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Chapter Fifteen
Examining Chiefdoms in the Southeast: An Application of Multiscalar Analysis
David G. Anderson

Multiscalar analysis is a powerful tool for studying long-term change in the archaeological record. In this chapter, I use this approach to evaluate the importance of variables traditionally used to explore culture change in the Late Prehistoric Southeast. My analyses rely on data for a series of geographic scales from a number of Mississippian societies. My goal is to help develop a better understanding of the emergence and subsequent development of the region’s chiefdoms.

Chiefdoms were present throughout the Southeast less than half a millennium ago. Thus, unlike those parts of the world where the first states arose, their archaeological remains are comparatively recent, relatively well preserved, and only rarely covered by subsequent occupations, although they are seriously threatened by our own civilization’s growth. In addition, an extensive ethnohistoric record describing these societies survives from the period of initial European contact.

The Southeast’s archaeological data base is truly massive, and thanks to more than a century of near-continuous investigation, the region has one of the best documented archaeological records in the world from which to examine the evolution of chiefdom societies. Through 1994, for example, more than 180,000 archaeological sites were recorded in the lower Southeast, and of these almost 20,000 had components dating to the Late Prehistoric and initial contact era between ca. A.D. 800 to 1600. Hundreds of these late period sites have had at least some level of excavation, and dozens have been extensively excavated and reported. Particularly intensive bursts of fieldwork occurred during three periods: during the 1880s and early 1890s when some 2,000 mounds were examined by the Mound Division of the Bureau of Ethnology; during the public works era of the 1930s and early 1940s when dozens of large village and mound sites were completely excavated; and during the past quarter century, when tens of thousands of sites have been recorded and many hundreds intensively examined as a result of federally-mandated cultural resource management activity (Anderson 1997a; Bense 1994). This massive data base and long history of research have made the construction of fine-grained cultural sequences possible in many areas, permitting us to monitor closely changes that occurred as chiefdoms emerged and evolved.

How can this record be used to achieve the objectives of this paper? Multiscalar analyses proceed by examining at different geographic scales the effects of single (isolated) and multiple (interrelated) variables on individual societies and across multiple societies. Calls for the adoption of such a perspective in exploring chiefdom political changes are beginning to appear in the Southeast (e.g., Smith 1990:3, 8), as in other parts of the world (e.g.,
Earle 1991, 4, 13; Upham 1990: 97). Applications in the Southeast have most typically examined evidence for prestige-goods exchange, status differentiation, warfare, or settlement variation (e.g., Blitz 1993; Hally 1993; Hally et al. 1990; Steponaitis 1991, Welch 1990a).

In this paper, I build on this previous work by presenting three examples of multiscalar analysis. First, a brief examination of the Mississippian occupations within a single drainage, the Savannah River basin, is provided to show how the archaeological record from individual sites and within given localities can only be understood by employing data from a number of geographic scales. Second, data from a number of South-eastern societies are compared to illustrate the insights that can be gained from a broad, general application of the multiscalar approach. Finally, the approach is used to evaluate and refine models of culture change surrounding Mississippian emergence, expansion, and collapse. My overall objective is to show that the adoption of multiscalar analysis is essential and ideally suited to the formulation and testing of models of long-term societal change.

Exploring Change in a Specific Locality

Research in the Savannah River basin of Georgia and South Carolina illustrates how use of a multiscalar perspective can elucidate the causes of culture change. To date, more than 500 Mississippian components have been identified in the basin, and extensive excavations have occurred at more than two dozen sites, including most of the known mound centers (Anderson 1990, 1994, 1996a; Anderson et al. 1986). Cultural sequences are detailed enough to permit the dating of components to within roughly 100 years. This degree of chronological control, in combination with the extensive survey and excavation data, makes it possible to examine culture change from a number of scales of analysis.

The Savannah River Basin Chiefdoms

Simple and complex chiefdoms rose and fell in the Savannah River basin over a span of four centuries. The initial appearance of simple chiefdoms is evidenced by the first Mississippian ceremonial centers sometime between A.D. 1100 and 1150 (Figure 15.1). By approximately A.D. 1200, simple chiefdoms were centered around sites with one or two mounds scattered throughout the basin. By A.D. 1350 (Figure 15.2), however, the political landscape changed dramatically. Most of the small centers were abandoned, and two major multimound centers, presumably the ceremonial and political foci of complex chiefdoms, were present in the central part of the basin. By A.D. 1400 or so (Figure 15.3), only one of these large centers was left in the central basin. Soon after A.D. 1450, it too collapsed and the central and lower basin was abandoned. Further upriver, small mound centers not only continued but may in fact have expanded, possibly as the result of population movement from lower in the basin.

The pattern of the lower portions of the basin being abandoned before those further upriver may have been linked to variation in the basin's size and productivity. The lower Savannah basin is quite narrow. It has few well-defined terraces along its margins and extensive pine forests in the interriverine area. In contrast, the upper Savannah basin is characterized by pronounced relief, better defined terraces, and a richer deciduous canopy. Thus, chiefdoms lower in the basin may have relied on a less productive resource base, making them more vulnerable to stress than their neighbors upstream.

The Broader Context of the Savannah River Basin Chiefdoms

Turning to a larger geographic scale, the Savannah River basin is comparatively small, and Mississippian societies occupying it may have been at something of a disadvantage in competition with groups occupying the much larger Oconee and Santee/Wateree basins to the north and south, respectively. In the sixteenth century these larger basins were occupied by powerful chiefdoms, which the Spanish described as the provinces of Ocute and Cofitachequi. De Soto expedition chroniclers amply document relations between the Ocute and Cofitachequi during the early historic era as being characterized by rivalry and enmity. This competition probably had a long history and may have taken place at the expense of the elites and commoners in the Savannah River chiefdoms who were caught in the middle.

Coupled with these broad scales, political conditions, the period between the late fourteenth through late fifteenth centuries was a time of moderate environmental deterioration, which would have placed the agriculturally-based Savannah River basin chiefdoms under considerable stress. Rainfall reconstructions derived from bald cypress tree-ring data indicate that growing season precipitation was below average over much of this inter-
Figure 15.1. Political change in the Savannah River basin, A.D. 1100–1150 and A.D. 1200.

Figure 15.2. Political change in the Savannah River basin — A.D. 1250 and A.D. 1350.
val (Anderson et al. 1995). Declining harvests would have hampered the ability of elites to mobilize tribute and may have forced an increased reliance on wild plant and animal resources from the interriverine buffer zones. However, this wild resource exploitation may have been difficult due to the presence of the powerful Ocute and Cofitachequi chiefdoms on the opposite sides of the buffer zones. The ultimate abandonment of the Savannah River basin suggests that the local chiefly elites failed to respond effectively to these broader scale, political and environmental challenges.

Site Types
At a smaller scale of analysis, five major site types can currently be identified in the Savannah River basin at one time or another over the Mississippian period. These include: 1) "vacant" ceremonial centers/or chiefly compounds (after Williams 1996) where little evidence has been found for permanent occupation by more than a few people, yet where large numbers of people apparently came together for short intervals for collective ceremonial activities; 2) permanently occupied ceremonial centers with large residential populations present year round; 3) organized villages occupied for extended periods; 4) isolated hamlets, also occupied for extended periods; and 5) short-term, presumably nonresidential sites where hunting, collecting, or other specialized activities occurred.

To make sense of events documented for any one of these site types requires that comparisons be made with
the other site types as well. For example, shifts in the locations of both villages and hamlets can be linked to the location and stability of regional ceremonial centers and to climatic conditions. When political conditions were stable and polities were at relative peace, and when the climate was favorable to the production of agricultural surpluses, people appear to have dispersed into a series of unfortified villages and hamlets, congregating periodically at otherwise "vacant" ceremonial centers. In contrast, when hostilities were pronounced, or when climatic conditions were unfavorable, population nucleation into larger fortified communities occurred.

While the need to compare developments at different site types, which represent embedded scales of interaction, may seem obvious, interpreting the results of such comparisons can be difficult. Take, for example, the case of hamlets that were common in parts of the basin whose distributional shifts have been linked, as noted previously, to the location and stability of ceremonial centers. However, the nature of this linkage is unclear. In the lower basin, early Mississippian hamlets were located both along and away from the river, while Middle Mississippian hamlets (from the period just prior to the abandonment of the lower basin) were located almost exclusively away from the main channel. This locational shift may have been a defensive measure—an attempt literally to hide from raiding groups, who favored the major transportation arteries. Alternatively, given that complex chiefdoms had emerged in the central basin during the Middle Mississippian, some of the observed population relocation may have been an attempt by local populations to avoid or lower their tribute burden.

**Rucker's Bottom**

Changes in the political landscape can be seen at a still smaller scale at Rucker's Bottom, the basin's one Mississippian village that has been intensively studied (Anderson and Schuldenrein 1985). Located in the central basin, this village was small throughout its occupation, never exceeding a hectare in size and with a population on the order of 90 to 150 people. These occupants were commoners, and skeletal analyses indicate that they were subject to considerable disease stress. This village was a part of a larger chiefdom, and the villagers were undoubtedly subservient to the elites ruling this society. However, the presence of communal buildings in both the early and later occupations of Rucker's Bottom indicates that at least some decision-making was under local control.

