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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

1. Development Concept Plan / General Management Plan

If the Lamar Unit of Ocmulgee National Monument is to be protected, preserved, and interpreted, a Development Concept Plan must address the archeological survey and testing of areas to be impacted far enough in advance of planning to incorporate necessary survey findings into the final recommended alternatives for Lamar. Currently, interpretation of the Lamar Unit is not addressed in the park’s General Management Plan/Environmental Assessment (NPS 1982).

2. Recataloguing, Evaluation, and Synthesis of Archival Materials

The records held at the Southeast Archeological Center dealing with the WPA/CCC/ERA period excavations are mixed and separated over at least four Accessions. Their identification with individual principal investigators, project directors, and crew chiefs, has been problematical. In many cases they are not labeled and have been mixed inadvertently over the years. Therefore, they should be recatalogued according to project and principal investigator, and then reaccessioned.

The quality of individual archeological investigations from 1934 - 1940 should also be reevaluated according to data requirements for current NPS cultural resource management guidelines, standards, and studies. In this regard, the research orientation and objectives of each investigator must be respected, considering both the technology of the period and the level of inquiry. Questions of definitive provenience and summary analysis appear to be of greatest concern, and both the original catalog cards and the present cataloguing by FSU should be used to ameliorate these apparent difficulties.

Once the accession records have been straightened out and each investigation evaluated, a comparative synthesis of the work should be written which will give an overall interpretation of the work carried out at the Lamar Site from 1934 through 1940. This should be a definitive report consisting of three volumes on the individual investigations of James Ford, Gordon Willey, and Charles Fairbanks at Lamar.

3. Archeological Analysis and Report on the Lamar Collections

The archeological collections resulting from the work at Lamar have been in questionable condition for a number of years. There are records of materials on the original catalog cards, but many of these are vague. Subsequent to the 1973 analysis
by FSU, 32 type collections were distributed to various institutions (SEAC ACC. 181) and over 10,000 mostly plain sherd s were discarded (Penman 1990: personal communication). The present cataloguing, being carried out under cooperative agreement by FSU should provide a locational collections management database whereby the missing artifacts as well as the remainder of the Lamar collections can be tabulated, if not accounted for.

The 1973 analysis carried out by FSU was that of a quantitative sampling strategy which resulted in typological summaries. From the present 1990 - 1991 FSU cataloguing effort the status of the collections should be further evaluated by provenience, typology, temper, motif, etc. in order to provide an analytical database. This would provide necessary data to make summary as well as predictive statements concerning the Lamar Site before any new archeological work should be contemplated.

4. Recommendations for Archeological Research

Once a synthesis of the 1934 -1940 investigations has been made, and an analysis of the collections has resulted in a summary and predictive report, recommendations for new archeological testing and evaluation can then be made. These recommended investigations should center on questions which: 1) could not be answered by the data at hand, 2) will tend to verify or deny hypotheses generated from the above summary reports, 3) will incorporate modern technology and current methodological approaches, yet relate to the body of data already compiled, and 4) will reflect general research questions regarding "the Lamar Culture" across the Southeast.

5. Historic Structures Report

An Historic Structures Report is needed for the Lamar Mounds prior to any programmed development. Based on the WPA studies done by Ford, excavation of the northeast quarter of Mound A revealed a staged construction with an occupation layer part way up, as well as house evidence below the mound edge. Mound B, one of the only existent spiral mounds in the country, has had no archeological and/or historic architectural evaluation. "The Historic Structures Report would be the product of archeology rather than history or historic architecture. It should be done by the same individual who recatalogs and synthesizes the archival material [above]" (Brown 1990: personal communication).
6. Section 106 Compliance Archeology

Prior to any research archeology and/or interpretive development certain archeological compliance issues will need to be addressed. Access to the site will involve road improvement. Interpretation will involve restoration of the historic scene (clearing vegetation, e.g.), site stabilization, and visitor accommodations, and therefore, determination of impact. Since flooding continues to affect the site, if it is determined that the levee does not have to be rehabilitated, this will mean effects of periodic flooding will have to be evaluated as to their real and potential impacts. Further archeological clearance and testing may be indicated where necessary.
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INTRODUCTION

The Lamar site is a unit of Ocmulgee National Monument located near Macon, Georgia. The site itself was a palisaded mound center consisting of two mounds and a village. The area encompassed by the palisade is approximately 21.5 acres. Mound A, situated on the western side of the site is a truncated mound approximately 6.2 meters in height. Mound B, located almost directly east of Mound A, is a conical mound with a spiral ramp. Lamar was occupied from the Archaic to the Historic period with its major occupation being during Mississippian times. The site has not been developed for interpretation and today is overgrown with trees and privet.

Lamar has been the site of three major excavations conducted between 1934 and 1941. These investigations, begun before the site was in Federal ownership, were directed by men who were later to become influential forces in southeastern archeology: Arthur R. Kelly, James A. Ford, Gordon R. Willey, Jesse D. Jennings, and Charles H. Fairbanks. In addition, these investigations, and those conducted concurrently at other southeastern sites, were to become the basis for defining many cultural phases, periods and pottery type descriptions for the Central Georgia area and the southeast in general. The work done at Lamar also provided the baseline information for what is now called the "Lamar" culture, which eventually made its way into many descriptions of southeastern Mississippian cultural phases (see also Prehistoric Overview, this volume). Clearly this is an important site in southeastern prehistory.

Despite its importance, very little definitive information is known from the Lamar site. Most of the investigations conducted at the site were done as part of the WPA, CCC and CWA relief efforts. As with many of the archeological projects done during that time, few site reports have ever been written about the work that was done. As a result we are left with only the notes and collections to guide the interpretation of the site.

