions (1722-1763)</td>
<td>333,059 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owed to individuals</td>
<td>34,146 pesos 1 tomín 6 granos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was charged with bigamy (Franck 1700; Senior Inquisitor of the Holy Office Against Jose Miguel Reyes 1760). Similarly, while 25 women chose to move to Pensacola in 1756, Pensacola’s earlier reputation was that of a place Mexican officials could not bring themselves to send even female prisoners (Bracamonte 1703; Junta General 1703; Jurado 1703; Ahumada y Villalón 1756a). Such a shift in reputation between Santa Maria (1698-1719) and San Miguel (1754-1763) from a garrison of the lower class to a place where people willingly moved perhaps indicates that Spanish officials mimicked the French strategy of using lower-class single women from Paris to increase the social stature and population of the colony.

In short, 1754 marked the beginning of a transformation in Pensacola. As opposed to earlier, harsher conditions, it became a site for frontier opportunities for both the Spanish and Native Americans, largely due to the opportunities offered by royal funding as well as a solid alliance with France against England during the Seven Years War. Infantry Lieutenant Don Thomas Sebastian, among others, advocated the utility of having distinguished families in Pensacola (Ortiz 1759). By 1763, royal investment in Pensacola
was less than that of Puerto Rico and Santo Domingo but more than Santiago, Cuba, Santa Fe, and other areas (Table 7).

Table 7: 1763 Finances (Adapted from Barnuevo and Mier y Theran 1763)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Annual Expense Reported in 1763</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windward Fleet Locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo</td>
<td>898,662 pesos 1 tomín 1 grano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan de Puerto Rico</td>
<td>435,972 pesos 1 tomín 8 grano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isla de Cuba</td>
<td>38,050 pesos 2 tomines 4 granos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida [St. Augustine &amp; Pensacola]</td>
<td>274,616 pesos 1 tomín 6 granos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola: to buy iron and other things</td>
<td>200,000 pesos 1 tomín 9 granos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumana</td>
<td>205,356 pesos 5 tomines 3 granos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escuadra de Cartagena</td>
<td>440,000 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio de Carmen</td>
<td>262,236 pesos 2 tomines 10 granos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in New Spain’s Frontier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Agustín de Ahumada</td>
<td>13,065 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>32,095 pesos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with other colonial garrisons, the corruption of Pensacola restricted its official economic development but led to an extensive trade network. Native Americans played a huge role as middlemen and intermediaries within this economic development.

**Gulf Coast Native American Alliance Decisions**

Economic connections translated to political prestige, and Native Americans attempted to shape European knowledge and action accordingly (Lightfoot 2005; DuVal 2006). At times, Native Americans and Europeans enjoyed a mutual accommodation (White 1991). However, more powerful Native groups sought more than compromise and incorporated rather than accommodated Europeans (DuVal 2006:4-5). Alliances depended on the character of participants, whether they maintained neutrality between the
powers or sought alliance with a particular nation. This section attempts to determine how different groups chose between the Spanish and French by outlining political situations and manipulations.

In the eighteenth century, Native Americans that chose to ally with the Spanish did so due to some combination of economic opportunity as well as loyalty to Spain and the Church. After the Yamasee War, the Spanish continued using the mission system to maintain a “modified paramount chieftdom” (Worth 2002:46) by cementing alliances with the Yamasee and Apalachee in the Pensacola area through rations for the tribes and official titles for the chiefs. These and other Native Americans carefully considered which Europeans to choose as allies based on political, economic, and social reasons (Hann 1992:188-208; Worth 1995:47, 1998 (1):77-102).

Among the three European powers, the French consciously accommodated Native American ideas regarding gift and tribute (DuVal 2006:63; Ramsey 2008:60-61). As such, eighteenth-century French officials and traders maintained close ties with Native Americans with mutual military and economic benefit. Substantial, continuous Native assistance maintained French settlements to gain European goods and military allies. French colonists consciously lived near Native settlements to encourage this quid-pro-quo (Waselkov and Gums 2000:215-216, following Zitomersky 1992:154-177). Despite this over-arching similarity, relations between the French and Native Americans differed depending on specific local social, economic, demographic, and political factors.

The arrival of the French in 1702 quickly benefited the Mobilians, who had suffered over 10 years of British-sponsored slave raiding by the Upper Creek and struggled to maintain their primacy in the area. In exchange for food and military
assistance, the French attempted to broker treaties between the Mobilians, Chickasaw, and Alabama, but only managed a temporary truce in March 1702 (Waselkov and Gums 2000:7-8). Mobilian acceptance of French customs seems to have been fairly limited; while guns and certain other goods proved popular, only a few individuals accepted Christianity or married Frenchmen (Waselkov and Gums 2000:16). British-allied elements of the Choctaw attempted to turn the Mobilians away from the French several times during the first half of the eighteenth century, but the Mobilians continually refused (Waselkov and Gums 2000:17).

The Tomé similarly wanted alliance with the French, who barely managed to broker alliances between the Tomé and Mobilians, even though those two Native groups had the same enemies in the Chickasaw and Alabama (Waselkov and Gums 2000:19-20). The Tomé maintained close links to the Choctaw, dating from a seventeenth-century salt trade that persisted until at least 1746. Additionally, “a few Chatta” lived with the Tomé in 1714, and by 1730 Tomé and Naniaba lived with the Choctaw along the Mobile River. Close socioeconomic connections extended from the seventeenth through eighteenth centuries between the Tomé and Choctaw, that might indeed reflect “a shared ethnic identity and foreshadow their eventual political consolidation” (Waselkov and Gums 2000:37).

The Choctaw, numbering some 20,000 in a Creek-like confederacy at the time of French contact, proved the most important group to French diplomatic efforts. Marcos Delgado in 1686 mentioned the Choctaw war with the Pensacola and Estananis (Biloxis). The Choctaw provided economic and strategic benefit by providing “deerskins and peltry, bear oil, foodstuffs, and medicinal plant products in exchange for manufactured
goods from France” (Waselkov and Gums 2000:37). Individual French colonists were allowed to enter Choctaw villages. In March 1702, Henri de Tonti began an annual tradition of giving 50,000 livres of muskets, gunpowder, shot, and other gifts to the Choctaw and Chickasaw, who soon resumed their war. By 1708, a pro-British faction developed in eastern Choctaw towns. This British-French rift among the Choctaw grew to the point that the pro-French towns of Loucha (Coucha), Echicachae (Chickasaway), and an unnamed village (likely Yowani) moved to the Mobile area from about 1715 until the 1725 defeat of the pro-British faction. During the late 1720s, the French inhabited a few of these Choctaw villages, establishing a Jesuit mission in Chickasaway and a trading house in Yowani. During the 1729-1731 Natchez War, the Choctaw repeatedly attacked the Natchez villages and refugee fort (Waselkov and Gums 2000:36-37). While the French shared Creek alliances with the British, they fiercely protected the Choctaw trade by encouraging violent action against British factions, leading to a Choctaw civil war that lasted from 1746 to 1750. The French enjoyed a pyrrhic victory as their faction won after hundreds of deaths (Waselkov and Gums 2000:37).

Small coastal groups, such as the Tensaw, moved their settlements in an attempt to ingratiate themselves with the French at Mobile, and later to seek areas less vulnerable to British-allied Indians (Waselkov and Gums 2000:32-34). Even these groups accepted French goods on their terms rather than assimilating to French society. Larger groups such as the Choctaw represented larger economic potential for the French, who also saw the potential benefit in balancing alliances between the French and British. By 1713, the Alabama sought refuge from conflict with the French and Spanish allied Indians, and in 1717 encouraged the construction of Fort Toulouse at the village of Taskigi, sending
British traders there to other towns (Waselkov and Gums 2000:35, following Thomas 1960; Waselkov et al. 1982; and Waselkov 1993). Such strategies of balancing allegiances at the town level proved profitable for many Native American groups until 1763. Larger groups could balance multiple European powers, while smaller Native American groups such as the Tomé continued traditional alliances even after the arrival of the French. Native concerns drove much of eighteenth-century interaction in the Southeast.

**Conclusion and Discussion**

While several authors (see for example León 1996:107) often describe the colonial era as one European country with her Native American allies against another, this chapter briefly expands on such an oversimplification. For example, the Creek maintained a balance between the European powers and traded with Pensacola through the Yamassee and Apalachee before destroying the outskirts of Pensacola in 1761. Without these outposts, Pensacola largely collapsed, as buildings and other resources fell into disrepair. This vulnerability increased with the 1762 British seizure of Havana. From 1762-1763, the British sold cloth, jackets, and slaves from Havana to the military in Spanish Pensacola (León 1996:108). Because Native Americans often dictated colonial interaction, the subsequent chapter focuses on the Apalachee by contextualizing their varying actions and situations.
CHAPTER IV
APALACHEE RESPONSE

Extensive research describes the Creek as at times actively attempting to maintain neutrality with Europeans; groups of Apalachee acted likewise as capable middlemen. Eighteenth-century Apalachee stood in a unique position to take advantage of Southeastern political relationships. This position emerged, in part, due to their situations and responses dating back to the early seventeenth-century interactions with Europeans. While largely allied with the Spanish, by 1704 dissatisfaction led several Apalachee to pursue alliances with the British, while others remained in Spanish Florida or moved to French Mobile. Individual strategies as well as a sense of community affected shifts in Apalachee identity throughout the eighteenth century.

In 1608, the Apalachee and Spanish pursued alliances for different reasons. By this point, Apalachee individuals had access to European goods via neighboring Native Americans as well as the rare shipwreck. Native leaders pursued alliances, in part, to receive gifts from the Florida governor at St. Augustine. After actions elsewhere in New Spain demonstrated the power of gift giving rather than force as a cheap method to maintain alliances, the Spanish Crown allotted an annual sum for these gifts (Hann 1988:133). In 1608, friars attempted to broker peace between the Apalachee and Timucua to continue their success with the Timucua (Hann 1988:182, following Ore 1936:114-117). Soon after the formal 1633 establishment of Apalachee missions, Spaniards ended
hostilities between the Apalachee and their neighbors: the Chacato, Amacano, and Apalachicola (Hann 1988:182, following Vega Castro y Pardo 1639). As with other colonial interaction, European and Native interests alike governed these negotiations.

As far back as the era of Hernando de Soto, Spaniards noted a communal pride in being Apalachee, as well as the fact that individual village units made independent decisions. As such, the Apalachee, as well as other Southeastern Native groups, possessed a certain “tight cultural unity” that likely existed due to certain political relationships between villages (Hann 1988:97). However, towns rarely agreed unanimously on political matters (Hann 1988:97). Eleven largely autonomous major villages each possessed one to five satellite villages. Historic documents only provide brief hints as to how the Spanish manipulated chiefly control over particular villages (Hann 1988:100). For example, political relationships within the Apalachee shifted when the Spanish chose San Luís as the capital area, leading other Apalachee leaders to covet the relationship the San Luís leader enjoyed (Hann 1988:31). Despite this situation, from 1608 through 1702, Spaniards described Ivitachuco’s chief, rather than that of San Luís, as “greatest of them all” and “the most important of all the Apalachee chiefs” (Hann 1988:99). By 1671, Spaniards noted hostility between villages, especially directed toward San Luís, and began to play different Apalachee groups against each other (Hann 1988:77, following Bushnell 1978:9).

Chiefly authorities did not entirely control the distribution of materials stored in community storehouses (Hann 1988:145). In the case of certain leaders, their rise to power occurred in part due to official endorsement from friars and other Spaniards. Certain Native American leaders also served, during the 1670s and 1680s at least, as
infantry captains in village militias. A number of these individuals had Spanish names and could write and speak Spanish. The parish interpreter and fiscal gained some standing in the eyes of certain Spaniards by at times directly serving the friars or the military. A royal interpreter served during visitations and other official interactions. This scenario echoes situations elsewhere in New Spain, through which interpreters in legal matters enjoyed a certain level of power and prestige.