The archaeological record of Rucker's Bottom appears to reflect conditions in the larger polity and interpoltiy region. Changes in the larger political landscape are indicated in a number of ways. Settlement shifted from an open, roughly circular arrangement of houses around a central plaza during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to a similar arrangement of structures around a plaza in the north-central part of the terrace during the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. This later community was fortified, first by a semicircular enclosure and later by a rectangular ditched and stockaded enclosure. During this time, Rucker's Bottom also grew larger, suggesting the increasing concentration or nucleation of local populations, perhaps as a defensive measure. The appearance and increasing complexity of the fortifications suggest that hostilities were occurring during the century before the abandonment of the central and lower basin. The causes of these hostilities were probably the broader scale political and environmental conditions discussed previously.

Analyses of a range of data categories at still smaller scale, the household or feature level, help us to understand how and why something as dramatic as the abandonment of much of a river basin could have occurred. Paleosubsistence analyses undertaken at the Rucker's Bottom site suggest an increase in land clearing and a greater use of acorns in the years immediately before abandonment (Moore 1985). As climate was deteriorating locally and warfare was increasing, the villagers' response appears to have been to increase farming activity and the gathering of wild plant resources like acorns, probably to make up for harvest shortfalls or surpluses lost to raiding.

During most of Rucker's Bottom's history, maize storage is assumed to have been in aboveground facilities, or barbacoas, like those reported by the early Spanish explorers. Many small circular and rectangular post arrangements have been excavated and interpreted as possible storage sheds or corn cribs (Judge 1991). In the last village occupation prior to site abandonment, these structures were located in prominent positions in the village, adjacent to the probable council house and near the rectangular palisade wall. Anyone accessing these facilities would have been clearly visible, something that may have facilitated their defense from raiders. What appear to be massive subterranean storage features were also constructed at the site during its final occupation, suggesting a desire to hide food supplies or restrict their use.
Summary

Elsewhere I have argued that the dramatic changes observed in the late prehistoric archaeological sequence of the Savannah River basin were caused by a complex array of factors (Anderson 1994, 1996a,b). These include: 1) weaknesses inherent to chiefdom organizational forms in general, such as divisive factional competition centered on chiefly succession and the allocation of wealth and power; 2) shifts in the structure of the local and regional political organization; and 3) short- and long-term changes in climate, and their effects on local and regional patterns of resource availability.

While my explanations require additional testing, what I have presented here should illustrate how investigating the causes of culture change can proceed at many different scales and with many kinds of data. In fact, accurately interpreting the local archaeological record in the Savannah River basin would probably not be possible without a multiscalar perspective.

Exploring Culture Change

at the Regional Level

Comparative analyses of Mississippian chiefdoms can be productive in two ways. First, by placing individual chiefdoms in their broader contexts, such analyses can make developments within those chiefdoms more understandable, as in the Savannah River basin. Secondly, by revealing the similarities and differences among Mississippian chiefdoms, such analyses can provide the basis for formulating explanatory models of culture change for the Southeast in general. In this section, comparative data on a series of Mississippian chiefdoms are presented in a multiscalar format. The following section uses these data to consider the problem of formulating models of culture change.

The data considered here consists of qualitative summary information on organizational change, agricultural intensification, population demographic trends, prestige-goods exchange, craft specialization, and warfare for a dozen localities selected to maximize geographical and organization diversity across the Southeast (Figure 15.4). The scales or levels of analysis encompass the household, community, chiefly polity, and interpolity regions (see Earle 1991:4).

Qualitative summary data rather than quantitative values are used because this is the kind of information most typically available in the published literature. While a number of exceptional analytical studies exist that have explored some of these variables quantitatively, they have typically focused on small samples or on only one or a few localities, rendering comparative analyses difficult. Thus, for example, while population estimates and settlement spacing have been calculated for every known center and village within the Coosa polity (Hally et al. 1990), this kind of data remains to be developed elsewhere in the Southeast. Fortunately, detailed quantitatively-based analyses are appearing with increased incidence, offering great hope for the future. Examples of such studies include analyses of site size or mound volume across the region (e.g., Holley, Chapter 2; Muller, Chapter 11), of mound center longevity and spacing (e.g., Scarry, Chapter 5; Hally 1993, 1996b), and of prestige grave-good incidence over time (e.g., Anderson 1994; Steponaitis 1991; Welch 1991). The value of the qualitative data considered here is that it permits comparisons of multiple variables, cases, and scales. Even the simplest comparisons reveal important trends, which currently cannot be discerned in more focused, quantitatively-based studies.

Organization

Evidence for organizational change has received intensive study across the region, and a number of attributes have been associated with the emergence, expansion, and collapse of chiefly polities (Table 15.1). Architectural correlates of chiefdom emergence in the Southeast include, for example, the disappearance of council houses and the appearance of elite residences both atop and away from mounds, presumably reflecting changes from collective/egalitarian to hierarchical/elite decision-making apparatuses. In contrast, chiefdom collapse is correlated with the disappearance of elite residences and sometimes with the reappearance of council houses.

Fortifications, besides signaling periods when conflict was widespread (such as during the Late Mississippian period), are also observed when chiefdoms first appear in some areas (i.e., in northeast Arkansas at the Zebree site, at several centers along the Savannah River, and at Town Creek in North Carolina). This suggests that Mississippian emergence was not an altogether peaceful development and, at least in some areas, involved competition or conflict between groups.

The occurrence of fortifications also provides clues about regional political relationships later in the Missis-
Figure 15.4. Areas used in comparisons.
sippian era. The expansion of the complex chiefdom at Moundville, for example, appears linked to the disappearance of fortifications at centers in nearby areas (i.e., at Lubbub Creek along the Tombigbee), and the outright disappearance of societies from other areas (Welch 1990b, 1991). This suppression of potential rivals seems to have been a common strategy by elites in complex Mississippian chiefdoms.

Individual construction stages in Southeastern mounds are commonly thought to reflect successional episodes, specifically demarcating the replacement of one chief by another. Taken collectively, periods when mound stages were being added without interruption are viewed as probable measures of polity duration, or the lifespan of politically successful chiefly lineages at a given center. Mound stage construction appears to have occurred about once a generation or so at many sites. Since more than four to six successive stages are only rarely present without major interruption, some researchers have suggested that Southeastern chiefdoms usually did not last more than 50 to 150 years (Anderson 1994; Hally 1993, 1996b).

Just as centers were occupied, abandoned, and sometimes reoccupied, so too were much larger parts of the region at various times during the Mississippian era. The abandonment of chiefdoms over large parts of the central Mississippi Valley and along the central and lower Savannah River in the Late Mississippian period are among the most dramatic examples of sweeping organizational change known from the region (Anderson 1994, 1996a,c; Williams 1990).

Demography

While little firm data exists as to the actual numbers of people present in various parts of the Southeast, evidence about settlement distributions is on secure footing in many areas (Table 15.2). During the period of Mississippian emergence appreciable demographic variability is evident across the region, with little evidence for uniformity in either settlement change or population growth. In some areas, for example, small villages were replaced by a dispersed hamlet/center settlement pattern (i.e., in the American Bottom around Cahokia and in western Alabama around Moundville), while in other localities dispersed populations aggregated into larger villages and centers, at least for portions of the year (i.e., in southwestern Indiana around Angel and along the upper Tombigbee in Mississippi near Lubbub Creek). While population growth may have been occurring at this time, population reorganization is what stands out in the archaeological record.

Comparable settlement variability likewise characterizes localities where chiefdoms have time-depth. In parts of the region the only settlements away from major centers are small farmsteads and hamlets, while in other areas hamlets and villages, or just villages may occur away from the centers. The larger polities in terms of numbers of people are typically the most complex organizationally, a pattern characteristic of pre-state societies throughout the New World (Feinman and Neitzel 1984).

Major population change unquestionably occurred during the Mississippian era, with particularly dramatic examples including large scale abandonments like those noted previously or the dramatic expansion in the size of some centers (i.e., at Moundville and Cahokia). Whether these large scale changes reflect actual population growth or decline within the larger region, or merely population relocation or reorganization, is unknown.

Subsistence

Agricultural intensification is clearly associated, on a broad level, with the emergence of chiefdoms across the region (Table 15.3). Examining specific cases, however, it appears that the adoption of intensive maize agriculture preceded the Mississippian emergence in some areas (i.e., along the upper Tombigbee, in northern Florida), paced it in others (i.e., in the American Bottom, in the Savannah River Valley), and did not occur until appreciably later in still other areas (i.e., in northeast Arkansas). The adoption of intensive maize agriculture appears to have spread across the region faster than Mississippian political organization itself. However, in areas unusually rich in wild food resources, maize did not become a major element of the diet until after Mississippian emergence, even in areas where Mississippian political organization arose early, as in the central Mississippi Valley (i.e., in northeast Arkansas at Zebree).