The archival documentary collections from the Lamar investigations are now over fifty years old and they have not aged well. This overview represents the results of over a year's efforts in trying to untangle the archival collections. It is by no means a definitive statement on the archeology of the Lamar site, but rather an introduction to the work carried out. In going through the collections many discrepancies and errors were uncovered; some were resolved, some remain. Many sources of information were used, but four stand out: the fieldnotes from the three projects, two Key Maps of the Lamar site, the 1973 report on the Lamar collections by Hale Smith, and Mark Williams' transcription of the Lamar Symposium held at Florida State University in 1973. The maps of the three excavations in this report were digitized from the 1941 Key Map of Lamar drawn by L.K. Sessions. They are not exact reproductions however, as we determined that the Key Map was inaccurate as to the orientation of Ford's and Willey's units. They should not be considered to be the final
statement as to the location of the units but rather as the best estimate to date on
the general layout of Ford's, Willey's and Fairbanks' excavations.

The artifacts from Lamar are currently being recataloged by the Anthropology
Department of Florida State University. It is conceivable that upon completion of
this project, an archeological synthesis of the Lamar site can be written based on
what has already been dug up at Lamar. However, due to the poor condition of the
collections it is all but certain that more work will have to be conducted at Lamar in
order to adequately interpret the site within the current understanding of
southeastern prehistory.
Photograph 1: Vertical Aerial View of the Lamar Unit, 1939, North to top
Photograph 2: Mound A, 1934, Taken from Mound B, View West
Photograph 3: Mound B, 1934, View East
EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENT

PHYSIOGRAPHY (Figure 1)

The Lamar site is located just below the Fall Line near Macon, Georgia. The Fall Line marks the intersection of the Piedmont to the north and the Coastal Plain to the south. The site lies within the floodplain of the Ocmulgee River which is a quarter of a mile west of the site. To the east of the site is Black Lake, an abandoned channel of the Ocmulgee (and part of the bed of a stream which was rerouted when the 1840s railroad was constructed).

The site is approximately 45 acres in area and sits atop an erosional remnant of red Eocene clay. This dome-like remnant has been found to intersect the property line on the north, south, and east sides. It has been suggested that as recently as 1800, the Lamar “island” would have been discernable in the midst of the river swamp (Jennings 1939:55).

Today, the area around the site is still generally low and sometimes swampy. The entire site (with the exception of the mounds) is covered with 8 to 24 inches of alluvial silt. The ages of the silt deposits are not certain. Current theory proposes that the siltation began with agricultural land clearing practices around 1840 (White 1849; Schmitt 1943).

CLIMATE

Macon falls into the warm temperate, subtropical climate zone. It is characterized by year-round humidity and hot summers. The average annual precipitation for Macon is 51.6 inches with most of the rain falling between the months of March and July. The average annual temperature is 62 degrees Fahrenheit. In January the average daily high temperature is 60 degrees and the low is 35 degrees. In July, highs reach well over 90 degrees with average daily highs in the 90s. At night, lows average in the 70s.

SOILS AND GEOLOGY

The Soil Conservation Service classifies the entire area of the site as belonging to the Chewacla soil association. Chewacla soils are described as being nearly level, somewhat poorly drained soils formed in loamy alluvium. These soils are strongly to moderately acidic and are suited to hardwood growth (USDA 1979:36). Soil descriptions from archeological work done by Willey describe a typical profile as 12
Figure 1: Physiographic Provinces of Georgia (from Hally and Rudolph 1986:3)
inches of alluvium over a layer of light brown and yellow sand, next is a layer of light gray sand, which is followed by a layer of gray clay, underneath which is a light brown clay (Willey SEAC Acc 125 Vol 4). In 1988, Beth Horvath of the Southeast Archeological Center, dug a number of shovel tests around both mounds in preparation for fences being placed around the mounds. Since the depth of the fence posts were going to be about 24 inches, the shovel tests were dug to 60 cm (approximately 24 inches). The stratigraphy recorded for a shovel test on the west side of Mound B was 30 cm of yellow brown loamy clay (alluvium) followed by 20 cm of brown clayey sand, and at the bottom of the test was a yellowish red clay. A shovel test on the southeast side of Mound A had 22 cm of alluvium, followed by 28 cm of midden deposits in a brown and yellow soil, under which was a dark brown sandy clay (Horvath 1989).

FLORA AND FAUNA

The vegetation at the site is presently very thick. There are trees growing on and around the mounds and portions of the site are thickly overgrown with vines and briars. Tree species consist of pine species with some hardwoods such as oak, sycamore, yellow poplar and green ash. The site was plowed in the early twentieth century and was mowed during the WPA work in the late 1930s and early 1940s. During World War II, the site was allowed to become overgrown and it was not mowed again until the 1960s. In 1964, the levee and much of the site was cleared, although the mounds may have been left covered (Fischer 1990: personal communication). Following this period the site was left to become overgrown again and it has not been cleared since, other than some parts of the levee, some trails, and the fence area around the mounds.

A variety of faunal species would have been available to the prehistoric inhabitants of the Lamar site. Most abundant were small mammals such as raccoon, otter, opposum, rabbit, beaver and gray fox (USDI 1982:13). Large mammals such as white tailed deer and black bear were almost certainly available during prehistoric times although they may not be as prevalent in the area today. The river would have provided a variety of fish and other aquatic resources such as bass, shad, catfish, gar, bream and shellfish. Birds such as turkey and duck would also have been available. Today, large mammals are rare and Fish and Wildlife lists two endangered species which may be found in the park; the red-cockaded woodpecker and the American Alligator, although the alligator is no longer considered an endangered species.
PREHISTORIC OVERVIEW

There is evidence that human occupation of the Lamar site spans almost every defined time period from PaleoIndian to the present (Figure 2). During much of the earlier period, however, the site was probably occupied by only a few people or used as only a camp site for short term occupation. The largest occupation by far is the Lamar occupation during the Late Mississippian Period and dates approximately from 1100 A.D to about 1600 A.D. (Williams 1990:63-64). Because the Fall Line appears to act as some kind of cultural boundary line, or more likely an overlap zone, the culture history of Central Georgia is not as straightforward as in many other areas. In addition to the regional problem, the sparsity of reported research from the Lamar site itself makes it difficult to place the site into chronologies that were developed using data from nearby areas (Williams 1990:63). This points to the need for a chronological history for Lamar proper to compare with those developed for these nearby areas. The purpose of the following discussion of the culture history of the Lamar site should be viewed as a synthesis based on present knowledge in the area of the Lamar unit, and not as an overall culture history of the Lamar Culture. As further information becomes available, the culture history will, no doubt, require some revisions.

