

BOOK REVIEWS

The Development of Southeastern Archaeology, JAY K. JOHNSON (editor). The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, 1993. viii + 360 pp., biblio., index. \$29.95 (paper).

Reviewed by David G. Anderson, Interagency Archeological Services Division, National Park Service, Atlanta, Georgia.

It is appropriate as we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Archaeological Society of South Carolina that a new book has appeared that allows us to look back on the development of Southeastern Archaeology. *The Development of Southeastern Archaeology* is an important collection of essays describing the history of research in a number of areas of interest to archaeologists, such as (to recount most of the chapter headings) ceramics, lithics, physical anthropology, ethnohistory, zooarchaeology, paleoethnobotany, and archaeometry. The various chapters describe developments in a number of research specializations—basically, who did what, when, and how this past research is now viewed. These chapters are typically extremely well written and full of details about the history of research in the specializations examined. Anyone reading this work will come away from it with an increased appreciation for the complexity of southeastern archaeological research.

David S. Brose starts the volume with a chapter on the intellectual history of southeastern archaeology entitled "Changing Paradigms in the Explanation of Southeastern Prehistory." While I found it interesting and written with rhetorical flourish, the discussion was too abbreviated in some sections and far too detailed in others, sometimes wandering tangentially into topics and areas (i.e., fractal geometry, quantum electrodynamics) of little seeming relevance to the practice of archaeology. Expecting a history, I was confused in places by the terminological/philosophical overkill. The chapter nonetheless offers a view of developments in the region from one of its top scholars.

Jon L. Gibson's chapter on "Ceramics" follows and is written in an engaging, humorous and down home style that provides a solid and informative history of ceramic analysis in the region while simultaneously touching most of the appropriate bases (i.e., persons and topics). Written from a Louisiana perspective, it is weakest

and most dated when reviewing developments at the other end of the Southeast, in Georgia and the Carolinas. In particular, Frankie Snow's two decades of work with Swift Creek design element distributions—finding dozens of paddle matches from sites all across southern Georgia—have gone far beyond Gibson's summary of what was known on this topic in the 1960s.

Jay K. Johnson's chapter of "Lithics" is an excellent, detailed, and reasonably well-balanced view of regional work with lithic remains. It is the best overview of the subject produced to date from the Southeast, and will prove of great value to students interested in the analysis of primarily chipped-stone artifacts. My one concern is that work by researchers in Georgia and the Carolinas is not as well represented as perhaps it could be. This problem haunts the entire volume, which appears written from a Midsouth/Lower Mississippi Valley perspective.

Maria O. Smith and Kristen J. Gremillion's chapters on "Physical Anthropology" and "Paleoethnobotany," respectively, are the kind of comprehensive historical treatments every author recounting developments in a discipline should try to emulate. Reitz's chapter on "Zooarchaeology" is likewise a good historical treatment, with insightful commentary on the problems specialized researchers face when they become involved with modern CRM projects (i.e., sometimes poor coordination of their research with larger project goals; limited publication or dissemination of results). All three chapters highlight the importance of bringing an informed anthropological research perspective to technical analyses of paleofloral, faunal, and human remains.

Patricia Galloway's chapter on "Ethnohistory" provides an on-the-mark (if sometimes uncomfortably devastating) critique of the use of historic accounts by southeastern archaeologists. While in agreement with much of what she says about our profession's failings in these regards, I don't see much value in castigating earlier generations of archaeologists and ethnologists for failing to meet modern historical research standards, particularly when the trained historians of the time did little to improve the picture. Thus, while John R. Swanton admittedly did much to confuse our view of Southeastern Indian life by conflating accounts centuries apart in time and over vast areas, to say he "was the biggest stumbling

block to the effective use of ethnohistorical evidence by archaeologists in the Southeast" is at best unkind given the breadth of his work, and the fact he actually did introduce the historic accounts to generations of scholars. Nevertheless, Galloway's message is clear: the analysis of historic accounts is serious research best done by or in coordination with appropriately trained scholars.

Ronald L. Bishop and Valetta Canouts chapter on "Archaeometry"—which, in their words "involves the application of techniques derived from the physical and chemical sciences to characterize archaeological materials" (p. 160)—is an excellent discussion of both methods and results in this area of research over (primarily) the last two decades. The paper highlights the importance of multidisciplinary research to the resolution of the kinds of questions of interest to modern archaeologists. W. Frederick Limp concludes the principal essays with an appropriately space-age and future-trending overview of "Multispectral Digital Imaging," or remote sensing based on reflected or emitted radiation. While the technology is not quite at the level of the sensors seen on board the starship Enterprise, Limp documents many important things that can be learned from such analyses. A particularly useful aspect of his paper is its hands-on approach, providing a number of specific archaeological examples of applications.