Subsistence resource procurement likewise tended to be highly diversified in unusually rich locales, while in other areas it became increasingly focused over time (i.e., directed to a few crops and game species). A possible reason for this contrast is that the labor requirements associated with agricultural intensification may have forced a restriction of hunting effort to one or a few species offering a high rate of return (Speth and Scott 1985). Interestingly, when complex Mississippian societies collapsed, use of maize may have declined as well. This is
clearly the case at the Irene site along the lower Savannah River (Larsen et al. 1992), although the pattern is by no means universal. Over the region it appears that the appearance of intensive agriculture may be more closely linked to major patterns of population growth than to the emergence of chiefdom organization.

Population skeletal health, a direct measure of the effectiveness of provisioning systems, appears closely tied to organizational complexity across the region. Population health for all segments of Mississippian society was generally better in the most complex chiefdoms than it was in simpler societies, unless the less-complex chiefdoms were located in resource-rich areas (e.g., Hatch 1987; Powell 1988). This patterning also appears related to societal stability and longevity. Typically, the largest chiefdoms were among the longest-lived, indicating that they had developed highly successful strategies for reducing subsistence-related stress. These strategies were most likely tied to maximizing production of and control over subsistence surpluses. Finally, more than maize was involved in the subsistence tributary base of the Mississippian political economy. Evidence for the provisioning of elites with choice game such as deer meat has been recovered in some areas (i.e., Savannah River Valley, upper Tombigbee drainage) (Jackson and Scott 1995).

**Prestige Goods Exchange**

Prestige goods exchange and use varied appreciably over the region (Table 15.4). Distributions of specific goods indicate that interaction spheres existed and varied in size, and that regional political geography shaped the flow of goods. The larger centers appear to have constrained the use or even the receipt of prestige goods by populations at smaller centers, both in areas under their direct control and in adjoining polities. Thus, the emergence of the presumed Moundville paramount chiefdom after A.D. 1200 is tied to a diminution in prestige-good incidence in smaller societies to the west, along the Tombigbee and in the Pocahontas region of Mississippi (Blitz 1993; Steponaitis 1991). Prestige goods flowed to major centers of power where they would have proven useful to the elites. How these exchange systems actually operated, however, is poorly known at the present.

An interesting consequence of the apparent centralization of control over long distance exchange was that extralocal materials or "prestige goods" came to be viewed differently in societies of differing levels of complexity. Elites in the more complex Mississippian chiefdoms exercised considerable control over the use of prestige goods in their own societies, often restricting the use of specific goods to particular social segments. In these societies prestige goods were used to signal status, with specific goods or items viewed as insignia of rank. In contrast, prestige goods in less complex chiefdoms tended to occur (if they occurred at all) more widely over all segments of society and were viewed as wealth items.

The maintenance of prestige goods exchange networks across the region does not appear to have been crucial to the successful operation of many Mississippian chiefdoms. Exchange waxed and waned over time and was quite important during some periods and less so during others. From a pronounced peak in the thirteenth century, when the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex was at its height (Muller 1989), evidence for long-distance exchange declined markedly in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. However, even given this decline, many chiefdoms both large and small continued to function in the Late Mississippian period. Even during earlier periods there is evidence from a number of areas that ceremonial centers continued to be occupied, and mound stages continued to be added, well after a major decline in prestige goods incidence occurred (Anderson 1994; Steponaitis 1991; Welch 1991).

**Craft Specialization**

Evidence for the existence of full-time craft specialists, something often advanced as a hallmark of fairly complex society, is ambiguous over the region (Table 15.5). There is little doubt, however, that the specialized manufacture of a wide range of goods by small segments of the population occurred in a number of Southeastern societies. In most cases, however, this production appears to have been a part-time affair conducted as one part of everyday life. Evidence for the existence of full-time craft specialists supported by an elite is not obvious, although an extensive and sometimes quite impassioned debate does admittedly exist on the subject. Modifying a "rule" advanced by Yoffee (1993:69) to encompass similar arguments about whether or not states are present in an area. I suggest that since we can argue heatedly about whether or not craft specialization occurred, it probably did not at any level of importance (that is, if it occurred enough to matter, the evidence would be dear cut). The comparative data does indicate that considerable variation occurred in the production and use of specialized goods over the region. In some polities these goods were apparently produced by
elites, or at least made at elite centers, while in other societies they were more widely produced at farmsteads, villages, and centers, possibly by elites and commoners alike.

**Warfare**

Mississippian chiefdoms appear to have both constrained warfare and given it reign in new forms over the region (Table 15.6). The Mississippian emergence witnessed a decline in warfare compared with the preceding Late Woodland period in some areas (i.e., at Moundville and along the Tombigbee), while in other areas it was accompanied by the appearance of fortifications around sites, suggesting disagreements with local or nearby groups. Differing solutions to perceived threats were adopted throughout the Mississippian era. In some areas populations nucleated. In others they remained dispersed, yet converged on fortified centers during periods of conflict. Additionally, in some areas attempts were apparently made to conceal stored food reserves during periods of unusual stress.

There appear to have been periods when warfare occurred with greater or lesser intensity across the region as a whole. The Late Mississippian in particular appears to have been a time of increased strife across the region. Settlement nucleation, improved fortifications, and an increased incidence of weapons trauma on skeletal remains has been observed at this time in a number of areas, suggesting increased frequency or intensity of conflict. This is probably directly tied to the decline of the region-wide prestige goods exchange network that occurred following the Middle Mississippian period. This network would have facilitated interaction and alliance formation between elites in differing polities, fostering cooperation rather than conflict. A decline in mound building also occurs during the Late Mississippian period, and it has been suggested that societal energies were increasingly directed to defense rather than to ceremonialism.

**Evaluating Models of Culture Change in the Southeast**

The data presented in the preceding section provide a basis for developing explanatory models for culture change in the Southeast, models that may offer insights for archaeologists working in other parts of the world as well. In the Southeast, the three questions that have been the focus of efforts to formulate explanatory models all pertain to the general topic of chiefdoms. First, how and why did such societies evolve in the Southeast? Second, once chiefdoms appeared, how and why did they spread? Finally, how and why did these societies collapse, individually and collectively? Each of these questions is considered below.

**Models of Chiefdom Emergence**

In the introduction to a volume addressing the problem of how and why chiefdoms arose in the Southeast, Smith (1990:1–2) noted that the major frameworks advanced to explain the Mississippian emergence comprised a seeming polar opposition, what he called the homology/analogy dilemma. The homology or "historical relatedness" position sees the emergence of chiefdoms across the region as due to the movement of people or innovations from a central core area, with their survival or selection due to the adaptive advantage of new organizational forms. The alternative, analogy or "process" position views the Mississippian emergence as "independent and isolated cultural responses to similar challenges" (Smith 1990:2). Although the record of Mississippian emergence is superbly documented in many localities, Smith (1990:1–2) has observed that it is "far from clear to what degree this broadly similar process of cultural transformation was due to developmental interaction between river valley societies in transition, as opposed to their independent response to similar developmental constraints and opportunities." Explanatory mechanisms or frameworks are not well worked out, although the role of a few key variables have been explored, such as the use of maize or other domesticates (i.e., the impact of agricultural intensification), demography (i.e., the impact of population growth and pressure), and trade (i.e., the importance of elite prestige goods exchange). Recognizing that "there is no single, simple, all encompassing and comforting theoretical explanation for the Mississippian emergence" (Smith 1990:2–3), Smith has argued that the best way to identify and evaluate the factors that led to the Mississippian emergence is through the adoption of a multiscalar analytical approach that:

... seeks out and accommodates information from the full range of nested levels, ranging from basic economic unit households up through regional systems ... [we] need to simultaneously consider and pursue explanations of Mississippian origins on a number of nested levels [employing] multiple, if partial, explanations from a variety of theoretical perspectives (Smith 1990:3,8).
Whatever brought about the emergence of chiefdoms across the Southeast, the simple comparison of developments in a number of localities highlights the inadequacy of prime-movers, or single causal factors (Table 15.1–15.6). Patterns of organizational change varied appreciably during the period of Mississippian emergence. In some areas such as the American Bottom, small villages were replaced by a center-hamlet dichotomy, while in other areas such as along the Savannah River, hamlets were replaced by nucleated villages and centers (Table 15.1). Population distributions appear to have varied widely over the region, rendering it difficult to accept that any one trajectory or critical threshold was required before chiefdoms could emerge (Table 15.2). Likewise, agricultural intensification leading to either population growth and pressure or storable surpluses promoting elite prestige goods exchange has been suggested as a factor in the emergence of chiefdoms. However, comparative analysis makes it clear that in different areas the adoption of intensive agriculture preceded, was contemporaneous, or even postdated the Mississippian emergence (Table 15.3). Arguments linking the Mississippian emergence to agricultural intensification or population pressure—usually focusing on the control of subsistence-generating resources like prime agricultural soils or hunting territories—are particularly hard to accept since large portions of the region remained unoccupied even after intensive agriculture was widely adopted and chiefdoms were present over much of the landscape. Settlement distributions appear to have been shaped as much as by political as by environmental conditions.