THE PALEOINDIAN PERIOD

The peopling of the New World is believed to have occurred sometime around 20,000 years ago, although the Early Paleoindian in the lower Southeast is believed to date from ca. 11,500 - 11,000 B.P. (before present) (Anderson et al. 1990:6). At this time, sea levels were much lower than they are today due to the incredible amount of water locked in ice in the polar regions. Because of the low sea levels, the land bridge connecting Asia to North America was dry allowing hunting populations to follow the large herds of mega-fauna across the land bridge into North America. The people who came to North America from Asia belong to the Paleoindian cultural period. The Paleoindian period in Georgia has not been well understood due to the paucity of stratified sites with PaleoIndian components. However, the recent study by Anderson, Ledbetter, and O'Steen (1990) has made a most significant contribution to the understanding of the Paleoindian Period in Georgia.

Almost the only remains of PaleoIndian peoples recovered to date are stone tools, used mostly for meat processing. It is assumed that PaleoIndian peoples hunted megafauna such as mammoth, mastodon, horse, and sloth. While this assumption is almost certainly correct, no PaleoIndian points have ever been found in conclusive association with megafaunal remains in the Southeast. Typical tool kits consisted of points, knives, burins, and end and side scrapers. While most stone tools remained unchanged for thousands of years, the projectile points change through time.
## CHRONOLOGY OF THE CULTURAL SEQUENCE FOR THE MACON AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Horizon</th>
<th>Estimated Dates</th>
<th>Cultural Complexes</th>
<th>Developments on Monument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>A.D. 1821 - A.D. 1933</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunlap Farm, Railroads, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>A.D. 1716 - A.D. 1819</td>
<td>Ocmulgee Fields</td>
<td>Seasonal Creek Occupation During Shad Runs, Creek Trading House (1806-09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>A.D. 1690 - A.D. 1715</td>
<td>Ocmulgee Fields</td>
<td>Ocmulgee Town, British Colonial Trading Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>A.D. 1250 - A.D. 1650</td>
<td>Lamar</td>
<td>Lamar occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>A.D. 1100 - A.D. 1250</td>
<td>Macon Plateau- Etowah-Lamar</td>
<td>Lamar occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>A.D. 900 - A.D. 1250</td>
<td>Macon Plateau- Etowah-Weeden Island</td>
<td>Macon Plateau mounds (Corn agriculture added to economy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>A.D. 400 - A.D. 1000</td>
<td>Weeden Island-Swift Creek-Napier-Mossy Oak</td>
<td>Limited agriculture but prime dependence on hunting-gather economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>200 B.C. - A.D. 200</td>
<td>Swift Creek, Mossy Oak</td>
<td>Hunting-Gathering Economy- Incipient agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>900 B.C. - 200 B.C.</td>
<td>Dunlap-Deptford</td>
<td>Hunting-Gathering Economy- Incipient agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>3000 B.C. - 700 B.C.</td>
<td>Stallings Island, Savannah River</td>
<td>Incipient agriculture (Introduction of pottery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5000 B.C. - 3000 B.C.</td>
<td>Morrow Mountain, Stanley</td>
<td>Incipient agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>8000 B.C. - 5000 B.C.</td>
<td>Kirk, Big Sandy, Dalton</td>
<td>Hunting-Gathering (Hunting included now extinct big game animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleo-Indian</td>
<td>10,000 B.C. - 8000 B.C.</td>
<td>Clovis</td>
<td>Hunting-Gathering (Hunting included now extinct big game animals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Central Georgia Chronology.
Paleoindian points are lanceolate in form. They are generally long and narrow and have concave rather than stemmed bases (Willey and Phillips, 1958:112). Paleoindian-type points have been recovered from the Lamar site (Smith, 1973: 130; Hale 1990: personal communication; Flowers 1991: personal communication). Elsewhere within the Monument, a broken Paleoindian point was recovered from the excavations on the Macon Plateau (Walker 1971:12; Flowers 1991: personal communication), and an intact point was recovered on the surface at the Gledhill No. 2 site (Walker 1971:12). Other excavations within the Monument at Ocmulgee Bottoms (9Bi23) recovered two Dalton points (considered to be transitional Paleoindian-Archaic) "although unfortunately they came from units largely devoid of material and were omitted from the seriation [Nelson et al. 1974:15]" (Anderson et al. 1990:26).

THE ARCHAIC PERIOD

Sometime around 10,000 years ago (8,000 B.C), the form of projectile points changed from the earlier lanceolate form to stemmed and notched point forms. This change in point technology is used as a marker for the beginning of the Archaic period. The Archaic cultural sequence for Georgia has been defined by using data from stratified sites in Alabama, North Carolina and West Virginia by DePratter (1975:2) who dates the Early Archaic from 8,000 B.C. to 5,500 B.C. Early Archaic point types include Kirk, Big Sandy, LeCroy, and St. Albans. These points were found in association with drills, scrapers, and hearths. Other than the change in points, there is little change in the basic tool kit found during the Paleoindian period. This seems to indicate that there was little change in the basic subsistence pattern of hunting (DePratter 1975:4). Point types dating to the Early Archaic which have been recovered from the Lamar site include, Big Sandy, Kirk, and Searcy (Smith 1973: Appendix E; Hale 1990: personal communication).