Spaniards considered non-Apalachee settlements sufficiently autonomous within the Apalachee province enough to receive separate treatments during visitations, proving they existed as separate mission centers with their own perspectives and grievances rather than merely existing as satellite Apalachee villages (Hann 1988:103). Following royal decrees, and despite criticism by some Spanish officials, the Apalachee maintained cultural practices that did not contradict Catholicism. The matrilineal and matrilocal elements common in Southeastern groups continued, as did particular elaborate dress for battle and revenge killings (Hann 1988:70-71). Christianity and Spanish legal ideas might have restrained these practices to some unknown degree, but they certainly persisted (Hann 1988:248). Slave taking was officially outlawed, but some amount of the practice was allowed, as it discouraged the murder of prisoners (Hann 1988:158). Three games—chunkey (quisio), the ball game, and a women’s cane racket game—persisted, despite extensive protests regarding the spiritual aspects of the ball game. Both Apalachee leaders and local Spaniards defended the ball game, arguing that it had been stripped of its pagan superstitions and provided a more peaceful way for individuals and groups to take out aggression that might otherwise lead to more violent conflict (Hann 1988:86-88). Some truth likely lies within that official stance, and undoubtedly local Spaniards and
Apalachee leaders used that excuse to maintain an important cultural practice. Similarly, shamanism, including curanderos or healers, similarly persisted, as did traditional dances. Body painting may have become less common, or perhaps it was simply not described in the documents. Friars regulated the busk, or green corn ceremony, by converting it to St. Louis’s feast day and Holy Saturday. The Apalachee likely maintained their own traditions within Catholic practices, synthesizing the two worldviews in a way that the friars did not describe for fear of downplaying their conversion efforts. Throughout the mission era, Spaniards continued to describe polygamy and adultery committed by Native Americans (Hann 1988:92-94). In short, a variety of actions indicate some degree of communal maintenance of tradition even as the Apalachee at least nominally adopted certain Spanish practices.

Hann (1988:237) concludes that ethnogenesis occurred in the Apalachee homeland; extensive connections between the Spanish and Apalachee led to the formation of a new culture that fused Spanish and aboriginal elements. Native potters at times produced pottery exclusively for the Spanish (Hann 1988:245, citing Montiano 1756; Waselkov and Gums 2000; Cordell 2001; Melcher 2011) that led to dramatic shifts in the forms of Native ceramics. Colonowares, including the annular ring and pitcher form, emerged in response to European-inspired Mexican majolica (Hann 1988:245-246).

Demographic decline led to the emergence of new social ties and traditions, even a “decline in aesthetics” (Hann 1988:246; Saunders 2000, 2009). Bushnell (1978) demonstrates the skill Florida natives possessed in navigating the Spanish legal system that also occurred elsewhere in colonial Latin America (Yannakakis 2008). These factors, coupled with increased interaction along the Camino Real that was built on existing
Indian trade routes, led to what Worth (2009a) terms a “Northwest Florida mission identity.” Despite maintaining this identity, by the late seventeenth century a number of Apalachee had grown tired of the Spanish.

**Hispanicized and Bitter from 1670s-1704**

The Spanish stepped up military activity starting in 1659 in response to British and French aggression. This intensified activity increased demands on Native labor and potentially led to the emergence of a more complex leadership structure (Hann 1988:116). The governor of Florida’s deputy in Apalachee during the 1680s, Lt. Antonio Matheos, made increasingly unreasonable demands on Apalachee resources while insulting their leaders. His brutal tyranny led a few Apalachee to move to Apalachicola, particularly because new financial restrictions frustrated and irritated several Apalachee leaders by prohibiting trade with the Apalachicola (Aranda y Avellaneda 1687; Royal Officials of Florida 1687; Hann 1988:227). Matheos’ unpopularity might have contributed to, or been aggravated by, the fact that his superiors did not reimburse him for his expedition to look for the La Salle settlement (Márquez Cabrera 1688).

As Matheos strained relationships with the Apalachee, the Lower Creek towns of Coweta and Cussita invited British traders and stated they wanted nothing to do with the Spanish. Henry Woodward arrived first in Coweta, leading to their privileged authority in the Chattahoochee region with regard to the British. Lt. Antonio Matheos made numerous attempts to expel the British, in part aided by Apalachicola chief Pentocolo. Pentocolo made some efforts to placate Matheos, but blamed the four northern towns for the British trade, including Coweta and Cussita, figuring Matheos would punish those towns but spare the others. Satisfied, Matheos burned those four northern towns. Woodward, having
already married a niece to a Coweta, distributed gifts to the Lower Creek. His actions, coupled with debts the Native Americans had already developed with the English and the Spaniards’ overstepping their bounds by building a fort in Apalachicola, convinced the Apalachicola to abandon Spanish alliances. Accordingly, the chiefs of Coweta and Cussita led the Chattahoochee River people toward Carolina, signifying a new political leadership as the Coweta went from being a “new town” to being the leading one (Hahn 2004:41-47). A few experienced Floridians described the initial actions of Coweta as cultivating options and potential neutrality, but Spanish over-reaction in the form of Matheos would prove disastrous (Hann 1988:187-190, 227; 2006:107).

A new governor in 1693 corrected many of these abuses directed toward the Apalachee, for example, he moved Spanish ranches away from Apalachee land. On the other hand, he continued to drain Apalachee resources by leading another expedition to the Pensacola area (Auto General 1694; Hann 1988:232). The 1701-1714 War for Spanish Succession further drained Spain and New Spain alike, causing Florida to rely on her Native allies who were at that point “grievously alienated and severely demoralized” (Hann 1988:60). The Council of the Indies (1702a) recognized these problems, yet the Apalachee proved necessary, including performing such tasks as serving as carpenters at Presidio Santa Maria (Council of the Indies 1702b). While Spaniards recognized the British threat to the Apalachee (Martinez 1699; Torres y Ayala 1699), they could not defend their Native allies. This weakness, coupled with decades of exploitation, led many Apalachee to surrender to Colonel James Moore during the raids of 1704 (Hann 1988:117). Two entire villages went to Moore without a fight, and many other Apalachee frankly stated their bitterness to Spanish soldiers and refused the offer of resettlement at
St. Augustine (Hann 1988:234-236). While many did remain with the Spanish, some 1,000 Apalachee slaves and 1,300 free Apalachee went with Moore and his Creek allies (Hann 1988:269, 294).

A 1707 document written by the Royal Officials of Florida states that those Apalachee carried off to South Carolina formed three new Apalachee villages (Hann 1988:296). A 1708 description of South Carolina tribes describes 250 Apalachee men “who behaved themselves very submissive to the government” on the Savannah River in a “considerable town” (Salley 1947 (5):208, 247). Covington (1972:376) identifies that village as lying near New Windsor, South Carolina. The same 1708 source states free Apalachee also lived among the 11 towns along the Ocmulgee River, and J. Leitch Wright felt that some Apalachee lived scattered around South Carolina (Hann 1988:296, following Wright pers. comm. 1984).

The Apalachee may have lived along an upper branch of the Oconee River, as that branch remains known as the Apalachee River, though no other evidence supports this possibility, and no archaeological sites have yet hinted at their presence (Hann 1988:290). Perhaps the scarcity of grog temper restricts the ability to identify an Apalachee ceramic assemblage or South Carolina classification is not sufficiently consistent with Florida classification methods. However, Apalachee ceramic traits could have disappeared during their exile in Creek territory (see Chapter 5 for further discussion). Hann (1988:290-291) cites a 1984 communication with Mark Williams, who found no pre-1780 record of the name Apalachee for the river. Further, Smith (1992:31-32) states that the local occupation ended by the first third of the seventeenth century.
Despite certain initial misgivings by the British, the Apalachee hunted, worked as pack bearers and field hands, and even fought with the English in the Tuscarora War (Hann 1988:297 following Barnwell 1908:30; and Covington 1967:14, 1972:376). The British even moved the Apalachee closer to Charlestown for defense. Heavy trade in skins between the new villages in South Carolina led to an “Apalachee trail” to Charlestown (Crane 1929:87-88; Covington 1972:376-377). A 1708 Governor’s Council states, “these people are seated very advantageous for carrying on trade. Indians seated upwards of 700 miles off are supplied with goods by our white men that transport them from this river upon Indians’ backs” (Hann 1988:297, following Salley 1947 (5):208).

Despite this endorsement, the British sold the wives and children of Apalachee warriors into slavery or forced free Apalachee to work on trader’s farms (Hann 1988:297, following Covington 1967:14; McDowell 1955:4). Charges to this affect appear in the Commons session of 1706-1707, in which John Musgrove was charged with arbitrarily enslaving many free Indians, including some explicitly identified as Apalachee (Hann 1988:297-298). Commissioners for the Regulation of the Indian Trade made some effort to rectify these and other abuses, but the Apalachee still joined the Yamasee in the 1715 Yamasee War (Crane 1929:170). Unlike the Spanish, the British seem to have made no attempt to convert the Apalachee, though Captain Thomas Nairne applied for missionaries from the English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (Crane 1929:145-146; Hann 1988:301).

After the Yamasee War, St. Augustine hosted a variety of Creeks in 1717, including Adrián, chief of the former Apalachee village of Bacuqua. Some 46 other Apalachee from the Lower Creek joined Chief Adrián on his third visit. Adrián enjoyed
close connections with pro-Spanish Lower Creek leaders, especially Chiscalachisle (also known as Tascaliche, Chalquilicha, Talachasliche, Chislacasliche, Chasliquasliche, Cherokeeeléeeche, Cherokee-killer) chief of the town of that name built in 1716 just above the confluence of the Flint and the Chattahoochee, and Chipacasi (also known as Tsipacaya, Sincapafi, Seepeycoffee), nephew and heir to Brims (also known as Yslachamuque). The wives of Emperor Brims and Chipacasi were Christian Apalachees. The pro-English stance of Brims’ wife likely reflects the fact that she fled to the Creek during Antonio Matheos’s 1680s rule of Apalachee (Barcia Carballido y Zuñiga 1723:358; Boyd 1952:126; Tepaske 1964:202; Corkran 1967:52, 62-63; Hann 1988:288).

During the 1704 attacks, over 50 Apalachee rebels fought against the Spanish and their fellow tribesmen. In 1717, Diego Peña reported that the Apalachee and Yamasee lived dispersed among the Creek (Boyd 1952:123). Peña also mentions a Christian Apalachee, Augustus, who led a few hamlets in the Lower Creek country four days north of Chislacasliche, one day away from an Apalachee-owned cattle ranch, probably the one noted in 1716 to lie two leagues south of Sabacola (Boyd 1952:114-118). While Peña all but states that certain Apalachee enjoyed considerable power among the Lower Creek, Thomas Nairne (quoted in Ramsey 2008:111) describes the Apalachee by saying that “nothing but downright force brought them over to our side.” Gallay (2002) described them as “in effect, hostages” (quoted in Ramsey 2008:111). Following these sources and following volume two of Carroll’s (1836:575) *Historical Collections of South Carolina*, Ramsey (2008:111) concludes that the Lower Creek towns of Oconee and Apalachacola “may have functioned as sentry towns to monitor and control a captive population.”

With this statement, and the thought that the Yamasee and Apalachee lived dispersed
among the Creek to avoid further conflict (Ramsey 2008:118), interpretations of the Apalachee based on British documents seem to contradict interpretations based on Spanish documents. Even among those allied with the British in the eighteenth century, the term Apalachee might refer to a slave, a leader in Lower Creek society, or anyone in between, depending on that individual’s ability and connections.

At any rate, those Apalachee who survived the Yamasee War moved to the Chattahoochee River with the Coweta, Apalachicola, Savana, Yuchi, and Oconee tribes. Some Apalachee continued on to Pensacola, St. Augustine, or Mobile (Crane 1929:254-255). At the time of the uprising, the 1,300 free Apalachee who had relocated to Carolina in 1704 had been reduced to 638—275 men, 243 women, 65 boys, and 55 girls—while others were captured and shipped abroad as slaves (Covington 1972:378). Hann (1988:301, following Snell 1972:102) remarks that “there is no indication whether any of the Apalachee enslaved in 1704 were able to take advantage of the uprising to secure their freedom.” Other Apalachee remained with the Spanish.