The importance of prestige goods exchange likewise appears to have varied greatly over the region (Table 15.4). The data clearly indicate, however, that the growth of political centralization and the development of prestige goods exchange networks in the Southeast were closely linked. Accordingly, the purpose of exchange may not have been merely to promote alliance formation (e.g., Brown et al. 1990:253), but also to facilitate the accumulation of wealth and power in the hands of individuals and lineages. It is possible that demand for prestige goods may have contributed to agricultural intensification and organizational changes by generating increased requirements on subsistence production (i.e., to generate and control the surpluses needed to acquire prestige goods). While trade was indeed “an instrument of political activity” (Brown et al. 1990:255), its result was the accumulation of power, which was maintained for its own sake. However, once chiefdoms were in place, and elite power was centralized and reasonably secure, the importance of trade goods for the maintenance of elite authority declined. As Drennan (1991:281) has it, once chiefdoms are in place, long-distance trade “provided the plumes of the chiefly peacock, not its basic diet.”

The decline of the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex after ca. A.D. 1250, may reflect such a broad-scale evolutionary process.

The variable of prestige goods exchange illustrates how the timing and interrelationships between many variables need to be considered to understand Mississippian emergence. At Emergent Mississippian sites like Range in the American Bottom (Kelly 1990:253), shifts in community plan over time evidence increasing social differentiation, including the probable emergence of ranked population subsets. A recently favored explanation for this emergent ranking has been elite competition and associated prestige goods exchange, leading to the accumulation of wealth and power and the development of permanent status differences within privileged lineages. However, this explanation has little empirical support, since the documented occurrence of elite/prestige goods in emergent Mississippian settings is minimal. Extensive elite exchange did occur throughout the region by early Mississippian times (ca. A.D. 1000–1100), peaked by ca. A.D. 1200 or so, and declined after that. Thus, while prestige goods exchange apparently was not the cause for the emergence of chiefdoms, it may have played an important role in their subsequent development.

The Spread of Mississippian: Timing and Precursors

While chiefdoms emerged across the Southeast within no more than 300 years, from ca. A.D. 900 to 1150 or so, there is an apparent time-transgressive west to east spread of the adaptation in the region (Table 15.7; Figure 15.5). Chiefdom societies are present after ca. A.D. 900 in the central Mississippi River Valley, but do not appear in places like Moundville until ca. A.D. 1050, and only after ca. A.D. 1100–1150 in the Carolinas. While few now believe that waves of chiefly elites moved out of a central/lower Mississippi River Valley heartland, it may be that chiefdom organizational forms in the late prehistoric era did indeed first arise in this area, and spread through a process of both competitive emulation and defensive reaction (Anderson 1997b).

Given the scarcity of evidence for chiefdom organizational spread through migration (something now suggested in only a few areas such as at Macon Plateau in central...
Figure 15.5. Inferred spread of chiefdoms in the Southeast.
Georgia (at the Zebree site in northeast Arkansas) and the
fairly dear indication for in situ development in many ar-
aeas, a direct movement of people as the primary cause of the
Mississippian emergence over the region is unlikely. Instead,
the spread of chiefly organization was more likely some-
ting of a reactive process. Following arguments by Car-
neiro (1970, 1981), if the first chiefdoms were predatory,
chiefdoms may have emerged across the region as a de-
defensive reaction. Alternatively or additionally, they developed
to allow privileged lineages to participate more effectively in
expanding trade and status-based, power-enhancing games
through a process of competitive emulation.

We need to look very carefully at preexisting condi-
tions, the long historical trajectories leading to the criti-
cal two centuries when the Mississippian emergence
occurred. Until quite recently there has been an unfor-
tunate tendency for researchers to simplify Middle and
Late Woodland organizational complexity (but see
Nassaney and Cobb 1991), with the result that the Missis-
sippian emergence appears all the more impressive and
disjunctive. However, many of the largest mound and
other earthen constructions and some of the most elabo-
rately furnished burials in the region occur well before
the Mississippian era at Middle or Late Woodland cen-
ters like Pinson, Kolomoki, Lake George, and Toltec. We
need to consider the kinds of organizational forms that
could have produced these remains, and how their exis-
tence shaped subsequent developments.

Likewise, care must be taken to differentiate between
the evolution and spread of chiefdom organizational
forms over the region and the spread of Mississippian
ideology (Pauketat and Emerson 1997). The former (i.e.,
chiefdom-like societies) appears to have emerged in the
nineth and tenth centuries, if not before, in some areas.
The latter (i.e., Mississippian ideology and religion) appears
to have developed or crystallized in the tenth and eleventh
centuries, after chiefdoms themselves had emerged in a
number of areas, and Cahokia seems to have been the pri-
mary center where this took place. "Mississippian" increas-
ingly is thus coming to be recognized as an ideological/
religious system that a number of the region's chiefdoms
participated in, and whose origin and spread owe a great
deal to the early and dramatic emergence of Cahokia
(Anderson 1997b; Emerson 1997; Knight 1986; Pauketat
1994, 1997; Pauketat and Emerson 1997).

Models of Chiefdom Development and Decline
By ca. A.D. 1100 or shortly thereafter the Southeast was
dotted with simple and complex chiefdoms from east
texas and Louisiana to the Carolinas and north to the
Ohio River. Over the next four centuries complex chief-
doms rose and fell over the region, with Moundville,
Cahokia, Spiro, and Etowah being four of the better-
known societies that collapsed well before contact. Else-
where I have argued that cycling—the emergence and
collapse of complex chiefdoms amid a regional land-
scape of simple chiefdoms—is an inherent property of
chiefdoms (Anderson 1990, 1996a; 1997b). David Hally
(1996b:124–125), in an important extension of research
on chiefdom emergence and collapse and cycling theory,
has shown with a large archaeological sample from the
Georgia area that simple chiefdoms, like complex chief-
doms, are also extremely fragile and short lived, and
themselves "cycled" between birth and death. We are
now at the point where we can examine and compare the
historical trajectories of a large number of chiefdoms in
the region, to understand better how processes like cy-
cling operate to produce cultural change (e.g., Drennan

Why one or more Mississippian societies in the East-
ern Woodlands never developed into state-level polities
is also a question of some interest, since chiefdoms else-
where in the New World made this transition. Compari-
itive studies have shown that state formation does not
automatically occur when a threshold population size/
density is reached (Upham 1990). More typically, the
response is system collapse and downward cycling. Thus,
thresholds of population size/density were reached re-
peatedly throughout prehistory; but only rarely and in a
few parts of the world did successful organizational re-
sponses occur. These selection events, however, never
happened in the Southeast.

The societies of the Eastern Woodlands apparently
developed in isolation, with little or no direct contact
with other New World states, precluding the likelihood
of secondary state formation. The nearest state-level
societies were in central Mexico at a considerable dis-
tance and separated by major geographic barriers. Cur-
cently no conclusive evidence of any kind has been found
for direct or regular contact between the Middle Ameri-
can states and the Mississippian or pre-Mississippian
societies of the Eastern Woodlands (see Cobb et al.
Chapter 13). The only Latin American artifacts reaching
the Eastern Woodlands were domesticates such as corn
and beans, and they apparently spread gradually from
group to group.

The development of increasingly complex societies
may have been hindered in many parts of the Eastern
Woodlands by their physiographic and resource structure. Although the area occupied by Mississippian chiefdoms was quite large, larger in fact than nuclear Mesoamerica, comparatively small portions of this broad area were suitable for the emergence and development of agricultural/game-based chiefdoms. These portions were (typically) river floodplains, most of which were not only narrow but also widely spaced.

Both of these characteristics would have discouraged state formation. Narrow valleys could not contain multiple, densely packed, complex chiefdoms, a condition favorable for state formation. Also, the distances between individual chiefly societies would have made the formation of stable, multiplicity aggregates difficult. It is true that some Mississippian chiefdoms apparently exerted influence over considerable areas. However, their direct administrative control appears to have been within fairly small areas.

Mississippian chiefdoms did exhibit one characteristic that comparative studies have identified as conducive to state formation—the prevalence of warfare often involving the unification of a number of chiefdom-level societies through conquest and subsequent administrative reorganization (Wright 1986). Among Mississippian chiefdoms, low intensity warfare, which occasionally gave way to major episodes of apparent conquest or extermination, was a way of life. Some have suggested in fact that increasing competition and conflict among chiefly centers occurred over the course of the Mississippian period. If true, it may be that European contact truncated trends that otherwise would have led to state formation.

Two other trends observed among Mississippian chiefdoms could also be suggested as precursors of state formation. One is the apparent gradual change from sacred, cooperatively base forms of political control to secular, more authoritarian forms. The other is settlement nucleation, which may have been related to the apparent pattern of increased warfare.