Following the Early Archaic is the Middle Archaic period. DePratter (1975:4) dates the Middle Archaic from 5,500 B.C. to 3,000 B.C. During this period, ground stone artifacts are added to the material culture. Ground stone artifacts are typically bowls, pipes, axes, adzes, plummetts, gorgets, and atlatl weights. Middle Archaic point types include Stanly, Morrow Mountain and Guilford (DePratter 1975).

The Late Archaic period (3,000 B.C. to approximately 600 B.C.) is divided into two phases based on the presence or absence of ceramics. The pre-ceramic phase in Georgia is called Savannah River and is marked by Benton, Savannah River, Elora, and Appalachian point types. The ceramic phase of the Late Archaic is signalled by the addition of fiber-tempered pottery to the material assemblage. Most fiber-tempered pottery found in central Georgia belongs to the Stallings Island type. Fiber-tempered pottery occurs as early as 2500 B.C. at some sites along the coast in
Georgia (DePratter 1975), although in Central Georgia (and therefore, Lamar) the dates for the appearance of fiber-tempered pottery are probably closer to 2000 B.C. (Walker 1972:chart; Figure 3A).

THE WOODLAND PERIOD

While the material expression of the PaleoIndian and Archaic periods are fairly consistent throughout the state of Georgia, there appears to be an environmental bias during the Woodland period. During the Woodland period, the Fall Line seems to act as a cultural boundary line, or interactive zone, between north and south Georgia (Garrow 1973:17), although Woodland Swift Creek is found in both north and south Georgia (Flowers 1990: personal communication). Perhaps because the Lamar site lies near the Fall Line, it seems to have been influenced by both northern and southern traditions during the Woodland period. Also, while the Woodland period is better documented than the preceding periods, it still remains a poorly understood phase in Georgia prehistory (Garrow 1973). The Woodland period in central Georgia dates from approximately 1000 B.C. to 1000 A.D. (with a tighter range of 600 B.C. to 800-900 A.D. proposed by Walker [1972:chart]), and is divided into Early, Middle and Late phases.

Transitional frames of reference are acceptable as well. For instance, the Late Archaic - Early Woodland evidences the presence of a "Transitional Fiber-Grit Tempered" ceramic complex, described by Walker (1972:2) as pottery which contains both fiber and grit tempering, and "first defined by David S. Phelps, who placed it in his 'Norwood Series' (this also included fiber tempered pottery)." Walker also notes that "Considerable amounts of fiber and grit tempered pottery occur in Bibb County; and although most of it is plain or incised, some is simple stamped and at least one is check stamped" (1972:2).

Although the earliest Woodland pottery noted as the ceramic marker for this phase had been previously recognized as Dunlap Fabric Marked, Walker (1972:2) clearly stated the case for Deptford in Central Georgia:

The earliest Woodland pottery according to Fairbanks' sequence was Dunlap Fabric Marked. Although this was a reasonable assumption at the time Fairbanks was writing (based on the fact that cordmarked and fabric marked were the earliest ceramics from areas where fiber tempered pottery did not occur), it no longer is, because of the radiocarbon dates that are now available. Deptford in Florida has been radiocarbon dated at 600+ B.C., whereas Dunlap, which rather obviously must have been introduced from the north by way of Tennessee (it didn't make it down the east coast into coastal Georgia until later) has not been dated there much earlier than 150 B.C. These
dates, plus the simple and check stamping on the Transitional Fiber-Grit, seem to rather definitely indicate that Deptford was the earliest grit tempered pottery in central Georgia.

The economic base of northern Early Woodland peoples seemed to be hunting, fishing, and gathering with some apparent emphasis on acorns, hickory nuts and walnuts. House structures which have been excavated at sites dating to this phase are generally small and circular in shape.

The Middle Woodland in central Georgia generally dates from 200 B.C. to 300 - 400 A.D. and is marked by the phasing out of the Deptford Complex, and the presence of Dunlap Fabric Marked, Mossy Oak Simple Stamped, and some Weeden Island I ceramics; at the same time the Swift Creek Ceramic Complex begins its fluorescence (Walker 1972:2). There is no firm evidence as yet for a change in subsistence or house form from the earlier period.

For the most part, the Late Woodland (approximately 400 - 900 A.D.) in central Georgia is represented by the Swift Creek cultural complex, which may have originated in central Georgia (Lawson 1990: personal communication). It is marked by the decline of Mossy Oak and Weeden Island I ceramics, and the advent of Napier Complicated Stamped, and Weeden Island II (Walker 1972:chart). Swift Creek ceramics belong to the Southern Appalachian tradition as defined by Caldwell (1958): sand to grit tempered with curvilinear complicated stamped designs; whereas Late Woodland Napier has primarily rectilinear designs. Late Woodland villages usually had a conical burial mound with flexed burials and grave goods, with some of the larger sites (Swift Creek Village, Mandeville, etc.) having platform mounds. Late Woodland subsistence was based on hunting, fishing, and gathering largely supplemented by horticulture.

Very few Woodland period ceramic types have been recovered and identified from the Lamar site, although Dunlap Fabric Marked, Mossy Oak Simple Stamped, Swift Creek Complicated Stamped, and Napier Complicated Stamped were all defined at Macon and the type sites are all located near Lamar (Walker 1991:personal communication). Traces of Swift Creek, Napier, Dunlap, and Mossy Oak ceramics have been identified in the collections from Ford and Willey (Smith 1973: Appendix E, Hale 1990: personal communication). Due to the paucity of evidence for a prolonged Woodland period occupation at the Lamar site however, it is impossible at this time to assign the site to any cultural phase for this period.