**Migration to Pensacola/Mobile**

In 1704, San Luís leaders led 800 Native Americans, including most of San Luís, part of Escambe, as well as some Chato and Yamasee, to Pensacola along with their cattle (Zuniga y Zerda 1704a:65-67, 1704b:67-68; Higginbotham 1977:192-193; Hann 1988:305). Eight Spanish families traveled by sea to Pensacola from San Luís. The Pensacola commandant welcomed the newcomers despite the difficulties involved with feeding them. He attempted to keep his new Native American allies in Pensacola, but food shortages led him to reduce the daily ration of bread starting August 1. This lack of resources in turn convinced most Native Americans to relocate to Mobile. By the end of
August, San Luís and Chacato leaders arrived in Mobile with a Pensacola friar (Bienville 1704:27; Guzman 1704:62-64; Ruiz de Cuenca 1705:70-72; Higginbotham 1977:189-192; Hann 1988:305). Bienville (1704:27) was pleasantly surprised to see the San Luís contingent, who he felt would be the least likely to join him due to their close Spanish association. He estimated Apalachee immigrants at 400 and Chacato at 200 (Higginbotham 1977:189-190). At this point, most of the San Luís and Chacato relocated to Mobile, with the majority of Escambe remaining at Pensacola (Higginbotham 1977:191-192). Several more Apalachee joined the French by 1706, at which point Bienville (1726:535-536) estimated the total number of Apalachee immigrants at 500 men and the Chacato at 250 men. Because Bienville attempted to emphasize his success with Indians to Minister Ponchartrain, these numbers might be exaggerations. French success did have its limits—two Tocobaga individuals left Mobile in 1719, expressing dissatisfaction with French treatment (Barcia Carballido y Zuñiga 1723:374-5; Hann 1988:282).

In 1720, Le Page du Pratz described the Chacato Indians as Catholic, living in a small group of 40 huts, and more than willing to work for the French (Waselkov and Gums 2000:183). At Dog River, the Chacato interacted mostly with a local plantation-owning family, the Rochons (Waselkov and Gums 2000:166). Archaeological evidence suggests that Chacato households, while in a single village, were dispersed along the lower Dog River (Waselkov and Gums 2000:184). The Chacato provided labor, corn, deerskins, and other consumables to the Rochons in return for muskets, gunpowder, lead shot, glass beads, and copper kettles (Waselkov and Gums 2000:189).
In Spanish territory, small groups of Native Americans lived close to Presidio Santa María de Galve, but regulations at the time restricted Spanish access to Native American settlements. In 1705, about 200 Indians lived on the Perdido River, and at least 80 Native American laborers received rations in 1707 (Harris 1999, 2003; Clune et al. 2003; Worth 2008). Between 1715 and 1717, Yamassee and Apalachee, living among the Creek, relocated to the Pensacola area (Clune et al. 2003; Worth 2008). Juan Marcos, after receiving the title of Apalachee Governor from the Viceroy of New Spain, established a town for his own people near Pensacola in 1718, and a number of Apalachee soon left French Mobile and the British-allied Creek to join him. His Nuestra Señora de la Soledad y San Luís grew such that Juan Marcos soon established another town at San Marcos de Apalache (Barcia Carballido y Zuñiga 1723:366, 368, 372-373, 378; Worth 2008). While a Spanish store was eventually established at San Marcos, it could not successfully compete with the British (Montiano 1745; Hann 1988:293). Jose Primo de Rivera (1718) describes the Yamassee as relocating there to escape the British-allied Uchise. These Yamassee started at the Chacato village of San Carlos on the Apalachicola River before moving to the Sartucha forest, closer to Fort San Marcos de Apalache (Barcia Carballido y Zuñiga 1723:378; Hann 2006:169). From 1722 to 1740, 120 “domestic Indians” came and went as laborers and received rations at Presidio Santa Rosa (Castro Figueroa y Salazar 1740). While the ethnicity of these groups is not listed, most of them were likely Apalachee.

During the 1740s, the Apalachee and Yamassee established new settlements in Pensacola. The store in San Marcos de Apalachee also enjoyed some success in the mid-1740s (Güemes y Horcasitas 1744; Havana Company Officials 1744; Montiano 1745,
1746). The location of the Spanish presidio officially shifted to the mainland in 1756 to avoid hurricanes and gain access to Native allies, while balancing an increased vulnerability to British attack (Solís 1754). Any success proved short-lived, as in 1761 attacks by the Creek destroyed the Apalachee and Yamasee missions, resulting in the establishment of “Indian Town,” consisting of both groups just east of the San Miguel garrison in present-day downtown Pensacola. The 1763 conclusion of the Seven Years War, however, led to the Spanish evacuation of Florida. As a result, the Yamasee and Apalachee at Pensacola settled near the city of Veracruz, Mexico (Gold 1965, 1969; Worth 2008).

**Apalachee as Middlemen**


In 1719, the Apalachee at the new Spanish-allied mission village of Nuestra Señora de la Soledad y San Luís near Pensacola (Figure 7) heard that French-allied Apalachee intended to destroy the Pensacola-allied settlement. Balancing skepticism with apprehension of potential French aggression, the Pensacola commandant ordered the construction of a fortification sufficient to protect the mission long enough for the presidio to provide aid (Barcia Carballido y Zuñiga 1723:372; Hann 1988:309). During France’s brief control of Pensacola, the Apalachee seem to have remained at the mission.
In early August of 1719, an expedition sent from Cuba regained control of the Pensacola garrison. A nephew of Bienville, heading a Native American force that included Apalachee, reached Pensacola on August 11 but agreed to depart peaceably. Before departing, he and his Native American allies spent the night at the Apalachee settlement (Noyan 1719:252; Barcia Carballido y Zuñiga 1723:384-386; Hann 1988:309).

Figure 7: Pensacola area garrisons and Native American settlements (from Worth 2008)

Social connections between Apalachee on either side of the French-Spanish conflict were likely easier to maintain after the end of the conflict. Documents certainly imply that the Apalachee took advantage of the relaxed political boundaries. In 1724, the Spanish supplied the Mobile-allied Apalachee with arms (Council of the Indies 1724). By
1760, the Apalachee at present-day Blakely Park, on the eastern side of the upper delta of Mobile Bay, operated a ferry to Mobile and thus to some degree controlled the trade along the Pensacola-Mobile road (Taitt 1771; Waselkov and Gums 2000:29, 32).

Similarly, Mission San Joseph de Escambe stood near where eighteenth-century trails going west and north from Pensacola met (Taitt 1771).

In addition to serving directly between the Spanish and French, the Apalachee likely stood between the Creek and the Spanish/French. Hann (1988:312) felt the 1717-1718 Apalachee migration from Creek to Spanish territory might have been encouraged by the Creek. Lower Creek Emperor Brims likely felt Apalachee connections with the Spanish would cement Creek alliances with the Spanish and French. The Creek certainly pursued those alliances before the Yamassee War, when Creek and Yamassee sought goods and ammunition from St. Augustine and Pensacola (Crane 1929: 254-255). As such, Emperor Brims perhaps enjoyed the opportunity to send intermediaries in an effort to seek peace with all European colonists and thus preserve a power balance that suited the Creek (Hann 1988: 312).

**Conclusion and Discussion**

The Spanish at Pensacola felt the loyal Apalachee and Yamasee served as valuable connections for alliances with interior Native Americans. Indeed, these groups provided valuable information with regards to the personality of Amucaiche, new cacique of the Talapoosa (Autos 1761). Perhaps as a direct result of aiding the Spanish, French, or British, the Apalachee seem to have maintained a coherent identity in the eyes of all three European powers. While previous research has demonstrated Creek (Hahn 2004) and Quapaw (DuVal 2006) efforts at maintaining sovereignty during the colonial era, the
Apalachee have been overlooked in this regard as such actions only grew critical during the eighteenth century, a period for which the Apalachee escape scholarly notice (though see Worth 2008 for an exception). As with other groups, rather than accommodating, they utilized a variety of European groups to acquire resources, exchange goods, and gain alliances (DuVal 2006:5). By consistently referring to the group as Apalachee, documents imply that Apalachee groups successfully maintained their identity during the eighteenth century. However, the turmoil of nearly being decimated by British attacks, in addition to geographic movements and alliance shifts, likely had some affect on the material culture. The next chapter attempts to bridge the gap between the historical and material records by comparing a seventeenth-century Apalachee ceramic assemblage with four eighteenth-century assemblages known to contain Apalachee ceramics, two assemblages suspected to, and two contemporary Lower Creek assemblages. As such, the historical record outlined in this and the preceding chapter qualifies and guides the quantitative comparisons of the following chapter.
CHAPTER V
CERAMIC ASSEMBLAGES

Despite a general rejection of the culture-history perspective, archaeologists still argue for some degree of correlation between ceramic assemblages and Native societies. Various archaeologists attempt to corroborate such connections by incorporating European trade goods, historical documents, archaeometric methods, ecological approaches, and other lines of evidence. I attempt to build upon the typical use of ceramic typologies to refine spatial and/or temporal boundaries by creating a broad typology that addresses eighteenth-century shifts in the region (Agbe-Davies 2006; Ginn 2009; Worth 2009a).

A Fort Walton-influenced Lamar assemblage appeared in the lower Chattahoochee Valley during the Singer phase (AD 1300-1400) and evolved stylistically in situ during the subsequent Bull Creek (1400-1475) and Stewart (1475-1550) phases (Worth 2000:267-268). The following Abercrombie phase (1550-1650) involved more dramatic changes in material culture due to the emergence of distinctive incised, brushed, burnished, and plain shell-tempered ceramic types, leading to a reduced frequency of grit-tempered Lamar and Fort Walton types with incised and stamped decorations (Worth 2000:268). Despite population collapse, the Abercrombie phase served as the basis for growth during the later Blackmon phase (1650-1715) (Knight 1994a:384; Worth 2000:270) (Table 8).

From 1550 to 1650, shifts occurred both in the Chattahoochee Valley and in the Tallahassee area. In Tallahassee, a Lamar-derived Leon-Jefferson ceramic assemblage gradually replaced the Fort Walton assemblage (Table 9).
Table 8: Cultural Phases in Lower Chattahoochee Valley Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase and Date Range</th>
<th>Material Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singer Phase (1300-1400)</td>
<td><em>In-situ</em> Lamar assemblage with Fort Walton affinities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull Creek (1400-1475)</td>
<td><em>In-situ</em> Lamar assemblage with Fort Walton affinities and more complicated stamping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Phase (1475-1550)</td>
<td><em>In-situ</em> Lamar assemblage with Fort Walton affinities, even more complicated stamping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abercrombie Phase (1550-1650)</td>
<td>New distinctive incised, brushed, burnished, and plain shell-tempered varieties and fewer grit-tempered incised and stamped varieties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackmon Phase (1650-1715)</td>
<td>Dominance of shell tempered brushing and cob-marking and grit-tempered incising and stamping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson Field Phase (1715-1836)</td>
<td>Disappearance of shell tempering in favor of grit-tempered brushed, incised, and red filmed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Cultural Phases in the Tallahassee Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase and Date Range</th>
<th>Material Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Walton Phase (1100-1550)</td>
<td>Predominantly incised and punctated decoration, with largely grit and grog rather than shell tempering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velda Phase (c1550-1633)</td>
<td>Lamar-derived assemblage: wide folded pinched rims and check and curvilinear complicated stamped designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Phase (1633-1704)</td>
<td>Emergence of Spanish missions and colono ware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both assemblages possess similar wide folded, pinched rims as well as check and curvilinear complicated stamping designs, though Leon-Jefferson alone has grog-grit tempering (Braley 1998:10; Worth 2000:271). If this resemblance indicates direct migration of people from the Chattahoochee Valley, the Stewart phase (1475-1550) would represent the direct predecessor of the Velda phase in the Tallahassee area (Braley 1998:10; Worth 2000:271). The shift from Velda (circa 1500-1633) to the San Luis phase...
(1633-1704) in the Tallahassee area has mostly been defined based on the appearance of Spanish missions (Worth 2000:284; Marrinan and White 2007).