I think that if European contact had not occurred, it is probable that conquest-based states would have eventually emerged in at least some parts of the Eastern Woodlands. In my view, the most likely location would have been the central and lower Mississippi River Valley, one of the largest and most ecologically rich areas in the Southeast where large numbers of complex chiefdoms were closely packed together in the landscape. Elsewhere, the wide spacing of chiefdoms would have made conquest difficult and state formation much less likely.

Unfortunately for Mississippian populations, European contact did occur and within a century chiefdom level society had ended across much of the Southeast. It has traditionally been thought that Mississippian chiefdoms underwent a general collapse or "devolution" prior to contact, a view largely shaped by the abandonments observed at such major centers as Cahokia, Etowah, and Moundville. This regional decline has been variously attributed to the collapse of interregional exchange networks, climatic change such as the onset of the Little Ice Age, or even population pressure. Such views are no longer widely held. We now know, for example, that the chiefdoms observed in the interior by the Spanish at the time of initial contact in the mid-sixteenth century, such as Cofitachequi or Coosa, were likely as large and as powerful as almost any that existed previously in the region.

Very real changes did occur over the Southeast in the centuries before contact, such as a decline in mound construction and long-distance exchange and an increase in warfare and settlement nucleation. However, these trends are better explained as the long-term consequences of chiefly cycling than as the result of evolutionary collapse.

The post-contact Mississippian collapse cannot be fully understood through reference to the chiefdom organizational systems existing previously. The native social systems were simply overwhelmed by the combined effects of a variety of external forces, including introduced diseases and unavoidable competition with foreign populations possessing adaptationally advantageous technological, organizational, and ideological systems. Any long-term developmental trends among Mississippian chiefdoms, wherever these trends may have been headed, were truncated by European contact.

Conclusions

An excellent series of articles outlining the theoretical and methodological approaches brought to the study of Mississippian societies was published in a recent issue of Southeastern Archaeology, celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. As Peebles (1990:25) noted in an article devoted exclusively to work on the Mississippian period, there has been "a sustained development of models of the Mississippian" in the region. These approaches have included the development of ecological/adaptationist models helping us to understand why certain locations within
the landscape were repeatedly selected (e.g., Griffin 1967; Larson 1972; Smith 1978); analyses of population health, trauma, and demography, indicating the effects of organizational change on the lives of the inhabitants of these cultural systems (e.g., Hatch 1987; Milner et al. 1991; Powell 1988); and evaluations of the role of iconography and ritual in the maintenance of authority structures (e.g., Brown 1985; Knight 1986; Sears 1961, 1973). In the same issue Watson (1990:43–50) and Dunnell (1990:18–19) recounted some of the research themes and accomplishments of Southeastern archaeology, which have included advances in areas as diverse yet interrelated as artifact classification and chronology, cultural historical reconstruction, trade and exchange (particularly raw material sourcing studies), paleoclimatic reconstruction, and the reconstruction of prehistoric lifeways and subsistence systems.

The contributions of Southeastern archaeology to anthropological theory, particularly the exploration of cultural evolution, however, were not viewed as profound. For example, Dunnell (1990:39) described research on the subject of the origins of cultural complexity in the region as "little more than searching for surrogates to warrant calling one or another units a tribe, chiefdom, or state" with "no new paradigm on the horizon." As I have attempted to demonstrate in this paper, and as the other Southeastern papers in this volume make clear, this assessment is simply not correct, at least as far as the contemporary research picture is concerned.

Southeastern archaeologists are currently taking full advantage of the exceptional opportunities offered by the Mississippian archaeological record to explain political change in chiefdom-level societies. They are performing sophisticated analyses of extensive survey and excavation assemblages, with fine-grained cultural chronologies, and with detailed paleoenvironmental data. The results of this work indicate that the emergence, development, and collapse of chiefdoms within the Southeast were due to a variety of factors, of which climate, regional resource structure and physiography, and local and regional political conditions all appear to have played a part.

The question now confronting Southeastern archaeologists is where do we go from here? In this paper, I have attempted to show how the study of cultural complexity, particularly long-term change in chiefdom societies, can proceed. To model political change in the Late Prehistoric Southeast, we need to control for the effects of many variables at many scales of analysis. In applying the multiscalar approach, we must of necessity be multidisciplinary and diachronic.

From the topics briefly explored in this paper, we have seen that any explanatory model of Mississippian emergence and subsequent development must incorporate a wide range of variables. Some of these variables are the physical environment, including climate and regional physiographic resources; demography, including the question of whether threshold values triggering change exist; subsistence, particularly the relationship between agricultural production and surplus mobilization; the nature of local and regional sociopolitical organization, including long-term historical or developmental trajectories; and internal and external exchange networks, particularly the location and operation of prestige-based systems.

We need to look at the big picture and the small, and let our observations from each analytical level inform our research on the other levels. Multiscalar analyses highlight the fact that the causes of culture change in chiefdom society are multifaceted and multivariate. That is, change comes about through the action of a wide range of factors operating at many levels or scales simultaneously, and whose measurable effects vary appreciably depending upon the scale selected for analysis. While some variables admittedly play a greater role than others, it is becoming clear that only rarely do single causal mechanisms bring about change. Accordingly, our analyses—and, ultimately, the theoretical models built from them—must encompass multiple causal mechanisms (i.e., independent as well as interrelated variables and lines of evidence) and at the same time be plausible, logical, and verifiable.

The Southeast is an ideal region for investigating long-term change in chiefdom level societies. If present work is any guide, it is clear that in the years ahead Southeastern archaeologists will be offering increasingly well grounded explanations of how and why the region's complex prestate societies evolved.
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### Table 15.1. Evidence for Organizational Change at Different Spatial Scales in the Late Prehistoric Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture Area/ Locality</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Chiefly Polity</th>
<th>Interpolity Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Bottom (including Cahokia and FAI 270 Project area)</td>
<td>Replacement of small villages with dispersed households upon onset of Early Mississippian.</td>
<td>Increasingly formalized arrangements of houses around plazas, centralized storage facilities over course of the Emergent Mississippian (data from Range).</td>
<td>Main polity in place for ca. 250 years; outlying centers exhibit varied (often volatile) occupational histories.</td>
<td>Threat zone/symbolic tribute likely exacted from immense area (far beyond the area under direct control of the chiefdom).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebree/Parkin/ Nodena NE Arkansas/SE Missouri</td>
<td>Small Late Woodland hamlets and villages replaced with nucleated villages in Emergent Mississippian.</td>
<td>Nucleated villages replaced by villages and dispersed hamlets in Middle Mississippian.</td>
<td>Direct placement of Late Woodland Community at Zebree site.</td>
<td>Appearance of fortified nucleated towns and centers in Late Mississippian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid Southern Illinois</td>
<td>Numerous dispersed farmsteads.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No secondary centers (perhaps suppressed by primary center).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel/Caborn- Welborn Southwest Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement of center/village settlement hierarchy with separate(?) villages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocahontas Region Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporaneous, contrasting mound burial patterns (mounds w/primary burials and few grave goods vs. mounds w/mostly isolated skulls and elaborate grave goods) suggest distinct social groups or segmentary organization.</td>
<td>Stability throughout sequence indicated; persistence of simple chiefdoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tombigbee Chiefdoms Northeast Mississippi</td>
<td>Most people live in dispersed farmsteads for much of the year. Population concentrations at local center infrequent, probably for ceremonial/social functions, or during warfare.</td>
<td>Food storagefeasting at local center in vicinity of mound. Paired ceremonial(?) structures replaced by low platform mound/plaza complex in Early Mississippian (Summerville I). Stability throughout sequence indicated; persistence of simple chiefdoms.</td>
<td>Intensive interaction w/Moundville indicated in Summerville II/III (extensive Moundville Engraved pottery, suppression(?) of fortifications).</td>
<td>Many small centers, no paramountcies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville Western Alabama</td>
<td>Nucleated Late Woodland (West Jefferson phase) villages replaced by dispersed farmsteads in Early Mississippian (Moundville I phase). Nucleated villages reappear in Late Mississippian (Moundville IV) following Moundville collapse.</td>
<td>Burial population at Moundville increases markedly as residential population declines from Moundville I to Moundville III. Burial population declines in late Moundville III times, coupled w/an expansion of cemeteries at outlying centers.</td>
<td>Occupation at paramount center declines markedly after Moundville I. (Dense residential zone about small center replaced by large, planned civic-ceremonial precinct). Superordinate segment of population apparently increases from ca. 1-2% to 5% between Moundville I and III.</td>
<td>Paramount chiefdom apparently stable for ca. 250 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Threat zone likely over large area (far beyond the area under direct control of the chiefdom).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15.1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture Area</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Chiefly Polity</th>
<th>Interpolity Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etowah/Coosa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earth-embanked structures (council houses?) replaced by platform mound/plaza complex in Early Mississippian.</td>
<td>Mound centers &lt;17 km or &gt;31 km apart in Coosa polity.</td>
<td>Occupation at Etowah interrupted twice (before and after Wilbanks phase complex chiefdom).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Georgia®</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organized communities (houses around plazas) characterize Late Mississippian.</td>
<td>Centers rarely occupied for more than 100-150 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Chiefdoms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earth-embanked structures (council houses?) replaced by platform mound/plaza complex in Early Mississippian.</td>
<td>Council house replaces platform mound following chiefdom collapse (data from Irene).</td>
<td>Rise and fall of complex chiefdoms evident over the course of the Mississippian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia/South Carolina®</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council houses present in villages in both simple and complex chiefdoms (data from Rucker's Bottom).</td>
<td>Major occupational shifts sometimes signaled by pronounced mound construction activity (i.e., placement of rock or shell coverings).</td>
<td>Much of basin abandoned after ca. A.D. 1450.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson/Apalachee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council houses evident in both historic and late prehistoric period.</td>
<td>Simple chiefdoms in Early Mississippian, replaced by complex chiefdoms ca. A.D. 1200.</td>
<td>Main polity in place for ca. 300 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Florida®</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No precursor Late Woodland groups; polity derived from Chattahoochee River area?</td>
<td>Centers shifted location and some were abandoned in Lake Jackson Velda phase transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic 16th polity very complex in 1540, may have declined appreciably by 1566-1568 (De Soto, Pardo expeditions).</td>
<td>Contraction of polity in 15th and 16th centuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacuum fortified center throughout period of occupation used for ceremony and protection?</td>
<td>Tributary/threat zone immense in A.D. 1540 (&gt;300 km).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippian organization disappears after ca. A.D. 1400.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5 Steponaitis 1991
6 Blitz 1993; Steponaitis 1991:208–209
7 Pembele 1986, 1987a,b; Powell 1988; Scarry 1986; Steponaitis 1991; Welch 1990a, 1996
8 Hally and Rudolph 1986; Hallyet al. 1990; King 1991; Smith 1987
9 Anderson 1994b; Anderson et al. 1986; Anderson et al. 1995
10 Scarry1990a,b;1996; Chapter 5
11 DePratter 1991; Hudson 1990
12 Coe 1995
American Bottom (including Cahokia and FAI 270 Project area)  
House size increases over time, size increase dramatic in later Mississippian (data from Range).  
Village size increases over course of Emergent Mississippian (data from Range).  
Villages replaced by centerl hamlet dichotomy in Lohmann phase.  
Populations increasing through Early Mississippian, followed by (apparent) gradual decline; area largely depopulated after Sand Prairie Phase.  
Largest population levels in Eastern Woodlands at peak?  
Area largely depopulated after ca. A.D. 1350–1400.