THE MISSISSISSIPPIAN PERIOD

The Mississippian period dates from about 900 A.D. to approximately 1600 A.D. and it has also been divided into Early, Middle and Late phases. It was during this
period that the Lamar site saw its largest occupation. Mississippi period ceramics far outnumber all the other types combined.

The Early Mississippi period generally dates from 900 A.D. to 1100-1200 A.D. and is expressed in four different cultural units (Woodstock, Macon Plateau, Averett, and Etowah) which are based on regional variations in material culture, mostly ceramic types (Hally and Rudolph 1986:25).

Most archeologists in Georgia consider the Woodstock culture the earliest Mississippian expression in the upper Piedmont... Several radiocarbon dates in the A.D. 900-1000 range (MASCA corrected)...attest to this culture's role as the successor to the Late Woodland occupations in the area. However, given its transitional characteristics, classifying the Woodstock culture as early Mississippian rather than terminal Late Woodland may be somewhat arbitrary, a problem recognized by Wauchope (1966).

(Hally and Rudolph 1986:25,29)

During the Early Mississippi period the dominant influence in the Ocmulgee River drainage area was the Macon Plateau culture which has only one phase, the Macon Plateau phase. The type site for the Macon Plateau phase is Macon Plateau which is located within three miles of the Lamar site. "Macon Plateau was a migration into central Georgia that occurred during the local Late Woodland period. The ceramics of the Late Woodland natives in the Macon area were probably a combination of styles, with simple stamped as the predominate type" (Williams 1991: personal communication). The diagnostic ceramic types for the Macon Plateau phase are Bibb Plain, McDougal Plain, Halstead Plain, Hawkins Fabric Marked, Macon Thick, and Brown's Mount Plain (Fairbanks 1956:11). During this phase, subsistence was based on hunting, gathering, and incipient maize, beans, and squash agriculture. The remains of deer, bear, turkey, fish and mussels have been recovered from the Macon Plateau site. The site consists of eight platform mounds (if you count Mound X) and eight circular earthlodges, as well as numerous house sites and other features. Charles Fairbanks (1956:13,42) believed that Macon Plateau represented an intrusion of a pure Mississippian culture into the Ocmulgee River area, exhibited by some of the earliest expressions of the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex (i.e., "the Southern Cult"). Fairbanks (1956:42; 1980:2) attributed this early expression of Mississippian traits to an actual migration of Mississippian peoples into the area as opposed to a simple diffusion of Mississippian traits. However, there is a great deal of disagreement over Fairbanks' conclusions concerning the Macon Plateau site and the Macon Plateau phase (Williams 1975, B. Smith 1984). Hally and Rudolph's Mississippian Chronology (1986:34) concluded that there is insufficient evidence to conclusively support the intrusive model for this area, although there is little support for local development. "If a 'local development,' it was in the form of a truly pure Mississippian culture, unlike the acculturated varieties such as the Etowah culture,
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTRAL GEORGIA MISSISSIPPIAN CHRONOLOGY</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ocmulgee River Valley</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUBBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATEAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRBANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARROLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
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</table>

**Oconee River Valley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DYAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUVALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUVALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STILL-HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARROLL SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Mississippian Chronology**
Figure 3A: Georgia Chronology
which was surely the result of a diffusion of ideas elaborated upon by indigenous people" (Flowers 1990: personal communication). Although open to question,

A final point that has not been made often enough is that the Macon Plateau culture failed. Whether it was an indigenous development or an invading population, it appears to have had little interaction with surrounding groups and seems to have contributed few if any lasting elements to succeeding cultures. (Hally and Rudolph 1986:35)

It is curious that, although the Macon Plateau and Lamar sites are close to each other, very few Macon Plateau ceramic types have been found in the Lamar village area and around the mounds (Walker 1991: personal communication). This does not necessarily mean however, that the Lamar site was unoccupied during the Early Mississippi period, but rather, that it was probably sparsely occupied. According to excavations carried out in Feature 10 (an elongated basin or pit just along the south edge of the palisade) and reported in 1939 by then-Superintendent Jesse Jennings, "It would seem that the Macon material was rather scanty, deposited early" (1939:51). Jack Walker also reports that there was a Macon Plateau occupation at the site (1971:5). But from the available information, there appears to be no evidence for a large Early Mississippian occupation in the Lamar village site area, if the phase used to define these time periods is the Macon Plateau phase. In the village site and mound area, the ceramics recovered by Ford and Willey are overwhelmingly Lamar. Only a few Bibb Plain ceramics have been identified from Willey's collection. "It may also be that the Macon period settlement was small, concentrated near the south edge of the island; the subsequent Lamar village was more extensive, or more long-lived" (Jennings 1939:55). The use of the term "settlement" however, may be misleading, and the Macon Plateau occupation at the Lamar site may have been more transitory, or incidental to the nearby Plateau site.

A small number of Etowah Complicated Stamped and Etowah Incised sherds were also recovered from the village and mound area but these amounted to less than one percent of the material sampled (H. Smith 1973, Hale 1990): enough, however, to show limited interaction or trade. Walker, in a letter to Mr. J. Anderson Comer (1972:3) is more specific:

Fairbanks does not mention that Etowah occurs in central Georgia. Although the percentages from the Macon Plateau, Brown's Mount, and Lamar are relatively small; there is at least one relatively pure site in the area. Apparently Savannah is even more scarce than Etowah; but it does occur.