The subsequent Blackmon phase (1650-1715) represents the direct ancestors of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Lower Creek. Direct stylistic changes from Abercrombie to Blackmon ceramics included a predominance of shell temper, brushing, and cob-marking, as well as grit-tempered Lamar decorations such as incising and stamping (Knight 1994b:189; Braley 1998:91; Worth 2000:275). Numerous groups migrated to the area during this time; the presence of cord marking likely reflects a connection to McKee Island/Woods Island phases to the northwest, and the presence of red filming likely represents a connection to the San Luis phase missionized Apalachee to the south (Worth 2000:275; Melcher 2011). The Lower Creek return west after the Yamassee War marks the beginning of the Lawson Field phase with a mostly grit tempered assemblage consisting largely of Chattahoochee Brushed, Ocmulgee Fields Incised, and Kasita Red Filmed types (Knight 1994b:189). Despite fundamental shifts in eighteenth-century Creek social, economic, and political situations and strategies, Creek domestic ceramics largely demonstrated maintenance of tradition even through the Removal period during the 1830s (Worth 2000:284) (Table 9).

The following analyses attempts to make qualitative and quantitative comparisons to evaluate the extent to which different eighteenth-century Apalachee groups demonstrated maintenance of tradition in response to their own demographic collapse in 1704. I describe shifts within ceramic assemblages that emerged in response to relocations and circumstances by systematically comparing various eighteenth-century southeastern sites occupied by either Creek and/or Apalachee Indians. More specifically,
adapting the latest UWF typology based on new excavations at Mission San Joseph de Escambe (Worth and Melcher [2011]) allows for comparisons of sherd counts among sites to examine change though space and time. While this typology capably describes the various tempers and surface treatments at the Pensacola presidios and missions, certain difficulties emerged when extending this typology outside the Pensacola area. For example, some archaeologists working in the Georgia interior have little experience with grog temper due to its infrequency in that area (Foster, pers. comm. 2011). Within the study area, a high percentage of grog temper signifies an Apalachee cultural influence, following excavations in the Tallahassee area including Missions San Luis and Patale (Shapiro 1987:115; Jones et al. 1991; Shapiro and McEwan 1992:50; Shapiro and Vernon 1992:266-267). I combined data from those excavations into a seventeenth-century Apalachee assemblage to account for different research designs in different years at different areas of the sites. The newly defined shell/grog temper Escambia series, identified at Mission San Joseph de Escambe, had not been described earlier and thus other sites do not include types in this series because it had not been recognized (Worth and Melcher [2011]). Because the sample size at Escambe is already the smallest (n = 528), the shell/grog varieties were split into separate shell and grog varieties. Many early excavations of Creek sites (Wauchope 1966; Nelson et al. 1974) do not distinguish between temper types. Excavations at sites with tight temporal control revealed ceramic types typically considered prehistoric, such as Fort Walton Incised at Santa Maria de Galve (1698-1719). To overcome inherent problems in nomenclature and scale of analysis, certain types within the typology (Table 10) have been grouped together for purposes of evaluating combinations of temper and surface treatment (Appendixes A
through G), as well as specific comparisons of tempers and specific comparisons of decorations and surface treatments.

To evaluate spatial patterning, I compare the pre-1719 sites of San Luis and Patale (Shapiro 1987:115; Jones et al. 1991; Shapiro and McEwan 1992:50; Shapiro and Vernon 1992:266-267), Presidio Santa Maria de Galve (Bense and Wilson 2003), Old Mobile (Silvia [1998], 2000), and Tarver sites (Pluckhan 1997:242) to each other, and post-Yamasee War sites San Joseph de Escambe (Worth and Melcher [2011]), Presidio Santa Rosa (Harris and Eschbach 2006), Dog River (Waselkov and Gums 2000), the Zimmerman Hill site (Hunter 1985), the Jackson site (DeJarnette 1975), and Fort Toulouse (Waselkov et al. 1982, Waselkov 1984) to each other. Finally, to evaluate shifts through time, I compare the Native American ceramics at the Spanish sites of Presidios Santa Maria and Santa Rosa, French sites of Old Mobile and Dog River, and Lower Creek sites of Jackson and Tarver (Figures 8-9, Tables 11-13, Figure 10, Table 14, Figure 11).
Table 10: Typology Illustrating How Types and Varieties Have Been Combined for Regional Analysis (Adapted from Worth and Melcher [2011])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Treatments</th>
<th>Temper</th>
<th>Shell and Sand</th>
<th>Grog and Sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roughened, Brushed, Cob Marked</td>
<td>Chattahoochee Brushed, Alachua Cob Marked, St. Johns Cob Marked, Plaquemine Brushed</td>
<td>Walnut Roughened, Graveline Roughened, Guillory Cob Marked</td>
<td>Jefferson Roughened, Jefferson Cob Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>Lamar Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>Graveline Complicated Stamped, Guillory Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>Jefferson Complicated Stamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamped</td>
<td>Lamar Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leon Check Stamped, Jefferson Check Stamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised, Punctated</td>
<td>Fort Walton Incised, Lake Jackson Incised, Lamar Bold Incised, Marsh Island Incised, Ocmulgee Incised, Cool Branch Incised, Fatherland Incised, Chickachae Combed, Englewood Incised, Maddox Engraved</td>
<td>Point Washington Incised, Pensacola Incised, Port Dauphin Incised, Winterville Incised, Bell Incised, Owens, Goggin, Doctor Lake Incised, Mississippi Punctate, Graveline Incised and Punctated, Kemper Combed</td>
<td>Baytown Incised, Fatherland Incised, Jefferson Incised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td>McKee Island Cordmarked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain, Burnished</td>
<td>Lamar Plain, Lake Jackson Plain, Miller Plain, St. John’s Plain, Ocmulgee Plain</td>
<td>Mississippi Plain, Bell Plain, Goggin Plain, Pensacola Plain, Guillory Plain</td>
<td>Lake Jackson Plain, Baytown Plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8: Map of analyzed sites
Figure 9: Temporal comparisons
Table 11: Sherd Counts for Sites Mainly Occupied Before 1715

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic variety</th>
<th>San Luis &amp; Patale</th>
<th>Santa Maria</th>
<th>Old Mobile</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Rough</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Comp</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit UID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Incised</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Paint</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Plain</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Rough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell UID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Incised</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Paint</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Plain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Rough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog UID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Incised</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Paint</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Plain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Rough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Check</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog UID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Incised</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Paint</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Plain</td>
<td>11,085</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>4,463</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,421</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,659</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,724</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Sherd Counts for Sites Mainly Occupied After 1715

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic variety</th>
<th>Tarver Sites</th>
<th>Dog River</th>
<th>Santa Rosa</th>
<th>Escambe</th>
<th>Ft. Toulouse</th>
<th>Zimmerman Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Rough</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Check</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit UID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Incised</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Paint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Grit Plain</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>10,207</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Rough</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell UID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Incised</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Paint</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Plain</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Rough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog UID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Incised</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Paint</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell/Grog Plain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Rough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog UID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Incised</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Paint</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grog Plain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>4,442</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>14,262</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Temper by Sherd Count and Percentage of Total Assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Sand/Grit</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Grog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Luis and Patale</td>
<td>983 sherds  7.9%</td>
<td>65 sherds  0.5%</td>
<td>11,373 sherds  91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>2,317 sherds  50.0%</td>
<td>458 sherds  9.9%</td>
<td>1,859 sherds  40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Mobile</td>
<td>6,036 sherds  4.4%</td>
<td>6,907 sherds  50.3%</td>
<td>6,212 sherds  45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>5,706 sherds  95.0%</td>
<td>302 sherds  5.0%</td>
<td>0 sherds  0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarver Sites</td>
<td>736 sherds  31.4%</td>
<td>1,611 sherds  68.6%</td>
<td>0 sherds  0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog River</td>
<td>558 sherds  12.6%</td>
<td>3,752 sherds  84.5%</td>
<td>132 sherds  3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>683 sherds  9.7%</td>
<td>324 sherds  23.6%</td>
<td>367 sherds  26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambe</td>
<td>334 sherds  3.3%</td>
<td>65 sherds  12.3%</td>
<td>129 sherds  24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Toulouse</td>
<td>13,859 sherds  97.2%</td>
<td>403 sherds  2.8%</td>
<td>0 sherds  0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Tri-plot of site assemblages by temper proportions
Table 14: Surface Treatments by Sherd Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Roughened</th>
<th>Stamped</th>
<th>Incised</th>
<th>Painted</th>
<th>Cord-marked</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Luis and Patale</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,284</td>
<td>12,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>4,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Mobile</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,525</td>
<td>13,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>6,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarver Sites</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>2,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog River</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>4,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambe</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Toulouse</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,591</td>
<td>14,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Relative frequency of decorations and surface treatments

**Ceramic Assemblages**

The seventeenth-century Apalachee San Luis and Patale assemblages are clearly dominated by plain grog-tempered sherds (11,085 out of 12,421). A negligible amount of shell temper and a small amount of sand/grit temper (about 8%) exists. Stamping
represents nearly half the surface treatments, with the rest split almost evenly between roughed, filmed, and incised (Figure 11).

Sherds at Presidio Santa Maria de Galve were sorted following Worth’s (1992) classification of Lamar and Leon-Jefferson ceramics (Harris 1999). Half of the sherds are sand/grit, with grog temper making up most of the rest. Incising is the clear majority among the decorative motifs and surface treatments considered here. Sand-tempered sherds, typically associated with historic Creek groups, include a few Kasita Red Filmed and Chattahoochee Brushed. Fatherland incisions on grog temper appear, as does a Doctor Lake Incised sherd, akin to those Silvia (2000) described at Old Mobile. A few types appear similar to those at San Luis—Jefferson Complicated Stamped, Mission Red Filmed, Jefferson Incised, and Leon Check Stamped (Harris 2003:279-285).

Santa Rosa’s ceramic assemblage is also half sand/grit, though the remainder is roughly evenly split between shell and grog temper. Roughly half the decorated sherds are roughened, with only a few cord-marked, some incised, and roughly 20% each of stamped and filmed. Santa Rosa ceramic types include mostly Chattahoochee Roughened (24%) and Walnut Roughened (20%), with Jefferson wares totaling 29.8% (Harris and Eschbach 2006:110-113). Because at least Yamassee and Apalachee contributed to the Native American ceramic assemblage at the Santa Rosa garrison, a certain degree of amalgamation of ceramic types may have occurred.

Such amalgamation more likely occurred at mission sites (Ginn 2009) such as San Joseph de Escambe. Introduction of the grog/shell type, Escambia, posits such amalgamation, but for the purposes of comparison, I divided the grog/shell frequencies in half into the grog and shell varieties. San Joseph de Escambe, like Santa Rosa, is
dominated by roughened sherds, with a sizeable minority of incised, followed by filmed, then stamped. The distribution of temper types is similar, too, though about 10% of the shell temper has shifted to sand/grit. Such similarities are unsurprising, as many of the Native Americans working at Presidio Santa Rosa were likely Apalachee. Qualitative comparisons alone show that this Apalachee mission demonstrates an incorporation of Lower Creek styles, especially when compared to earlier Apalachee missions (San Luis and Patale) because between 1704-1718 those Apalachee lived with the Creek (Worth et al. 2011; and see Chapter 4 of this thesis). In fact, the ceramic assemblage appears more similar to the Blackmon (1650-1715) phase rather than the contemporary Tallapoosa phase, which might indicate a degree of Apalachee isolation in San Joseph de Escambe from their contemporaries in the Creek interior.

The majority of sherds in Old Mobile’s ceramic assemblage are shell-tempered, followed closely by grog. Like its contemporary neighbor Presidio Santa Maria, most of the decorated sherds are incised, though in patterns perhaps more similar to the Alabama River area than those of Lamar. A diverse group of local and refugee Native Americans lived near Old Mobile, including Apalachee that fled the 1704 destruction of their province. Pottery, including complicated stamped designs and folded/pinched rims, resemble Apalachee decorated sherds from Northwest Florida mission assemblages. Further, these styles do not appear in local Mobilian and Tomé pottery. Apalachee likely also made colonoware pitchers and brimmed vessels with foot ring bases (Silvia 1990, [1998], 2000, 2002; Silvia Muller 1991; Waselkov 1991, 1999; Fuller 1994; Cordell 2001; Melcher 2011). The Old Mobile ceramic assemblage, when compared to that of San Luis, demonstrates a reduction in the number of forms, including fewer foot ring
bases and flattened rims, and a simplification in manufacturing technology, including less controlled firing temperatures. Decorations also shifted—styles became syncretized and brushing and stamping appear less frequently. At the same time, ceramic traditions continued in terms of similar surface finishing and grog temper size (Cordell 2001).