Zebree/Parkin/ Nodena NE Arkansas/SE Missouri  
Villages/hamlets centers in Early and Middle Mississippian.  
Village size increases over the course of the Mississippian from ca. 150 to several hundred or more.  
Nucleated towns replace dispersed villages/hamlets in Late Mississippian.  
Polity population ca. 4,000?

Kincaid Southern Illinois  
Hamlets of from 1-3 houses each widespread.  
Groups of 8-45 houses comprise small hamlets or villages.  
No villages.  
Population at local center (Lubbub Creek) very low (Summerville I: 5-30 people) (Summerville II/III: 25-90 people) (Summerville IV: 10–35 people).  
Depopulation of areas to north and northeast with emergence of Moundville complex chieftdom.  
Moundville resident population declines markedly after Moundville I (based on sheet midden debris).  
Moundville burial population increases markedly after Moundville I.  
Individual chiefdoms composed of 4-7 towns in Coosa paramounty.  
Individual chiefdoms of the Coosa paramounty occupied by up to ca. 5,000 people.

Angel/Caborn- Welborn Southwest Indiana  
Hamlets, small villages (1 ha) in Late Woodland.  
Center, large and small villages in Angel phase replaced by discrete villages in Caborn-Welborn phase.  
Angel center ca. 1,000 people; large village ca. 350 people; small 25-75 people; hamlets 10-15 people.  
Caborn-Welborn phase large and small villages replace Angel phase central town/dispersed settlement system.  
Small numbers of people lived near mound centers.

Pocahontas Region Mississippi  
Most population lives in small hamlets 0.1 to 0.8 ha in extent.  
No villages.  
Population at local center (Lubbub Creek) very low (Summerville I: 5-30 people) (Summerville II/III: 25-90 people) (Summerville IV: 10–35 people).  
Depopulation of areas to north and northeast with emergence of Moundville complex chieftdom.  
Moundville resident population declines markedly after Moundville I (based on sheet midden debris).  
Moundville burial population increases markedly after Moundville I.  
Individual chiefdoms composed of 4-7 towns in Coosa paramounty.  
Individual chiefdoms of the Coosa paramounty occupied by up to ca. 5,000 people.

Upper Tombigbee Chiefdoms Northeast Mississippi  
Movement between farmstead/local centers fluid.  
Farmsteads evince lesser degree of site permanence than local centers.  
No villages.  
Population at local center (Lubbub Creek) very low (Summerville I: 5-30 people) (Summerville II/III: 25-90 people) (Summerville IV: 10–35 people).  
Depopulation of areas to north and northeast with emergence of Moundville complex chieftdom.  
Moundville resident population declines markedly after Moundville I (based on sheet midden debris).  
Moundville burial population increases markedly after Moundville I.  
Individual chiefdoms composed of 4-7 towns in Coosa paramounty.  
Individual chiefdoms of the Coosa paramounty occupied by up to ca. 5,000 people.

Moundville Western Alabama  
Dispersed households become widespread and replace small nucleated villages with Mississippian emergence.  
Nucleated villages reappear in late Moundville III, as Moundville center declines.  
Moundville resident population declines markedly after Moundville I (based on sheet midden debris).  
Moundville burial population increases markedly after Moundville I.  
Individual chiefdoms composed of 4-7 towns in Coosa paramounty.  
Individual chiefdoms of the Coosa paramounty occupied by up to ca. 5,000 people.

Etowah/Coosa Northwest Georgia  
Most towns had between 200–300 people present.  
Individual chiefdoms composed of ca. seven simple1 complex chiefdoms.  
Minor centers ca. 1-2 ha in extent; major centers ca. 2-5 ha in extent.  
Growth in number of sites and centers from Early to Middle Mississippian in drainage; marked decline thereafter.

Savannah River Chiefdoms Georgia/South Carolina  
Hamlets throughout drainage during Early/Middle Mississippian era.  
Villages ca. 1 ha, 120–150 people (data from Rucker's Bottom).  
Village size increased ca. 25% over course of Middle Mississippian (data from Rucker's Bottom).  
Minor centers ca. 1-2 ha in extent; major centers ca. 2-5 ha in extent.  
Growth in number of sites and centers from Early to Middle Mississippian in drainage; marked decline thereafter.

Lake Jackson1 Apalachee Northern Florida  
Numerous scattered settlements tied to major town/ceremonial centrals.  
Total polity population estimated at between ca. 10,000 and 30,000.  
Gradual population increase over time.