In other words, I definitely do not accept a hiatus between Macon Plateau and Lamar for the Macon area, and I question a hiatus for the Macon Plateau.
The Middle Mississippian period in central Georgia dates from approximately 1100-1200 A.D. to 1350 A.D. (Walker 1972:chart; Hally and Rudolph 1986:51). It is represented by Savannah culture with a number of regional variants or phases. The Savannah culture is not represented by any "pure" sites in the Middle Ocmulgee River area although some Savannah / Wilbanks ceramics have been recovered from the Lamar site (Hale 1990: personal communication). Williams (1990:63) dates the Stubbs Phase of the early Lamar period from 1100 to 1400 A.D. which falls into this time period, and includes mixed Savannah and early Lamar materials. "The Stubbs Phase people (mixture of Early Mississippian and indigenous elements) were certainly in contact with the Etowah / Savannah cultures which were developing nearby -- along with the Rood culture on the Chattahoochee River, etc. and probably the Ft. Walton culture in Florida" (Flowers 1990: personal communication).

LATE MISSISSIPPIAN LAMAR

The Late Mississippian period dates from approximately 1350 A.D. to around 1600 A.D. and is represented by the Lamar culture in the Piedmont. The Lamar culture is used to describe, in general terms, all of the Late Mississippian ceramic and cultural complexes in the Georgia Piedmont. "During this time interval, Dallas in Tennessee, Ft. Walton in Florida, Irene on the Georgia coast, and some of the Alabama sites all have Lamar-like characteristics. Archeologists have noted that Lamar spread like 'kudzu' over much of the Southeast" (Flowers 1990: personal communication).

The defining characteristics for the Lamar culture deal mainly with ceramics. Lamar ceramics are generally represented by three types: Lamar Complicated Stamped, Lamar Bold Incised and Lamar Plain (Hally and Rudolph 1986:63). Other types include Lamar Check Stamped, Cordmarked, and Red-Filmed. Two vessel forms are commonly found on Lamar sites: the conoidal jar with an excurvate rim and the casuela bowl. "Plates and/or shallow bowls also occur" (Walker 1991:personal communication). Lamar conoidal jars also have a very distinct rimstrip which can be folded, thickened, pinched, punctated or any combination thereof. Lamar ceramics are generally described as being grit-tempered, but sand-tempered sherds have also been found.

Subsistence data have been collected from some Lamar sites. Using the data from these site investigations, Hally and Rudolph (1986:69) have outlined a general subsistence pattern for Lamar. Maize agriculture was widely practiced in central Georgia during this time. Other cultigens included beans and squash. Wild plant foods consisted of maypop, hickory nuts, acorns, grape, plum, and persimmon. Faunal remains collected from Lamar sites include deer (most predominant), box turtle, turkey, and various species of fish and aquatic turtles.
Figure 4: Distribution of Early Lamar Phases (from Hally and Rudolph 1986:65)
Many Lamar sites have at least one mound and some villages were palisaded. "No site has more than two mounds of demonstrated Lamar construction" (Hally and Rudolph 1986:70). Mound sites are believed to have functioned as political or religious centers for large population centers and surrounding communities (Hally and Rudolph 1986:73). Mound center village sites were probably occupied year round.

MIDDLE OCMULGEE RIVER STUBBS PHASE

The Lamar culture is further divided into eleven phases in the Georgia Piedmont based on regional variation (Hally and Rudolph 1986:64). In the Ocmulgee River area, two phases for the Lamar culture have been defined: the Stubbs phase and the Cowarts phase (Williams 1975:131; Williams and Shapiro 1990:63-64). Both the Stubbs Phase and the Cowarts Phase were defined using collections from WPA archeological projects. The Stubbs phase is the earlier of the two phases (ca. 1100 - 1400 A.D.) and is represented at the type site, Stubbs Mound (9Bi12), as well as Lamar. In Bibb County, other sites which exhibit Stubbs phase materials are the Scott site (9Bi22), Marshall Mill (9Bi35), and portions of Horseshoe Bend (9Bi16) (Williams 1975:132). The Stubbs Mound site was excavated by Gordon Willey in 1937 under the direction of the Works Progress Administration. The material was later analyzed by Mark Williams in 1975 as part of a National Park Service contract and "the site report of this small single-mound Lamar site was prepared by Williams (1975) as his master's thesis" (Williams and Shapiro 1990:15). From his analysis, Williams concluded that the Stubbs Mound ceramics shared the attributes of both Lamar Complicated Stamp and Swift Creek Complicated Stamp (Williams 1975:74-75). "Many, for instance, showed stamping and rim treatment similar to Lamar on a paste similar to Swift Creek" (Williams 1975:78). Williams postulated that, based on Willey's "diffuse-acculturation" model, the ceramic traits represented interactions which were the result of acculturative processes between indigenous peoples and Mississippian intruders (1975:139).

Perhaps Stubbs Mound represents the end result of symbiotic interactions between the remnant members of the Macon Plateau focus, new Mississippian from the west (Chattahoochee River Valley) and the indigenous hunters and gatherers, each contributing elements toward the synthesis of what was to become known as Lamar.

(Williams 1975:139)

"In terms of broad trends, the majority of the ceramic material from Stubbs Mound is more closely related to the post-1000 A.D. central Georgia manifestations (Macon Plateau and Lamar) than the pre-1000 A.D. ones (Swift Creek, etc.)" (Williams 1975:80).
In the recent publication, *Lamar Archaeology* (Williams and Shapiro, eds.), Williams (1990:63) listed several characteristics for Stubbs Phase ceramics for the Middle Ocmulgee River: mixed Savannah and early Lamar materials; the introduction of bold incising ceramic type; sandier and thinner sherds than in the subsequent Cowarts phase; notched lips reflecting the Savannah component; and common stamping. The subsistence base and lithic tool kit apparently remained essentially unchanged from the preceding Swift Creek Phase.