Almost all of the temper at Dog River is shell, with almost no grog and some sand/grit. About half of the decorations are incised; roughened/brushed and stamped decorations exist in nearly equal amounts. Waselkov and Gums (2000:124) feel that grog tempered and perhaps rectilinear, complicated-stamped, shell-tempered sherds likely represent the work of Apalachee potters. Sand-tempered “plain, corncob roughened, rectilinear complicated stamped, and incised and punctated varieties, in bowl, jar, brimmed bowl, incurved bowl, and miniature forms, are thought to comprise an early eighteenth-century Chacato ceramic assemblage” (Waselkov and Gums 2000:124). While sand-tempered, Ocmulgee Fields Incised “are attributed either to Creek or Apalachee potters; these specimens closely resemble the related Apalachee type Lake Jackson Incised var. Blountstown” (Waselkov and Gums 2000:127, following Shapiro 1987:164-165). Chattahoochee Roughened is interpreted to be Creek or perhaps Apalachee potters. Chacato potters likely produced the sand-tempered jars, several incurved sherds, and perhaps undecorated shell-tempered vessels (Waselkov and Gums 2000:127-129). While tempting, such interpretations of ceramic assemblages as representing particular ethnicities remain problematic. Despite these various Native American groups at Dog River discussed in French documents (Waselkov and Gums 2000), a certain degree of homogenization (Rice 1987:314-315, 452-454, 460-463; Saunders 2000, 2009) seems to have occurred. While pottery similar to that made by the Apalachee during the
seventeenth century exists in the Dog River assemblage, Native Americans in the area likely shared traditions to the point that a non-Apalachee could have made pottery in a style reminiscent of the seventeenth-century Apalachee, or an Apalachee could have made non-Apalachee pottery.

Hunter (1985, 1994) feels that a variety of migrant Native American groups lived at Zimmerman Hill, Louisiana. Hunter (1985:74) notes that the Zimmerman assemblage appears similar to neither a seventeenth-century Apalachee assemblage nor eighteenth- or nineteenth-century Lower Mississippi Valley assemblages. The Zimmerman assemblage is almost entirely shell-tempered plain, with a variety of Mississippi Plain, and six varieties of Bell Plain described. Filming of either red or black is reported on about 19% of the sherds. Recognized or defined types appear in the following number of sherds: 5 Fatherland, 6 Maddox Engraved, 17 Old Town Red (similar to Chicot Red), 5 Plaquennine Brushed, and 92 Zimmerman Black (Hunter 1985:74-103). If the Native Americans at this site were Apalachee, the prevalence of shell temper perhaps reflects a continuation of new tempering practices at the earlier Dog River site. While those Apalachee at San Joseph de Escambe did not personally move to the Zimmerman area, ongoing analysis of the Blakely Park Apalachee demonstrates clear similarities (Melcher pers. comm. 2011). As such, Zimmerman might represent non-Apalachee individuals or potentially indicate that the Apalachee at the site shifted their ceramic assemblage even more dramatically than those at Mission San Joseph de Escambe.

The French built Fort Toulouse next to an Upper Creek Alabama town, so Native ceramics there, as at Presidio Santa Rosa, differ from other sites that included village occupations. At this site, sand/grit temper is the majority; no grog temper whatsoever is
noted. Similarly, most of the decorated sherds are roughened, with 14.9% incised. Earlier Woodland components include fiber as well as sand/grit temper, with net impressed, fabric marked, cord marked, complicated and check stamped, punctated, and cord cob impressed wares. Mississippi and Historic component assemblages include shell and sand/grit temper with brushing, incising, and applied rim fillets. Historic Native ceramic types in this assemblage include Ocmulgee Fields Plain, Chattahoochee Brushed, Toulouse Plain, Toulouse Incised, and Walnut Roughened, though by far the most frequent is Chattahoochee Brushed (Waselkov et al. 1982:20-28). About half the sherds were shell-tempered with eroded surfaces (Waselkov 1984:25-27).

DeJarnette (1975) classified most pottery from the Jackson site as Chattahoochee Brushed (45%), including brushed, cob-marked, and stamped sand-tempered sherds. Ocmulgee Fields Plain sherds (43%) appear at a similar percentage to Santa Maria’s sand-tempered plain (46%). A few significant minority types appear as well: Ocmulgee Fields Incised (5%), Walnut Roughened (5%), Kasita Red (less than 1%), and Lamar Complicated Stamped (less than 1%) (DeJarnette 1975:115-123).

Unlike the Jackson site’s assemblage of half sand-grit temper, the Lower Creek Tarver sites are roughly two-thirds shell and one-third sand/grit. The absence of burnishing among the sand/grit sherds supports Mistovich and Knight’s (1986:69) idea that the shift from the Blackmon to Lawson Field phase involved a lower percentage of burnishing. In this case, however, this shift might indicate regional variation between the Chattahoochee and Ocmulgee River Valleys. Because incising occurred on a small percentage of vessels—generally between the rim and shoulder—only about 10% of sherds are Ocmulgee Incised. About 20% of sherds are Walnut Roughened, with a few

**Diversity Statistics**

A quantitative study of assemblage data involves certain issues and assumptions. Different site formation processes (Schiffer 1989:57, 1976: 133-138, 1983, 1985), as well as breakage rates and use/recovery contexts (Conkey 1989:128; Rice 1989:117), restrict any quantitative comparison of assemblages. Moving beyond these issues toward evaluating culturally-determined factors still assumes a representative distribution (Kintigh 1984:45). Regression has been utilized most commonly in the archaeological literature (Simek 1989) but assumes independent richness values with normal distributions along a linear regression line and equal variance along that line (Rhode 1988:712-713).

McCartney and Glass (1990:522) define diversity statistics as the dispersion of cases within nominal-level variables, akin to standard deviation within ordinal and metric variables. Nominal scales quantify cases via a finite set of mutually exclusive values and thus express variability. The term “diversity” refers to the variability expressed by richness and evenness—the number of classes and the equality of representation for the classes, respectively. Variability in heterogeneity, dependent on variability in richness and evenness, corresponds with the intuitive idea of diversity (McCartney and Glass 1990:522). Such comparisons between assemblages that contain the same types determine whether the two assemblages might both fall within a third expected or imaginary assemblage or if the two populations instead differ in significant ways (Rhode 1988:709).
While diversity measures take assemblage size into account to some degree, values often vary as a result of that size, meaning that the results might describe collection strategy or deposition bias rather than behavior (Rhode 1988:708). While potentially insightful, diversity values, even for assemblages numbering in the thousands, might suffer from sample error, depending on the number, frequency, and identification of particular classes (McCartney and Glass 1990:533). Despite these potential issues, utilization of a variety of diversity statistics allows for quantitative descriptions of a variety of Native ceramic assemblages and identification of patterns of temper and decoration that warrant further investigation (Kintigh 1989:36).

A variety of diversity statistics exist. Berger-Parker dominance simply divides the number of individuals in the dominant taxon by the total number of individuals. Dominance where \( n_i \) is number of individuals of taxon \( i \) as a general term is one minus the Simpson index and ranges from a value of zero in which all taxa occur in equal amounts to one in which a single taxon occurs.

\[
\text{Dominance} = \sum \left( \frac{n_i}{n} \right)^2
\]

The Simpson index, one minus dominance, measures the evenness of individuals within the taxa of a community from zero to one (Hammer et al. 2009: 50). Simpson’s (1949) index of diversity, rather than estimators such as Shannon-Weiner, provides “an unbiased estimator of true population-richness parameters” (Rhode 1988:711). However, as the sample size increases, the measure lends an increasing bias toward the more rare classes (Rhode 1988:711). Buzas and Gibson’s evenness measures the evenness with which individuals are divided among the taxa. Equitability, a similar measure, divides Shannon diversity by the logarithm of the number of taxa and thus measures. The Shannon index
measures entropy, ranging from zero, which indicates a community with a single taxon to high values for communities with many taxa that each possess a few individuals. The Shannon index formula is

\[ Shannon = \sum (\frac{n_i}{n} \ln \frac{n_i}{n}) \]

Other diversity statistics include Menhinick's richness index, that divides the number of taxa by the square root of sample size, and Margalef’s richness index of \((S-1)/\ln(n)\) with \(S\) representing the number of taxa and \(n\) the number of individuals. Fisher’s alpha \((a)\), the final diversity statistic used in this study, is defined by the formula

\[ Fisher's \ alpha = a \times \ln (1 + n/a) \]

(Hammer et al. 2009: 50).

**Spatial Comparisons Between Pre-Yamassee War Sites**

Occupations at San Luis/Patale (to 1704), Presidio Santa Maria de Galve (1698-1719), Old Mobile (1702-1711), and the Tarver sites roughly correspond to the period before the 1715 Yamassee War (Table 15).

All of the tests support the idea that Apalachee missions of San Luis and Patale represent the least diverse ceramic assemblages. Assuming this lack of diversity reflects a social reality, Native Americans not Apalachee by birth that migrated to these sites might have shifted their material culture to fit into the large population. A much higher dominance and Berger-Parker value indicate that most sherds fit into a particular type—grog plain. Very low evenness values echo the idea of an irregular distribution. Finally, diversity values of the Shannon, Menhinick, Margalef, and Fisher alpha fall noticeably short of other sites. In short, these values demonstrate what archaeologists already knew:
undecorated grog temper dominates the seventeenth-century Apalachee ceramic assemblage.

Table 15: Diversity Comparisons for Sites Largely Occupied Before 1715

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>San Luis/Patale</th>
<th>Santa Maria</th>
<th>Old Mobile</th>
<th>Tarver Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxa S</td>
<td>8.000000</td>
<td>16.000000</td>
<td>14.000000</td>
<td>8.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>12,421.000000</td>
<td>4,659.000000</td>
<td>13,724.000000</td>
<td>2,347.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>0.798800</td>
<td>0.35870</td>
<td>0.23410</td>
<td>0.41350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger-Parker</td>
<td>0.892400</td>
<td>0.47500</td>
<td>0.33830</td>
<td>0.58410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evenness:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenness e^H/S</td>
<td>0.212500</td>
<td>0.22300</td>
<td>0.39160</td>
<td>0.38530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitability J</td>
<td>0.255200</td>
<td>0.45880</td>
<td>0.64470</td>
<td>0.54140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon H</td>
<td>0.530700</td>
<td>1.27200</td>
<td>1.70200</td>
<td>1.12600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson indx</td>
<td>0.201200</td>
<td>0.64130</td>
<td>0.76590</td>
<td>0.58650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menhinick</td>
<td>0.071780</td>
<td>0.23440</td>
<td>0.11950</td>
<td>0.16510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margalef</td>
<td>0.742500</td>
<td>1.77600</td>
<td>1.36500</td>
<td>0.90200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher alpha</td>
<td>0.832400</td>
<td>2.07300</td>
<td>1.53900</td>
<td>1.03500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of 5 Diversity Tests</td>
<td>0.475716</td>
<td>1.19934</td>
<td>1.09825</td>
<td>0.76292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fairly low dominance values of 0.3587 and 0.475 indicate a more diverse ceramic assemblage from Presidio Santa Maria. Sand/grit and grog temper occur in roughly equal numbers, at 2,317 and 1,884 sherds respectively. Perhaps for this reason, evenness values at 0.223, 0.6413, and 0.4588 vary more widely. Three out of the four statistics indicate that Santa Maria possesses the most diverse assemblage, while the Shannon index states that Old Mobile is nearly half again as diverse.

The Old Mobile assemblage demonstrates French reliance on a variety of local Native Americans. More specifically, the lowest dominance and highest evenness scores for this assemblage alone prove this point; diversity results are more inconsistent. The
Shannon index indicates Old Mobile is the most diverse by a fair margin. However, Menhinick has Old Mobile only half again as diverse as San Luis/Patale and nearly that much less diverse than the Tarver sites. Finally, Margalef as well as Fisher alpha agree that Old Mobile falls about halfway between Santa Maria and Tarver. The ratio of grog temper to total assemblage at Old Mobile roughly equals that of Santa Maria, yet shell temper dominates rather than sand/grit and does so much more obviously.