---

Table 15.2. Evidence for Population Trends at Different Spatial Scales in the Late Prehistoric Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture Area</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Chiefly Polity</th>
<th>Interpolity Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Bottom</td>
<td>(including Cahokia and FAI 270 Project area)</td>
<td>House size increases over time, size increase dramatic in later Mississippian (data from Range).</td>
<td>Village size increases over course of Emergent Mississippian (data from Range).</td>
<td>Populations increasing through Early Mississippian, followed by (apparent) gradual decline; area largely depopulated after Sand Prairie Phase.</td>
<td>Largest population levels in Eastern Woodlands at peak? Area largely depopulated after ca. A.D. 1350–1400.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebree/Parkin/ Nodena</td>
<td>NE Arkansas/SE Missouri</td>
<td>Villages/hamlets centers in Early and Middle Mississippian.</td>
<td>Village size increases over the course of the Mississippian from ca. 150 to several hundred or more.</td>
<td>Nucleated towns replace dispersed villages/hamlets in Late Mississippian.</td>
<td>Dramatic abandonment of SE Missouri and much of NE Arkansas's western lowlands after ca. A.D. 1450.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid Southern Illinois</td>
<td>Hamlets of from 1-3 houses each widespread.</td>
<td>Groups of 8-45 houses comprise small hamlets or villages.</td>
<td>No villages.</td>
<td>Population at local center (Lubbub Creek) very low (Summerville I: 5-30 people) (Summerville II/III: 25-90 people) (Summerville IV: 10–35 people).</td>
<td>Depopulation of areas to north and northeast with emergence of Moundville complex chieftdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel/Caborn-Welborn</td>
<td>Hamlets, small villages (1 ha) in Late Woodland.</td>
<td>Center, large and small villages in Angel phase replaced by discrete villages in Caborn-Welborn phase.</td>
<td>Angel center ca. 1,000 people; large village ca. 350 people; small 25-75 people; hamlets 10-15 people.</td>
<td>Caborn-Welborn phase large and small villages replace Angel phase central town/dispersed settlement system.</td>
<td>Small numbers of people lived near mound centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocahontas Region Mississippi</td>
<td>Most population lives in small hamlets 0.1 to 0.8 ha in extent.</td>
<td>No villages.</td>
<td>No villages.</td>
<td>Population at local center (Lubbub Creek) very low (Summerville I: 5-30 people) (Summerville II/III: 25-90 people) (Summerville IV: 10–35 people).</td>
<td>Depopulation of areas to north and northeast with emergence of Moundville complex chieftdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tombigbee Chiefdoms</td>
<td>Movement between farmstead/local centers fluid.</td>
<td>Farmsteads evince lesser degree of site permanence than local centers.</td>
<td>No villages.</td>
<td>Population at local center (Lubbub Creek) very low (Summerville I: 5-30 people) (Summerville II/III: 25-90 people) (Summerville IV: 10–35 people).</td>
<td>Depopulation of areas to north and northeast with emergence of Moundville complex chieftdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville Western Alabama</td>
<td>Dispersed households become widespread and replace small nucleated villages with Mississippian emergence.</td>
<td>Nucleated villages reappear in late Moundville III, as Moundville center declines.</td>
<td>Moundville resident population declines markedly after Moundville I (based on sheet midden debris).</td>
<td>Moundville burial population increases markedly after Moundville I.</td>
<td>Individual chiefdoms composed of 4-7 towns in Coosa paramounty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etowah/Coosa Northwest Georgia</td>
<td>Most towns had between 200–300 people present.</td>
<td>Minor centers ca. 1-2 ha in extent; major centers ca. 2-5 ha in extent.</td>
<td>Individual chiefdoms composed of ca. seven simple1 complex chiefdoms.</td>
<td>Individual chiefdoms of the Coosa paramounty occupied by up to ca. 5,000 people.</td>
<td>Growth in number of sites and centers from Early to Middle Mississippian in drainage; marked decline thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Chiefdoms Georgia/South Carolina</td>
<td>Hamlets throughout drainage during Early/Middle Mississippian era.</td>
<td>Villages ca. 1 ha, 120–150 people (data from Rucker's Bottom).</td>
<td>Minor centers ca. 1-2 ha in extent; major centers ca. 2-5 ha in extent.</td>
<td>Minor centers ca. 1-2 ha in extent; major centers ca. 2-5 ha in extent.</td>
<td>Growth in number of sites and centers from Early to Middle Mississippian in drainage; marked decline thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson1 Apalachee Northern Florida</td>
<td>Numerous scattered settlements tied to major town/ceremonial centrals.</td>
<td>Total polity population estimated at between ca. 10,000 and 30,000.</td>
<td>Gradual population increase over time.</td>
<td>Gradual population increase over time.</td>
<td>Gradual population increase over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Culture Areal Localities</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Chiefly Polity</td>
<td>Interpolity Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofitachequi</td>
<td>Poor data, dispersed farmsteads suggested in some periods.</td>
<td>Poor data; small (1-2 ha) villages observed near major centers.</td>
<td>Large central towns (up to 20 ha).</td>
<td>Population contraction during Late Mississippian, abandonment of outlying centers and areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central South Carolina&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small (1-2 ha) villages away from local center.</td>
<td>Small local center (ca 2 ha).</td>
<td>Chiefdom area abandoned after Middle Mississippian.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central North Carolina&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>10</sup>See notes for Table 15.1
Table 15.3. Evidence for Agricultural Intensification at Different Spatial Scales in the Late Prehistoric Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture Areal Locality</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Chiefly Polity</th>
<th>Interpolity Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Bottom (including Cahokia and FAI 270 Project area)</td>
<td>Increasing use of starchy seeds in Late Woodland.</td>
<td>Maize use increases markedly after ca. A.D. 750.</td>
<td>Intensified maize production paces Mississippian Emergence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebree/Parkin/ Nodena NE Arkansas/SE Missouri</td>
<td>Increased species diversity evident in Emergent Mississippian sites.</td>
<td>Corn evident in Emergent Mississippian but not a major dietary constituent until Middle Mississippian times (trace element data).</td>
<td>Population skeletal health better in Emergent Mississippian populations than in later times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid Southern Illinois</td>
<td>Hamlets occupied much of the year with evidence for highly diversified resource exploitation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel/Caborn- Welborn Southwest Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocahontas Region Mississippi</td>
<td>Maize intensification begins in Late Woodland (Miller III), becomes marked in Early Mississippian (Summerville I).</td>
<td>No villages.</td>
<td>Late Woodland populations evince greater dietary stress than Early Mississippian populations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tombigbee Chiefdoms Northeast Mississippi</td>
<td>Maize use declines, nut use increases Late Mississippian (Summerville IV). Late Woodland food resources diversified, procurement becomes more focused in Early Mississippian.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Population skeletal health good over all Mississippian phases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville Western Alabama</td>
<td>Maize common at hamlets. Faunal data from Moundville and farmsteads (deer element distributions) indicate provisioning of elites at centers. Trace element evidence suggests elites may have eaten more meat than commoners.</td>
<td>Population skeletal health good over all Mississippian phases (over both elites and commoners). Considerable dietary stress indicated following collapse of Moundville polity (Alabama River Phase).</td>
<td>Population skeletal health good over all Mississippian phases (over both elites and commoners).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etowah/Coosa Northwest Georgia</td>
<td>Maize intensification appears with Mississippian. Maize is not present in any quantity in the Late Woodland. Increasingly focused procurement of game over course of Mississippian (data from Rucker's Bottom). Maize use declines at Irene with organizational decentralization. Commoner population skeletal health improves with emergence of complex chiefdom (data from Rucker's Bottom).</td>
<td>Spring rainfall variation apparently linked to crop yields/political stability of local societies. Evidence for forest clearing indicated through pollen, wood charcoal diversity data (data from Beaverdam Creek).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Chiefdoms Georgia/South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Culture Areal Locality</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Chiefly Polity</td>
<td>Interpolity Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize use paces Mississippian emergence, declines w/ collapse (data from Irene).</td>
<td>Commoner population skeletal health poor compared with elites at nearby center (data from Rucker’s Bottom, Beaverdam Creek).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize use appears in Late Woodland, but does not become important until Early Mississippian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize common in Middle and Late Mississippian contexts at major center (data from Mulberry).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize evident at most site types.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lake Jackson Apalachee
Northern Florida
Cofitachequi
Central South Carolina