**MIDDLE OCMULGEE RIVER COWARTS PHASE**

The Cowarts Phase, which Williams dates from 1400 to about 1600 A.D. (1990:64), is what is commonly known as "Classic" Lamar. The ceramics are characterized by: common stamping; bold incising; black surfaces on incised sherds; more grit temper; "sherds are thicker than in Stubbs phase"; and "pinched rims are more frequent" (Williams 1990:64). The major occupation of the Lamar site occurred during this phase. The phase was named for the Cowarts Landing site (9Bi20), which was the subject of W.P.A. investigations by Gordon Willey in 1937 and 1938 (Williams 1990:64). The site lies approximately 11-12 miles south of Ocmulgee National Monument on an old river terrace, 1/4 mile west of the Ocmulgee River. For purposes of the discussion at hand concerning the Lamar type-site, Cowarts Landing is the nearest late Lamar site of the Cowarts Phase to have undergone systematic archeological investigation and analysis (Hally and Rudolph 1986:66). Because of its proximity and presence along the same river valley, it should generally reflect many similar cultural conditions present at Lamar. A major difference is that Cowarts Landing (9Bi20) is a non-mound Lamar site. "Only a single late Lamar mound site, Lamar, is known for the Piedmont section of the Ocmulgee River" (Hally and Rudolph 1986:77). However, "Historical sources indicate mounds in both Butts and Jasper Counties in the piedmont section of the river; these could have been Cowarts Phase mounds. Also the newly discovered 23 mound Cowarts Phase site near Bullard in the river valley south of Macon" (Lawson 1991:personal communication).

The materials recovered during the 1937-38 stratigraphic survey project at Cowarts Landing were later the subject of analysis by Hamilton, Lauro, and Swindell (1975) as part of a contract with the National Park Service. Their ceramic analysis indicated that the major occupation of the site was Lamar, overlying Swift Creek. Although there was no evidence of direct continuity, the influence of Swift Creek was indicated (Hamilton et al 1975:21). However, "When compared to the intensity of the Lamar occupation, the Swift Creek habitation appears to have been insignificant" (Hamilton et al 1975:50). They stated that the major occupation at the site occurred between 1300 and 1450 A.D. (Hamilton et al 1975:50). Lamar ceramics made up over 85% of the total ceramic assemblage recovered at Cowarts Landing (Hamilton et al 1975:9).
1. Little Egypt (9Mu102)
2. Potts Tract (9Mu103)
3. Thompson (9Go4)
4. Mohman (9F1155)
5. King (9F15)
6. Etowah (9Br1)
7. Stamp Creek (9Br139)
8. 9Ck23
9. Nacoochee (9Wh3)
10. Eastwood (9Wh2)
11. Stephenson (9Wh28)
12. Estaroe (9St3)
13. Tugalo (9St1)
14. Chauga (380c47)
15. Dillard (9Ra3)
16. Vandiver (9Do1)
17. Scull Shoals (9Ge4)
18. Dyar (9Ge5)
19. 9Ge35
20. Shoulderbone (9Hk1)
21. Shinholser (9Bi11)
22. Little River (9Hg46)
23. Lamar (9Bi2)
24. Cowart's Landing (9Bi20)
25. Neisler (9Tr1)
26. 9Tr2
27. Park (9Tp49)
28. Avery (9Tp64)
29. Cooper (9Me3)
30. Engineer's Landing (9Ca5)
31. Abercrombie (1Ra1)
32. Bull Creek (9Mel)

Figure 5: Distribution of Late Lamar Phases (from Hally and Rudolph 1986:66)
RELATED WORK IN LAMAR CERAMIC ANALYSIS

More recent excavations have been conducted in the Oconee River Valley as part of the Wallace Reservoir project. The Oconee River is located approximately 30 miles to the east of the Ocmulgee River (Figure 5) and is roughly similar as to environment and ecology, although ceramic sequences apparently differ.

During the Wallace Reservoir work, the Dyar Mound site (9Ge5) was excavated. The Dyar Mound site is located about 60 miles northeast of the Lamar site. The ceramic analysis was conducted and written up by Marvin Smith (1983). It was his goal to refine the Lamar period into phases based on the ceramics found at the site which was a densely populated village site. His work resulted in the definition of three phases, two of which related to the Lamar period.

The first phase of the Lamar period here was defined as the Duvall phase. Dates for the Duvall Phase are 1300 to 1450 A.D. (contemporaneous with the Cowarts Landing site above). Smith defined it as the regional manifestation of early Lamar (1983:79), although this is considerably later than the evident beginning of Stubbs phase Lamar on the Ocmulgee. The diagnostic traits for the phase were: jars with Lamar rims (folded, pinched, molded, reed punctated etc.), the absence of Lamar Bold Incised ceramics, the presence of Morgan Incised, the predominance of plain surface treatment (80-90%), and vessel forms of conoidal jars with constricted necks and outflaring rims, small hemispherical bowls, and jars with straight necks and globular bodies (Smith 1983:79).

At the Dyar site in the Oconee River Valley, Smith originally had the Dyar Phase immediately follow the Duvall Phase and dating from 1450 to 1600 A.D. (Smith 1983:81). Described as the regional variant of "Classic Lamar," it is similar to the Barnett Phase in northwest Georgia and Cowarts phase on the Ocmulgee. At Dyar it was characterized by the relative frequency of Lamar Bold Incised ceramics (11-19%) and the relative infrequency of Lamar Complicated Stamped ceramics over time (from 16-20% early in the phase to 4.6% later on) (Smith 1983:81). Also common were vessels with folded and pinched rims. There is an increase in rim width through time and Lamar Incised lines appear to decrease in width through time (Smith 1983:82).