Diversity values at the Tarver sites represent an interesting median between San Luis/Patale and Old Mobile and Santa Maria. Evenness at Tarver roughly equals that of Old Mobile, while the equitability value falls between that of Santa Maria and Old Mobile. Most notably, the dominance of Tarver falls between that of the seventeenth-century Apalachee assemblage and later sites in the Pensacola and Mobile area.

To conclude, averaging differences between these diversity values shows that San Luis/Patale is 37.65% less diverse than Jackson, which is 29.79% less diverse than Old Mobile, which is 8.937% less diverse than Santa Maria. Following these values, seventeenth-century Apalachee sites maintained a distinct homogeneity in their ceramic assemblage. The Lower Creek demonstrate a median value of homogeneity when compared to French Old Mobile and Spanish Santa Maria. Old Mobile and Santa Maria, despite the strategies and successes evident in documents, possess very similar diversity values.

**Spatial Comparisons Between Post-Yamassee War Sites**

Occupations at the Jackson site (1715-1800s), Fort Toulouse (1718-1763), Dog River (1720s-1763), Santa Rosa (1722-1756), and Mission San Joseph de Escambe
(1741-1761) roughly correspond to the period between the 1715 Yamassee War and the 1763 Treaty of Paris (Table 16).

Table 16: Diversity Comparisons for Sites Occupied from 1715 to 1763

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxa S</td>
<td>8.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>6008.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>0.39810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger-Parker</td>
<td>0.45160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenness:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenness e^H/S</td>
<td>0.38270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitability J</td>
<td>0.53810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon H</td>
<td>1.11900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson indx</td>
<td>0.60190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menhinick</td>
<td>0.10320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margalef</td>
<td>0.80450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher alpha</td>
<td>0.90950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of 5 Diversity Values</td>
<td>0.70762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archaeologists investigating the Jackson site, unlike those researching the Tarver sites, might not have known to look for grog temper. Dominance values are roughly a median among the group of sites; depending on the test, Jackson’s assemblage is either slightly more dominant than that of Dog River but less than that of Fort Toulouse or only more dominant than that of Santa Rosa. Similarly, evenness values are either second only to Santa Rosa or lower than both Santa Rosa and Dog River. As a whole, diversity statistics demonstrate that the Jackson assemblage is roughly as homogenous as that of Fort Toulouse.
The strong “Alabama-ness” at the Upper Creek site of Fort Toulouse unsurprisingly leads to the highest dominance values and lowest evenness values. Other diversity statistics for the Fort Toulouse assemblage have either the lowest values or barely surpass those of Jackson. A striking similarity exists between the Lower Creek site of Tarver and the Upper Creek ceramic assemblages at Fort Toulouse.

Dog River has surprisingly high dominance values and low evenness values. Similarly, other diversity statistics place Dog River somewhere between Jackson and Santa Rosa. While some homogenization in the ceramic assemblage likely occurred, the lack of seventeenth-century sites for comparison leaves open the possibility that these groups already made similar ceramics.

The Santa Rosa assemblage possesses a surprisingly diverse assemblage, with the lowest dominance scores by far and one test showing nearly no dominance, and the highest evenness score, with both tests showing a nearly even distribution. However, diversity scores fall short of the initial test of Mission San Joseph de Escambe, due to the identification of shell/grog temper at that site. Despite this artificial difference, quantitative evidence supports the existence of various Native groups as described in Spanish documents. This site above others reflects the need for careful historical research when utilizing statistics as well as quick qualitative comparisons, as otherwise the behaviors and processes that explain the results would remain elusive.

Mission San Joseph de Escambe introduced the grog/shell type Escambia that inflated the diversity values, decreased the dominance values, and likely also affected the evenness values. To make more precise comparisons, I halved frequencies from this shell/grog type into shell and grog types. When divided, the diversity values decrease but
defy expectations by remaining above those of Santa Rosa. These results might, in part, reflect the small sample size.

Averaging diversity measures shows that Fort Toulouse stands as 5.4% less diverse than Jackson, which is 39.4% less diverse than Dog River, which is 70.8% less diverse than Santa Rosa, which is less than 1% less diverse than San Joseph de Escambe. As such, Creek sites of Tarver and Fort Toulouse show a noticeable homogeneity during the eighteenth century. Dog River stands as the median assemblage, noticeably more diverse than Creek sites and less diverse than the Spanish sites. This result likely demonstrates that non-local material culture assimilated more thoroughly. The most diverse assemblages Presidio Santa Rosa and Mission San Joseph de Escambe, show such an extreme similarity. Apalachee in name, those at mission Escambe thus made roughly the same assemblage as those at Presidio Santa Rosa, but both assemblages show a new-found diversity based on Apalachee experiences during the eighteenth century.

Comparing Pre-Yamassee War and Post-Yamassee War Sites

To evaluate the effect of the Yamassee War, I compare Presidio Santa Maria to Santa Rosa, Old Mobile to Dog River and Zimmerman Hill, as well as Tarver sites to the Jackson site (Table 17).

The shift in Spanish occupation of Presidio Santa Maria to Presidio Santa Rosa reflects a significant decrease in dominance and increase in evenness, with a very high increase in diversity (34.0%) at times. Theses results echo earlier work (Roberts 2009) that maintained an overall increase in the diversity of goods stemmed from an increase in illicit trade. While a reasonable hypothesis given the establishment of New Orleans in
Table 17: Diversity Results for Temporal Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Santa Maria</th>
<th>Santa Rosa</th>
<th>Old Mobile</th>
<th>Dog River</th>
<th>Zimmerman Hill</th>
<th>Tarver</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td>4,659.00000</td>
<td>1,374.00000</td>
<td>13,724.00000</td>
<td>4,561.00000</td>
<td>582.00000</td>
<td>2,347.00000</td>
<td>6,008.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>0.35870</td>
<td>0.1189</td>
<td>0.23410</td>
<td>0.3815</td>
<td>0.6090</td>
<td>0.41350</td>
<td>0.39810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger-Parker</td>
<td>0.47500</td>
<td>0.2504</td>
<td>0.33830</td>
<td>0.5850</td>
<td>0.7120</td>
<td>0.58410</td>
<td>0.45160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evenness:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenness e^H/S</td>
<td>0.22300</td>
<td>0.6382</td>
<td>0.39160</td>
<td>0.3264</td>
<td>0.5095</td>
<td>0.38530</td>
<td>0.38270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitability J</td>
<td>0.45880</td>
<td>0.8446</td>
<td>0.64470</td>
<td>0.5635</td>
<td>0.3910</td>
<td>0.54140</td>
<td>0.53810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon H</td>
<td>1.27200</td>
<td>2.4410</td>
<td>1.70200</td>
<td>1.4450</td>
<td>0.1658</td>
<td>1.12600</td>
<td>1.11900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson indx</td>
<td>0.64130</td>
<td>0.8811</td>
<td>0.76590</td>
<td>0.6185</td>
<td>0.4712</td>
<td>0.58650</td>
<td>0.60190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menhinick</td>
<td>0.23440</td>
<td>0.4856</td>
<td>0.11950</td>
<td>0.1925</td>
<td>0.5136</td>
<td>0.16510</td>
<td>0.10320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margalef</td>
<td>1.77600</td>
<td>2.3530</td>
<td>1.36500</td>
<td>1.4240</td>
<td>0.5784</td>
<td>0.90200</td>
<td>0.80450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher alpha</td>
<td>2.07300</td>
<td>2.9250</td>
<td>1.53900</td>
<td>1.6390</td>
<td>0.7560</td>
<td>1.03500</td>
<td>0.90950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average of 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Stats</td>
<td>1.19934</td>
<td>1.8171</td>
<td>1.09825</td>
<td>1.0638</td>
<td>0.4970</td>
<td>0.76292</td>
<td>0.70762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1718, these particular results more likely reflect increased Spanish success in tempting Native American allies after the 1715 Yamassee War, particularly the Yamassee themselves, some of whom left St. Augustine for Pensacola by 1747 (Worth and Melcher [2011]).

The temporal difference between Old Mobile and Dog River appears fairly undramatic. An increase in dominance by 70% to 72% corresponds with a roughly 30% decrease in evenness. However, diversity statistics provide an odd range, with two indicating an 8% increase, one a 40% increase, and the fourth a 15% decrease. This inconsistency remains unexplained, though an average difference of only 2.1368% difference seems to demonstrate a high degree of similarity.

However, the temporal difference between Dog River and Zimmerman Hill appears quite dramatic. While the small sample size of the Zimmerman assemblage might play a role, the much higher dominance values reflect the new-found prevalence of shell-tempered plain. Evenness values are comparable between the two sites, though this seems mildly coincidental when comparing Zimmerman’s four groups with Dog River’s 13 groups. Most tellingly, averaging the five diversity values for the Zimmerman site shows that this assemblage is 53.281% less diverse than Dog River. The use of shell temper, with some exclusive sand temper, likely reflects access to new tempering resources, and the lack of decoration in 75.6% of the assemblage might indicate some assimilation of styles. Such an assimilation likely echoes Hunter’s (1985, 1994) evidence that a variety of migrant Native American groups lived in the area.

A variety of research has already examined Lower Creek ceramic assemblages and concluded that few measurable differences occurred through time (Knight and Smith
1980; Knight 1994a, b; Waselkov 1994; Worth 2000), yet no published research has attempted quantitative comparisons. The temporal difference between Tarver and Jackson represents a 4% or 23% decrease in dominance and about 1% decrease in evenness. The decrease in diversity includes a wide range of low values: 0.6%, 11%, and 37.5%. Averaging the values shows that Jackson is merely 7.25% less diverse than Tarver. As such, these values merely quantify rather than correct previous research.

**Discussion and Summary**

While somewhat hindered, quantitative comparison of the diversity among Native American ceramic assemblages largely supports the historical record by pointing out which assemblages possessed diversity. Unsurprisingly, grog temper dominates ceramics at San Luis and Patal e. Santa Maria and Old Mobile, as well as Tarver and Jackson assemblages, possess a similar variety of ceramic tempers and decorations. Statistical tests evidence a certain level of assimilation or amalgamation of temper types and surface treatments at Dog River but not at Santa Rosa. Zimmerman Hill demonstrates this assimilation/amalgamation even more dramatically. Most critically, while still considered Apalachee in the historic record, Apalachee at Mission San Joseph de Escambe, when compared to seventeenth-century Apalachee at San Luis/Patal e, have an assemblage dominated by sand/grit temper rather than grog, with an assemblage 50% to 236% more even and at least three times as diverse.

Other processes might affect this data, and considerations other than Native American identity might describe the diversity shifts. Perhaps the varying degrees of European presence at a site reflect the diversity of that site’s assemblage. Excavations at San Luis and Patal e largely centered on the Spanish occupations of those sites, as
excavations at Fort Toulouse focused on the French occupation. The low values at those sites and the equivalent values between Fort Toulouse and Creek sites of Tarver and Jackson imply that occupation by Europeans did not dramatically affect these diversity values. Duration of site occupation does not seem to be the primary factor affecting diversity results (Table 18). Distance from the Gulf Coast and ability to trade more directly with foreign ports might have affected diversity values. However, the high diversity at Santa Rosa and Escambe, coupled with the fact that the peripheral occupations of Escambe, Dog River, and Fort Toulouse reflect such varied diversity values, implies that direct participation with foreign trade did not dramatically affect these diversity values (Figure 12).