Town Creek
Central North Carolina

1-12 See notes for Table 15.1
Table 15.4. Evidence for Prestige Goods Exchange at Different Spatial Scales in the Late Prehistoric Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture Areal Locality</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Chiefly Polity</th>
<th>Interpolity Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Bottom (including Cahokia and FAI 270 Project area)</td>
<td>Extralocal pottery and other materials found at large and small sites through later Mississippian periods.</td>
<td>Elite burials characterized by elaborate grave goods, many of extralocal raw materials.</td>
<td>Extensive shell bead blanket found on elite burial at Zebree.</td>
<td>Ramey Incised pottery found in low incidence over a large area. Greatest interaction in Emergent Mississippian and Stirling phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebree/Parkin/ Nodena</td>
<td>No villages.</td>
<td>Prestige goods used as insignia of rank (i.e., copper).</td>
<td>Rise of Moundville to east appears to have constrained prestige goods exchange.</td>
<td>Rise of Moundville to east appears to have constrained prestige goods exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Arkansas/SE Missouri</td>
<td>Shell beads are mostly of local shell in Late Woodland, majority are of marine shell in Early Mississippian</td>
<td>Prestige goods treated as wealth items in Early Mississippian, do not appear restricted to superordinate segment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid Southern Illinois</td>
<td>Finewares (and rarely, extralocal wares) occur at both hamlets and local center.</td>
<td>Prestige goods incidence in burials declines after Early Mississippian at both farmsteads and local center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel/Caborn- Welborn Southwest Indiana</td>
<td>Shell beads are mostly of local shell in Late Woodland, majority are of marine shell in Early Mississippian</td>
<td>Prestige goods use appears restricted exclusively to centers.</td>
<td>Nonlocal pottery minimal from east, suggesting major cultural boundary; nonlocal pottery more common from areas to west and lower Midwest.</td>
<td>Rise of Moundville to east appears to have constrained prestige goods exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocahontas Region Mississippi</td>
<td>Shell beads are mostly of local shell in Late Woodland, majority are of marine shell in Early Mississippian</td>
<td>Extralocal shell and greenstone use increases just prior to emergence of single mound sites; prestige goods are found at these sites during the Early Mississippian.</td>
<td>Prestige goods incidence in burials increases during Early Mississippian; peaks at Moundville I/II transition; declines during Moundville III/IV; gone by Moundville IV.</td>
<td>Rise of Moundville tied to reduction in prestige goods exchange in smaller surrounding chiefdoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tombigbee Chieftoms Northeast Mississippi</td>
<td>Extralocal pottery incidence declines after Moundville I.</td>
<td>Elaborate prestige goods serve as insignia of rank (i.e., copper).</td>
<td>Moundville pottery nonexistent, suggesting major cultural boundary.</td>
<td>Moundville pottery nonexistent, suggesting major cultural boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etowah/Coosa Northwest Georgia</td>
<td>Shell beads, copper artifacts found with elites at centers; shell beads, more mundane items found with commoner burials at villages and hamlets.</td>
<td>Elaborate prestige goods serve as insignia of rank (i.e., copper).</td>
<td>Etowah ceramics earliest Mississippian evidence at many sites over South Appalachian area.</td>
<td>Etowah ceramics earliest Mississippian evidence at many sites over South Appalachian area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Chieftoms Georgia/South Carolina</td>
<td>Shell beads, copper artifacts found with elites at centers; shell beads, more mundane items found with commoner burials at villages and hamlets.</td>
<td>Additional mound stages constructed at several centers following a marked decline in prestige goods incidence in burials (data from Hollywood, Chauga, Beaverdam Creek).</td>
<td>Pottery from western Southeast found with Hollywood burials.</td>
<td>Pottery from western Southeast found with Hollywood burials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson</td>
<td>Shell beads, copper artifacts found with elites at centers; shell beads, more mundane items found with commoner burials at villages and hamlets.</td>
<td>Increasing number and diversity of extralocal goods in burials evident at Lake Jackson</td>
<td>Interregional trade in prestige goods prominent ca. A.D. 1100-1200, trade disrupted ca. A.D. 1400.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15.4. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture Area/ Locality</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Chiefly Polity</th>
<th>Interpolity Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cofitachequi Central South Carolina 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Middle Mississippian, suggesting increasing elite power.</td>
<td>Elaborate carved mica artifacts found at major center (data from Mulberry).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Creek Central North Carolina 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-2See notes for Table 15.1
Table 15.5. Evidence for Craft Specialization at Different Spatial Scales in the Late Prehistoric Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture Areal Locality</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Chiefly Polity</th>
<th>Interpolity Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Bottom (including Cahokia and FAI 270 Project area)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Part-time household production of specialized craft goods indicated, including use of extralocal materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguous evidence for specialized production at centers.</td>
<td>Major regional center/node for prestige goods exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebree/Parkin/ Nodena NE Arkansas/SE Missouri&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bead manufacture restricted to areas within communities (data from Zebree).</td>
<td>Communities might produce specialized products (i.e., salt collection).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid Southern Illinois&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel/Caborn-Welborn Southwest Indiana&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocahontas Region Mississippi&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tombigbee Chiefdoms Northeast Mississippi&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Household production of chunky stones indicated.</td>
<td>No villages.</td>
<td>Fineware, greenstone, and shell bead manufacture appears restricted to local center.</td>
<td>Major regional center/node for prestige goods exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville Western Alabama&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Household manufacture of shell beads widespread in Late Woodland (as suggested by microdrill occurrence).</td>
<td>Extralocal goods processed at centers (greenstone, copper, mica, and graphite).</td>
<td>Engraved vessels may be made solely at major center; most specialized production restricted to major center in Moundville II/III phases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etowah/Coosa Northwest Georgia&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citico gorget co-extensive with Coosa; may indicate extent of marriage/alliance network.</td>
<td>Manufacture of copper prestige goods at major center indicated.</td>
<td>Major regional center/node in prestige goods exchange network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Chiefdoms Georgia/South Carolina&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No evidence for craft specialization.</td>
<td>No evidence for craft specialization (local manufacture of pottery, stone tools indicated).</td>
<td>Production of carved soapstone pipes appears restricted to local center (data from Beavard Creek).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson/ Apalachee Northern Florida&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence for standardized production of shell beads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofitachequi Central South Carolina&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence for mica processing found to be highly restricted in central community (data from Mulberry).</td>
<td>Major regional center/node in prestige goods exchange network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Creek Central North Carolina&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>-<sup>12</sup>See notes for Table 15.1
Table 15.6. Evidence for Warfare at Different Spatial Scales in the Late Prehistoric Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture Areal Locality</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Chiefly Polity</th>
<th>Interpolity Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Bottom (including Cahokia and FAI 270 Project area)</td>
<td>Cahokia center proper fortified throughout much of its existence.</td>
<td>Extent of Cahokia domination over surrounding macroregion uncertain; likely cast a long &quot;threat&quot; shadow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebree/Parkin/ Nodena NE Arkansas/SE Missouri</td>
<td>Fortifications around earliest Mississippian community; suggestion that replacement of Late Woodland populations organizations occurred (data from Zebree).</td>
<td>Fortifications (ditch and stockade lines) around major Late Mississippian communities.</td>
<td>Intensive competition between centers documented ethnohistorically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid Southern Illinois</td>
<td>Storage in underground pits in Early Mississippian (concealed?).</td>
<td>Main site palisaded.</td>
<td>Indication that household populations converge on main center during periods of conflict (large area at center defended, more than the small resident population would need).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel/Caborn- Welborn Southwest Indiana</td>
<td>Angel site palisaded; no clear evidence for fortification in Caborn-Welborn?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outlying populations converge on center during periods of conflict?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocahontas Region Mississippi</td>
<td>Local center had a bastioned palisade in Summerville I, this disappeared in the Summerville II/III, fortifications reappear in Summerville IV.</td>
<td>Miller III (Late Woodland) storage in concealed pits; Summerville I (Early Mississippian) storage in above-ground corn cribs.</td>
<td>Outlying populations converge on center during periods of conflict?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tombigbee Chiefdoms Northeast Mississippi</td>
<td>Late Woodland burials exhibit high incidence of trauma (parry fractures, embedded points); much lower in Early Mississippian.</td>
<td>Elite burials exhibit less evidence for trauma (injury) than nonelites at Moundville.</td>
<td>Moundville appears to have dominated polities (i.e., had a large threat zone) over an appreciable area; suppression of nearby societies indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville Western Alabama</td>
<td>Moundville extensively fortified from Moundville I through III phases.</td>
<td>Nucleated villages reappear in late Moundville III, possibly for defense.</td>
<td>Rivalry with Alabama chiefdoms documented ethnohistorically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etowah/Coosa Northwest Georgia</td>
<td>Fortifications around 16th century towns (data from King Site).</td>
<td>Etowah center massively fortified with ditch and bastioned stockade.</td>
<td>Abandonment of central, lower basin after A.D. 1450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Chiefdoms Georgia/South Carolina</td>
<td>Fortifications appear, become more elaborate at previously unfortified village prior to its abandonment (data from Rucker's Bottom).</td>
<td>Fortifications at local centers noted early, late in occupational histories (data from Irene, Chauga, Tugaloo).</td>
<td>(continues on overleaf)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture Areal Locality</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Chiefly Polity</th>
<th>Interpolity Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson/ Apalachee Northern Florida</td>
<td>Dispersed, unfortified hamlets.</td>
<td>Storage concealed in underground pits prior to site abandonment (data from Rucker's Bottom).</td>
<td>Evidence for increased incidence of trauma prior to abandonment of Irene.</td>
<td>Chiefdom was feared and respected over a wide area in the 16th century, as documented ethnohistorically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofitachequi Central South Carolina</td>
<td>Suggestion for fortifications around local villages (data from Ferry Landing).</td>
<td>Violent factional competition between members of the nobility documented ethnohistorically.</td>
<td>Major centers were unfortified.</td>
<td>Rivalry with chiefdoms in central Georgia (Ocute) documented ethnohistorically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Creek Central North Carolina</td>
<td>Fortifications around outlying villages.</td>
<td>Fortification ditch at major center (data from Mulberry).</td>
<td>Fortifications around local center.</td>
<td>Furthest expansion of Mississippian to the north along the Atlantic Slope.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-12See notes for Table 15.1
Table 15.7. The Emergence and Collapse of Mississippian Chiefdom Organizational Forms in the Late Prehistoric Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Culture</th>
<th>Date of Initial Chiefdom Appearance</th>
<th>Date of Ultimate Collapse/Abandonment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cahokia (including FAI 270 project)</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 850–900 (American Bottom Area)</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1300 (Cahokia proper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebree/Parkin/Nodena NE Arkansas/SE Missouri</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 900–950 (Zebree)</td>
<td>Post Contact (16th century?) (Parkin/Nodena)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid Southern Illinois</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 900–1000</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel/Caborn-Welborn Southwest Indiana</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1950 (Angel)</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1700 (Caborn-Welborn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocahontas Region Mississippi</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1000</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1500?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tombigbee Chiefdoms Northeast Mississippi</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1000–1050</td>
<td>European Contact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville Western Alabama</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1000 (Black Warrior drainage)</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1500 (Moundville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etowah/Coosa Northwest Georgia</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1100–1150</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1350 (Etowah) ca. A.D. 1565–1600 (Coosa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Chiefdoms Georgia/South Carolina</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1100–1150</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1450 (central and lower basin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson/Apalachee Northern Florida</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1050–1100</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1450 (paramount center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofitachequi Central South Carolina</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1150–1200</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1600? (Cofitachequi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Creek Central North Carolina</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1150–1200</td>
<td>ca. A.D. 1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-12 See notes for Table 15.1
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