Jay K. Johnson's "Conclusion" is a brief overview of the volume itself, which he variously sees as covering "the development of archaeology in the Southeast" (p. 207) or, more accurately, "summaries . . . of subdisciplines" (p. 207). A truly excellent review, it adds appreciably to what Brose attempted in the introductory chapter. One particularly insightful comment addresses the minimal impact some CRM "carpetbaggers" working in the region have had, primarily because their interests in southeastern archaeology appear driven by financial rather than scientific motives. There are indeed a few people like that out there, living quite comfortably off of archaeology while making little effort to advance our knowledge of the region's past, or see that their reports are circulated (reading them one can usually understand why). Not all of these people, however, are carpetbaggers from outside the region, nor do they all work in private companies, as is implied in Johnson's discussion. Some of them are sitting quite comfortably in companies and universities right here in our own region, and perhaps the most aggravating are those who made their reputation doing CRM archaeology when young yet disparage

it now that they have secure positions (i.e., tenure). Readers should thus be careful not to misconstrue Johnson's comments as a dismissal of CRM and its literature, for this is the ultimate source of the money driving a vast majority of the training and field programs occurring in our region. As an aside, since none of us want to be thought of as a carpetbaggers, it should be noted that John Cable and Steve Claggett's important work at the stratified Archaic-period Haw River sites in North Carolina, or the work Joe Schuldenrein and I did in the Russell Reservoir and at Mattassee Lake was done while we were working for a private company, Commonwealth Associates, Inc., based in Jackson, Michigan!

The Development of Southeastern Archaeology has an extensive bibliography (>1000 citations), and is of particular value for those seeking references in the specializations represented. As such it will be useful to all those lacking access to on-line bibliographic databases like the National Archaeological Database (NADB), which currently has 35,000 southeastern references in place. Until the world becomes fully computer literate, however, bibliographies like this one will serve a valuable role.

Readers of South Carolina Antiquities expecting to pick this volume up and learn much about South Carolina archaeology, however, will be sorely disappointed. This book is not a history of southeastern archaeology or archaeologists, which is what one might expect given its title. South Carolina readers will, accordingly, find no mention of the research of Mark J. Brooks, James L. Michie, Stanley A. South, Robert L. Stephenson, Michael B. Trinkley, or Martha Zierden, to cite just a few of the more prolific members of a long list of omitted South Carolina archaeologists. Likewise, they will find no references to work associated with massive, widely published local projects like the investigations in the Richard B. Russell Reservoir, on the Savannah River Site, or along the Cooper River Rediversion Canal. At a more general level, readers will find little or no discussion about the many signal contributions of geoarchaeology, geomorphology, historical archaeology, paleoecology, or paleoclimatology to the development of southeastern archaeology, nor will they find much information about events and processes occurring at specific times in the past, be it the Paleoindian, Mississippian, or historic periods. That these subjects and authors could be ignored in a book purporting to cover "the development of Southeastern Archaeology" illustrates the problem with its title.

The reason for these glaring omissions is not because the South Carolina scholars or projects that are overlooked failed to shape the development of southeastern archaeology. They unquestionably did. Unfortunately, their work fell outside of the research interests or areas of expertise of the contributors to the volume, or the topics selected for examination by its editor. Many of the papers, as noted, reflect a far better knowledge of research in the western and central parts of the region than in the South Appalachian/South Carolina area, something that could have been corrected given effective technical editing and review. In this regard Johnson's opinion, implied in the preface, that the importance of a scholar's work to the development of Southeastern archaeology might perhaps be measured by the number of citations they receive in the volume, is singularly inappropriate and off the mark, and has offended a great many scholars across the region. By this criteria, several of the contributors to *The Development of Southeastern Archaeology* are among the foremost figures in the region (four of the authors alone account for almost 50 references, and the editor, by his stated criteria of citation number, is apparently just about the most important figure in the history of southeastern archaeology, second only to James A. Ford). Fortunately, many of the other authors in the volume provide more balanced treatment.

As the author of well over 100 published papers and monographs on topics touching most periods and parts of the Southeast, and including several major research syntheses, the two citations I received (in light of Johnson's comment) sufficiently depressed me to the point where I seriously wondered whether I had ever done any

worthwhile archaeology (a feeling I found was shared by a great many colleagues who I talked to about this book). Fortunately, in checking the references, I found myself in good company, as indicated by the following scores for a few of the many people whose work I regard highly: David S. Brose (3 references—and he is an author in this volume!); Hester Davis (0 references); David L. DeJarnette (2 references); Chester B. DePratter (1 reference); Charles H. Fairbanks (0 references); Eugene Futato (3 references); Vernon J. Knight (2 references); Patricia K. Galloway (3 references—another author!); Albert C. Goodyear (4 references); Jerald T. Milanich (2 references); Dan F. Morse (5 references); John F. Scarry (1 reference); Marvin T. Smith (1 reference); and Stephen Williams (2 references). The point here is not to clear my reputation or that of my colleagues, but to show that the title of this volume is inappropriate and does not accurately reflect its contents, that the emperor's new clothes do not fit as advertised. A slight change of title and the deletion of an unfortunate line or two from the preface would, I suspect, have done much to make this volume less irritating than it has been to many of the region's archaeologists.

There is much in this book, however, of value to scholars, students, and avocational admirers of southeastern archaeology. I recommend it highly for anyone interested in learning about the development of a number of critically important research specializations, and the state of current research in these areas of endeavor. This is an important volume, and Johnson and his colleagues have done Southeastern archaeology a real service by putting it together.