Table 18: Occupation Date and Average Diversity Value for Each Assemblage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Occupation Range</th>
<th>Average Diversity Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Luis/Patale</td>
<td>Mid 1600s to 1704</td>
<td>0.475716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>1698 to 1719</td>
<td>1.199340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Mobile</td>
<td>1702 to 1711</td>
<td>1.098250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarver Sites</td>
<td>Circa 1650-1715</td>
<td>0.762920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>1715-1836</td>
<td>0.707620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Toulouse</td>
<td>1717 to 1763</td>
<td>0.711482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>1722 to 1752</td>
<td>1.817100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joseph de Escambe</td>
<td>1741 to 1761</td>
<td>1.832280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog River</td>
<td>1720s to 1780s</td>
<td>1.063800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman Hill</td>
<td>1763 to 1834</td>
<td>0.497000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless, the diversity comparisons remain limited. Systematic study of Native ceramic vessel forms was not done for any seventeenth-century Apalachee assemblage, restricting regional comparisons from considering ceramic forms and thus answering questions such as shifts from Native to European ceramic forms. Further regional
Figure 12: Averaged diversity values within study area
comparisons, including a variety of ceramic characteristics, would further define

Native participation in market demands and potential identity shifts.
CHAPTER VI

INTERPRETATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Among other literature, this thesis work demonstrates that archaeology cannot always distinguish between contradicting identities based on race, gender, class, and place (Haas 1995:9; Ginn 2009:105). Various considerations, some of which might mask others, directed the changes visible in the material and historical records. Combining the historical and material records allows for a multi-scalar approach that outlines diverse experiences, situations, and responses of individuals and groups while also describing the production of new societies. This approach, termed ethnographic history or historical anthropology, considers conflicting voices “in the same context and in relationship to the same events” (Dawdy 2008:xviii).

Such an approach makes use of Braudel (1972, 1980) and Bourdieu (1961, 1977, 1983, 1984, 1990; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990:35; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992; Fowler 1997) and allows for increased understanding of the interplay between short term ecological, material, economic, social, and political response and long-term cultural processes. Multiple scales of time and space allow for new insight into communal interaction between the Apalachee, other Native groups, and various Europeans. A variety of research has concluded that measurable changes occurred within the architectural rather than ceramic record during the eighteenth century (Knight and Smith 1980; Knight 1994a, b; Waselkov 1994; Worth 2000). As such, detailed quantitative
comparisons of Lower Creek ceramic assemblages (Foster 2007) focus on spatial rather than temporal shifts in material culture. Precise quantitative comparisons, guided by extensive historical research, thus allows for new insight into transformations that occurred in the colonial era and affected, or were driven by, the Apalachee and other Native Americans. A synthesis of primary and secondary sources places such potential transformations in a larger context by considering the colonial Southeast as an extension of larger Creek, French, Spanish, and British efforts.

Broad social processes, inspiring and inspired by continuity and/or change in communal tradition, thus allow for a nuanced understanding of this area of the eighteenth-century Southeast. Global and regional structures influenced and were influenced by individual actions at the local level. Social, economic, and political dealings often occurred simultaneously and led to a mixture of tradition, innovation, resistance, and adaptation. Such negotiations in some cases led to noticeable transformations in the form of ethnogenesis. Native leaders, by responding to both European and Native pressures, largely made the colonial system work and created hybrid cultures.

Ever-changing alliances affected the social geography of the Gulf Coast. The French colonized Louisiana as British Carolina annihilated Spanish Florida. French successes in fact drew some Apalachee from the Spanish in the early eighteenth century. Pensacola officials attempted to mimic French efforts in the Southeast, as Bourbon influences led the Spanish Crown to adopt French strategies in Europe. These new strategies certainly helped fuel the brief success of Presidio San Miguel (1754-1763).
Depending on specific conjunctures of Native action and larger structures, varying levels of transformations occurred in a variety of ways.

Different Apalachee groups and individuals succeeded due to their own abilities and alliances with the French, British, or Spanish during the eighteenth century. In the seventeenth century, Native groups such as the Apalachee chose to ally with the Spanish and, in so doing, sacrificed political autonomy and accepted the labor draft to use European trade goods to build social and political capital (Worth 1998). On the other hand, when faced with a similar option, interior groups merely traded. Political and military connections undoubtedly played a role, as this early trade largely involved exchanging slaves for weapons. Different Spanish-allied Apalachee succeeded during the seventeenth century due to their local alliances and ability to deal with Spanish friars, soldiers, civilians, and administrators. At the same time, Apalachee ceramics appear in Timucua territory to the east (Hann 1988; Worth 1998 (2):36) though such movement of Lamar-Jefferson pottery might also be explained by the spread of goods, transitions, or individuals from the north (Milanich 1999:106). Documents indicate that the Apalachee language and other traditions survived into the eighteenth century, despite friars’ efforts at teaching Spanish and Christianity. Individual Apalachee attempted to maintain power and success after the 1704 destruction of their province by allying with the Spanish, Creek, or French. At a regional level, the Apalachee acted as capable middlemen. Select Apalachee within Creek society proved a necessary connection for the 1718 Coweta Resolution, and resultant Creek position of neutrality. Apalachee communities stood at the Perdidio River, and later Blakely Park, both key areas between French Mobile and Spanish Pensacola. Those at the Pensacola missions instead stood between Pensacola and
interior Creek settlements. Despite the fact that the Apalachee existed in far fewer numbers when compared to other Native Americans, the eighteenth century represented such a turbulent time for European colonists in the Southeast that even such small groups enjoyed conditions described by DuVal (2006) as a “Native Ground.”

Potters, whether entirely Creek, entirely Apalachee, or some combination of ethnicities, participated in a community-specific ceramic practice that might have contributed to a shared social identity. Such communal acts complexly wove families and individuals together, but specific identity construction differed depending on the context (Ginn 2009:292-294). After the 1704 destruction of their settlements, the Apalachee redefined themselves as they sought refuge with the French, British, or Creek. In part because of the fluidity of eighteenth-century structures, the Apalachee had the clout to shape their response as they chose, including continuously recreating particular traditions in new areas.

Comparisons of ceramic tempering agents at the regional level provide valuable insight in evaluating the effect of the 1704 attacks on Apalachee tradition. Some Apalachee and Chacato moved from the Tallahassee area to ally with the French at Old Mobile and, from there, moved to Dog River and Blakely Park and eventually central Louisiana. Their assemblage thus shifted from about 90% grog temper to 90% shell temper. Those Apalachee that remained allied with the Spanish worked and traded with the Pensacola garrisons of Santa Maria and Santa Rosa, living at missions in the area, including Escambe. These transitions involved shifts toward sand/grit temper due to the influence of local Creek Indians. Creek assemblages made a similar change through time to eventual sand/grit dominance. Each of these three noticeable changes likely reflects
sociopolitical changes during the first few two decades of the eighteenth century, such as the Yamasee War.

Decorations and surface treatments provide another useful regional comparison. Incisions dominate at the contemporary sites of Santa María and Old Mobile, likely reflecting the adoption of a local tradition by refugee groups. The temporal change from Old Mobile to Dog River involved fewer incisions and an equal amount of stamping, while the temporal change from Santa Maria to Santa Rosa involved the virtual disappearance of incising in favor of brushing and roughening. Both of those changes through time in the Mobile and Pensacola areas thus represent an increased preference for Creek designs, echoed in the fact that Mission Escambe and Santa Rosa have similar proportions of roughened and painted sherds. Changes through time in Creek ceramics involved the increased domination of roughening and brushing, largely at the expense of incising. Lower and Upper Creek assemblages are very similar. At Zimmerman Hill, filming represents the only common decorative element, a proportion not uncommon to that region of central Louisiana.

Diversity indices provide an underutilized yet viable method for making regional comparisons. Decrease in diversity of Native American assemblages might reflect European market desires, as sites occupied by Native Americans are noticeably (at least 28.3%) less diverse than those occupied by Europeans. Further work, such as that of Roberts (2009) to quantify assemblages of trade goods, remains necessary to evaluate the success of European markets, as the values here instead reflect communal response. For example, Mission San Joseph de Escambe and Fort Toulouse both hosted trade, but
Escambe’s assemblage is about 2.5 times as diverse. Low diversity values for San Luís/Patale reflect a homogeneous seventeenth-century Apalachee material response, as the low values for Jackson, Fort Toulouse, and Tarver reflect the same for the eighteenth-century Creek. Broadly speaking, the assemblages are fairly uniform but not necessarily unique. Median diversity values at Old Mobile, Santa María, and Dog River could reflect material processes the Apalachee went through after fleeing the 1704 destruction of their missions. According to the primary documents, these three sites also hosted a variety of Native American groups and had fairly short occupations; these and other factors to some degree restrict interpretation of the results as a straightforward indicator of material response. Cordell (2001), for example, notes simplified designs in Apalachee pottery of Old Mobile when compared to San Luís. The high diversity results from Santa Rosa and Mission San Joseph de Escambe reflect Spanish success at tempting Apalachee and Yamsee to the mission from the Creek after the Yamassee War. For example, the high diversity of the 1741-1761 Mission San Joseph de Escambe reflects a combination of both Creek and Apalachee tempering and decorating strategies. Low diversity at Zimmerman Hill reflects amalgamation with groups in the Lower Mississippi Valley, though further comparisons should test the identification of the site as Apalachee. Put briefly, diverse assemblages do not correspond with heterogeneity in number of ethnicities; historical records remain better-equipped to answer such questions.

San Joseph de Escambe thus shows that in the mid eighteenth century the Apalachee, after leaving the Creek and living on their own, utilized a variety of Creek and Apalachee elements in their pottery. While this is valuable information, several questions remain unanswered. I feel that Apalachee response at Escambe represents some
resurgence of Apalachee ceramic tradition, because of some combination of factors: returning from Creek territory to ally with the Spanish, incorporating Apalachee from the Creek and French territories, or perhaps simply living in an Apalachee community.

Discussion

Material culture represents a tool selectively and largely unconsciously used to interpret social interactions and to act within them (Fisher and O’Hara 2009:23). In other words, comparing material assemblages without corroborating evidence of social interaction provides only a shadow of the true form of that interaction. Without careful historical research, including consideration of the timeline of European trade goods, Escambe might have been regarded as a pre-1715 Lower Creek site rather than a post-1715 Apalachee site. Similarly, as the Zimmerman Hill assemblage differs so dramatically from that of the seventeenth-century Apalachee, such a comparison could easily have been overlooked. These assemblage comparisons demonstrate that even if ceramics reflect some conscious form of identity communication, that communication would not represent a precisely bounded measure of time and space, but would fall instead somewhere within a continuum (Worth 2009a). As such, assemblage comparisons must be corroborated—whether through archaeometry, documents, or other methods—to ensure that the comparisons are being made with as much precision as possible. Additional precise assemblage comparisons, complete with corroboration, remain necessary to understand social transformations in the Southeast.

Further Research

While certain evidence detailed in this thesis supports themes of resurgence and transformation, additional methods, documents, and assemblages could further evaluate
Apalachee revitalization in the mid-eighteenth century. Archaeometry could offer valuable insight with regard to changing ceramic diversity by sourcing clays. On-site historical research in Spain, Mexico, France, and England would certainly offer valuable new information that would supplement the various primary and secondary resources available in the United States. Most critically, incorporation of other assemblages such as Blakely Park would allow for a nuanced comparison of French and Spanish colonialism through time on local Native American groups in this area.

While I utilized an extensive variety of primary documents, further synthesis of French, British, and Spanish documents would shed new insight. On-site research at the Archive of the Indies, in particular among archives in Spain, would augment my own work at Mexico’s National Archives. In Mexico, certain records, particularly those severely damaged, remain unexamined. Evaluation of legal documents such as Inquisition cases and salary disputes, following the approaches of Yannakakis (2008) and Bushnell (1978), would provide new insight into Pensacola’s social milieu. Efforts at digitizing records in the archives of Spain, Mexico, France, and other countries will allow for new research, as would extensive cooperation with the P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History at the University of Florida and the Center for Archaeological Studies at the University of South Alabama. My reliance on the Mississippi Provincial Archives, rather than French originals and Surrey’s calendar more directly, could also be improved. Similarly, on-site research in England might supplement the British documents available in the United States, though documents in English have been much more thoroughly mined. While I have offered several new insights, further historical research remains necessary.
Our understanding of colonial Pensacola’s social milieu largely results from decades of excavation by UWF, which focuses mainly on the presidios and shipwrecks. Excavation into the haciendas and other areas on Pensacola’s profitable outskirts would more clearly confirm or deny the historical evidence for increased economic success from 1754-1763. Additionally, these excavations would supplement on-going work at Mission San Joseph de Escambe. Perhaps the Apalachee there worked at nearby haciendas, as other Apalachee had worked earlier at Presidios Santa María de Galve and Santa Rosa, and perhaps they worked at the Rochon plantation at Dog River. Excavation of these areas outside the complicated stratigraphy of downtown Pensacola would also aid in comparisons between the First Spanish, British, and Second Spanish periods of Pensacola.

I focused on the Apalachee rather than other Native American groups largely due to the 2009 discovery of the securely-dated Mission San Joseph de Escambe (1741-1761), which I could systematically compare to other sites. While a multitude of Creek sites have been discovered, eighteenth-century date ranges largely cannot be narrowed down precisely. Discovery of any seventeenth-century Chacato or Mobilian sites would allow for valuable comparisons to their eighteenth-century counterparts. Similarly, discovery of eighteenth-century Yamasee sites in the Pensacola area, as well as at San Marcos de Apalachee, could lead to interesting comparisons. Ultimately, such discoveries could address the central issue of Native response from the seventeenth through eighteenth centuries, which could easily extend into the Removal era and beyond.

Evaluation of the Savannah River occupation by the Apalachee (1707-1715) and others would offer a key link between seventeenth-century Apalachee and those at
Mission San Joseph de Escambe. If these assemblages possess more grog than the Escambe assemblage, then grog temper might be argued to have diminished through time. More likely, sand/grit tempered ceramics would dominate Savannah River assemblages, and the Apalachee return to Spanish alliance and proximity to their ancestral home, might lead to a revitalization of Apalachee tradition in the form of increased grog temper. Otherwise, perhaps the higher amount of grog temper at Escambe when compared to contemporary Creek sites reflects the incorporation of French-allied Apalachee. Discovery of the Spanish-allied Apalachee site of Nuestra Senora de Soledad y San Luis (1718-1740) might distinguish between these two possibilities, but that area of the Escambia River has been heavily developed, and the ceramic assemblage might be presumed to fall within the cluster of Santa Maria, Santa Rosa, and Escambe with regards to ceramic temper, surface treatment, and diversity in general. The brief occupation (1704-1707) on the Perdido River would fill in a valuable gap, since those groups left Pensacola, so ceramics there likely reflect a combination of coastal Alabama/Florida traditions such as incisions and shell tempering, along with seventeenth-century Apalachee ceramic traditions.

The Dog River and Zimmerman Hill sites demonstrate dominance by local shell tempering. The reduction in diversity likely reflects the assimilation into local communities by Apalachee and other refugees. Quantification of the Apalachee occupation at Blakely Park would show the extent to which the Apalachee adopted particular ceramic elements simply due to living in the new area or if the assimilation into or of non-Apalachee communities played a larger role. Old Mobile and Escambe both have a large amount of Apalachee pottery yet represent medians between French-allied
and Creek traditions, respectively. Reanalysis of the assemblage from the French-allied Apalachee at Blakely Park tentatively demonstrates similarities to the roughly-contemporary Spanish-allied Apalachee at Escambe (Jennifer Melcher, pers. comm. 2011). However, further examination of the Blakely Park Apalachee assemblage remains necessary. If the assemblage there is significantly more similar to seventeenth-century Apalachee assemblages when compared to Escambe, but less than Old Mobile, that would mean that the Apalachee did not experience a revitalization movement in the form of ceramic traditions. Instead, that evidence would indicate that the French-allied Apalachee gradually became more distant from seventeenth-century Apalachee ceramic traditions, while the Apalachee who lived with the Creek became even more distant from those traditions. Escambe would thus represent a middle ground of people rather than merely traditions, because of the incorporation of Apalachee individuals from both Creek and French territory.

Despite the fact that Apalachee at times found themselves against each other politically during the eighteenth century, they manipulated Europeans by providing political and economic connections on their own terms. Numerous Spanish documents, in contrast to British material, outline the social standing of the Apalachee, even those that lived in Creek society. The Spanish at Pensacola described Apalachee and Yamassee as providing valuable connections to the Creek in the form of insight into Creek leaders, but the Creek themselves likely received similar information about the Spanish. The Creek encouraged and perhaps directed the connection to the Spanish via the Apalachee, but the Apalachee chose opportunities and methods to maintain and develop that connection. In other words, those Apalachee who chose to ally politically with either the French or
Spanish maintained social connections with both nations as well as the Creek; and through the Creek, they also enjoyed an economic connection with the British. At the same time, by consistently referring to the groups as Apalachee, documents imply some conscious maintenance of Apalachee identity during the eighteenth century. Apalachee refugees had sufficient resources to play Europeans against each other, yet adopted local ceramic traditions in the realm of household life. Political and material maneuvering allowed them to maintain their social identity and develop new forms of agency during the eighteenth century.

While analysis of ceramic surface treatments and temper, coupled with historical documents, has offered these conclusions, further work should be completed to evaluate these results. Further evidence from Escambe, perhaps in the form of architectural remains, would offer an independent line of comparison to the Creek. Further work should build upon Ginn’s (2009) work in southern California and Cordell’s (2001) work comparing Apalachee pottery of San Luís to that of Old Mobile. Both results follow the idea that technological style would be shared among a community due to a shared attitude of material, labor, and rituals; considering learning as a social phenomenon rather than individual practice (Lechtman 1977; Rice 1987; Wegner 1999). Ginn (2009: 245) concluded that that less visible characteristics of ceramic production—such as clay source, temper, and firing practices—appear more homogeneous in mission communities when compared to more visible characteristics such as production technique, vessel form, and finishing technique. Cordell (2001:55) concluded that select Apalachee pottery at Old Mobile appears similar to that of San Luís in terms of temper, form, and surface treatment, while colono wares in particular demonstrated a simplified style and form. My
comparisons, while different from Ginn (2009), similarly investigated communal response at the regional level and thus to some degree contextualize Cordell’s (2001) efforts. Extending Cordell’s (2001) exhaustive comparisons to select other assemblages would prove beneficial to answer precise questions with regard to technological, morphological, and decorative continuity and change between communities.

Further synthesis of qualitative and quantitative results, clay sourcing studies, and on-site historical research with precisely identified assemblages stands poised to offer new insight. Such work falls within on-going emphasis on Creek architectural (Waselkov 2011) and ecological responses (Foster 2011) as well as efforts at searching for early eighteenth-century sites at the Savannah River (DePratter, pers. comm. 2011). Perhaps the results of this thesis will lead to a nuanced use of underutilized statistical tests and primary sources, as well as other multidisciplinary approaches, to further investigate the interplay between local response and regional structures in the eighteenth-century Southeast and in a broader context.
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APPENDIX A

San Luis Ceramic Data
San Luis Ceramic Data (Adapted from Shapiro 1987; Shapiro and McEwan 1992; Shapiro and Vernon 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grit and sand</th>
<th>Shell and sand</th>
<th>Grog and sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leon Check Stamped: 15 (Shapiro 1987), 21 (Shapiro and McEwan 1992), 22 (Shapiro and Vernon 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted, Filmed, Slipped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission Red: 156 (Shapiro 1987), 32 (Shapiro and Vernon 1992)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No cordmarked, plain, or burnished sherds mentioned in these reports.
APPENDIX B

Patale Ceramic Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grit and sand</th>
<th>Shell and sand</th>
<th>Grog and sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roughened, Brushed, Cob Mark</td>
<td>2 Chattahoochee Roughed, 3 Alachua Cob Marked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Stamped</td>
<td>259 Lamar Complicated Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 Leon Check Stamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised, Punctated</td>
<td>316 Fort Walton Incised, 135 Lake Jackson Incised, 2 Lake Jackson Punctate, 5 Marsh Island Incised, 2 Ocmulge Incised, 1 Cool Branch Incised</td>
<td>39 Point Washington Incised, 3 Pensacola Incised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted, Filmed, Slipped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Mission Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain, Burnished</td>
<td>199 Lake Jackson Plain</td>
<td>6 Mississippi Plain</td>
<td>11085 Lake Jackson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Santa Maria Ceramic Data
Santa Maria Ceramic Data (Adapted from Bense and Wilson 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grit and sand</th>
<th>Shell and sand</th>
<th>Grog and sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roughened, Brushed, Cob Mark</td>
<td>1 Chattahoochee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brushed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>1 Lamar</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complicated Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamped</td>
<td>3 Leon Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised, Punctated</td>
<td>78, 11 Fort Walton</td>
<td>1 Doctor Lake Incised</td>
<td>182. 21 burnished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>24 Pensacola Incised</td>
<td>incised. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ocmulgee Incised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted, Filmed, Slipped</td>
<td>2 painted, 2 slipped, 5 Kasita Red</td>
<td>13 Pensacola Red</td>
<td>1 Brown slip. 9 Mission Red Filmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain, Burnished</td>
<td>1804 plain. 402 burnished, 6 Lake Jackson Plain, 1 Miller Plain</td>
<td>12 Bell Plain, 198 Mississippi Plain, 210 Pensacola Plain.</td>
<td>1205 plain. 397 burnished. 28 Jefferson Plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Old Mobile Ceramic Data
Old Mobile Ceramic Data (Adapted from Silvia [1998], 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grit and sand</th>
<th>Shell and sand</th>
<th>Grog and sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roughened, Brushed, Cob Mark</td>
<td>21 brushed</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 brushed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Stamped</td>
<td>25 Lamar Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>278. 554 Jefferson Complicated Stamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised, Punctated</td>
<td>1 incised, 332 Fatherland Incised, 3 Chickachae Combed, 7 Ocmulgee Incised,</td>
<td>1078. 380 Doctor Lake Incised, 956 Port Dauphin Incised, 25 Winterville Incised, 12 Bell Incised, 341 Owens Incised</td>
<td>421 incised. 2 Baytown Incised. 275 Fatherland Incised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted, Filmed, Slipped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain, Burnished</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3644</td>
<td>4643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Santa Rosa Ceramic Data
Santa Rosa Ceramic Data (Adapted from Harris and Eschbach 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grit and sand</th>
<th>Shell and sand</th>
<th>Grog and sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roughened, Brushed, Cob Mark</td>
<td>341 Chattahoochee Brushed, 3 St. Johns Cob Marked</td>
<td>136 Walnut Roughened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>29 Lamar Complicated Stamped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamped</td>
<td>22 Lamar Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised, Punctated</td>
<td>15 Lamar Incised, 11 Marsh Island Incised, 3 Fort Walton Incised, 1 Point Washington Incised, 4 Englewood Incised,</td>
<td>7 Doctor Lake, 1 Pens Incise, 1 Goggin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted, Filmed, Slipped</td>
<td>59 Kasita Red</td>
<td>121 Pensacola Mission Red, 10 Pensacola Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordmarked</td>
<td>2 Prairie Cordmarked, 1 Prairie Fabric Impressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain, Burnished</td>
<td>2 Lake Jackson Plain, 52 Lamar Plain, 6 St. Johns Plain</td>
<td>20 Bell Plain, 16 Mississippi Plain, 5 Pensacola Plain, 7 Goggin Plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 plain sherds tempered with limestone not considered
APPENDIX F

Dog River Ceramic Data
Dog River Ceramic Data (Adapted from Waselkov and Gums 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grit and sand</th>
<th>Shell and sand</th>
<th>Grog and sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roughened, Brushed, Cob Mark</td>
<td>1 Cob Marked, 32 Bell Roughened, 28 Graveline Roughened, 174 Guillory Cob Marked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Stamped</td>
<td>2 Graveline Complicated Stamped, 163 Guillory Complicated Stamped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised, Punctated</td>
<td>Bell Plain 89, 177 Guillory Incised, 346 Graveline Incised, 4 Mississippi Punctate, 66 Graveline Kemper Combed</td>
<td>5 Baytown Incised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint, Filmed, Slipped</td>
<td>68 Kasita Red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain, Burnished</td>
<td>76 Bell Plain, 164 Mississippi Plain, 1710 Graveline Plain, 718 Guillory Plain</td>
<td>127 Baytown Plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

119 Rochon Punctate sherds not considered
APPENDIX G

Zimmerman Hill Ceramic Data
Zimmerman Hill Ceramic Data (Adapted from Hunter 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grit and sand</th>
<th>Shell and sand</th>
<th>Grog and sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roughened, Brushed, Cob Mark</td>
<td>5 Plaquemine Brushed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised, Punctated</td>
<td>6 Fatherland, 22 Maddox Engraved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted, Filmed, Slipped</td>
<td></td>
<td>92 Zimmerman Black, 17 Old Town Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain, Burnished</td>
<td>365 Bell Plain, 75 Mississippi Plain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>