Using Smith's work from the Dyar site, Mark Williams and Steve Kowalewski reanalyzed the collections from the Carroll Village site (9Pm85), which was excavated in 1936 as a WPA project. The chronology for this site was worked out by Kowalewski and Williams in 1988 (Kowalewski and Williams 1989). Their new descriptions of the Lamar period phases were based on statistical analysis of four ceramic attributes: incision width (with <1mm = fine, 1-2mm = medium, >2mm = bold); presence of complicated stamping; number of incised lines; and width of rim fold (1989:61). Smith's 1983 definitions for the Duvall and Dyar Phases were used.
By their refined analysis of the ceramics from the Carroll site, they assigned it to the Dyar phase of the Upper Oconee Lamar period based on ceramic style. This was the latter half of the Dyar phase as defined in Smith's 1983 chronology. A new phase, called the Iron Horse phase, had been defined from the Scull Shoals (GE4) site and was placed between the Duvall and Dyar phases of Smith's 1983 chronology (Williams 1988). The ceramic attributes of the Iron Horse Phase (1450-1520 A.D.) are: common stamping; bold incising (of less than 2mm width) of two to four line motifs; Morgan Incised occurrence; medium width (14-15mm) pinched or folded applique' rim folds; and rare cane-punctated rims (Williams and Shapiro 1990:62).

The pertinence of the above studies is that they show the value of modern analytical techniques on both very recently excavated materials as well as WPA-era collections. By using new methods of measure, such as the width of incised lines, a more refined chronology of former phases was established. While the phases described above on the Oconee River materials may or may not be readily applicable to the Lamar type-site, most of the ceramic style attributes used to define them can be measured on the Lamar site materials. Therefore, it may be possible to further refine the Lamar phases for the Ocmulgee River area and gain a better understanding of the occupation at the Lamar site by applying such techniques to the WPA-era Lamar materials.
HISTORIC OVERVIEW

OCMULGEE FIELDS PHASE

The historic period cultural phase at the Lamar site is called Ocmulgee Fields. This phase was defined by Fairbanks (1956:48) and represents the Historic Creek occupation of the site. A separate phase has not been described yet for the Contact period on the Ocmulgee (Flowers 1990: personal communication). In the Oconee Valley chronology, the Contact period phase is the Bell Phase which was defined by Williams (1983), and has been dated to 1580 to 1660 A.D. The characteristics of the Bell Phase are ceramics with very wide rim folds, fine multiple line incising and T type rims and the virtual absence of stamped ceramics (less than 1%). Williams noted that the ceramics from the Bell Phase share characteristics with both Lamar and Ocmulgee Fields ceramics. However he felt that they were more similar to Lamar ceramics since they are grit-tempered, carefully decorated, and have no handles or appendages (Williams 1983:43). "Bell Phase of the Lamar culture covers protohistoric De Soto era material on the Oconee. The historic occupation there is Ocmulgee Fields, as on the Ocmulgee" (Flowers 1990: personal communication).

Fairbanks defined the Ocmulgee Fields phase using data from the Macon Plateau site (1956:48), although Ocmulgee Fields materials have been recovered from the Lamar site (Walker 1990: personal communication). He dated the phase from 1685 to 1716 A.D. In his 1958 article on the origins of Creek pottery, Fairbanks believed that the Ocmulgee Fields complex evolved out of the preceding Lamar complex (1958:54-55). Walker (1990:personal communication) points out that

There are some sherds which are decorated with what would ordinarily be termed Lamar Complicated Stamped and Ocmulgee Fields Incised (i.e., fine line rather sloppy incision). These may be transitional.

And further,

Historic and linguistic data present a rather convincing case for a Lamar/Creek relationship. That Muskogean speakers were in the Central Georgia area during the latter part of the Lamar period is borne out by town names and other terminology encountered by De Soto, Pardo, etc.

There are, however, differences between the two cultures. It is now thought that the precursors for Ocmulgee Fields ceramics are probably to be found in east central Alabama which was the heartland of the Creek Confederacy (Williams 1983:42),
although this may not hold for all Ocmulgee Fields ceramics and has yet to be proven (Flowers 1990: personal communication). Fairbanks suggested that the people of the Lamar occupation were the ancestors of the Historic Creek Indians (1958:60): "Certainly historic Creek pottery contains a heavy increment of Lamar traits". However, there is no clear evidence that this should be the case and there is a large amount of controversy surrounding the issue (Russell 1975, Williams 1983).

Ocmulgee Fields sites are generally smaller than Lamar sites and there are less of them, although "In the Macon area, if there is a Lamar site it almost always has an overlying Ocmulgee Fields component" (Flowers 1990: personal communication). Ocmulgee Fields village sites have no mounds and are not palisaded. The basic subsistence pattern for Ocmulgee Fields is the same as the Lamar pattern except that some European items such as peaches are added. However, European contact did make a huge impact on hunting practices during the Ocmulgee Fields phase by introducing firearms and the deer skin trade. Ocmulgee Fields ceramics are also different in some respects from Lamar. The basic vessel shapes are the same but Ocmulgee Fields vessels (Walnut Roughened) quite often have handles or appendages applied to them while Lamar ceramics did not. Lamar ceramics are bold incised while Ocmulgee Fields are very fine incised. The incisions on Lamar ceramics are carefully and neatly applied while these on Ocmulgee Fields have been described as sloppy. Lamar ceramics are generally grit-tempered whereas Ocmulgee Fields ceramics (again, Walnut Roughened) are shell tempered. Red-filming is very common in Ocmulgee Fields period Kasita Red-Filmed while it is rare (Smith 1973), if nonexistent in Lamar (Williams 1983:41). In arguing the discontinuity, Fairbanks (1958:40) stated that:

As Ocmulgee Fields is the direct descendant of Lamar and all the pottery types of Ocmulgee Fields grew out of Lamar, it is to be expected that some Lamar types continued into the historic period. In the case of the present Lamar collections this does not seem to be the case. There is evidence in the documents and in the excavated remains that the Creeks returned to Ocmulgee Old Fields about 1690 and were not resident here for several generations before that. If this is the case we would expect to find a full-fledged Ocmulgee Fields ceramic complex rather than a transitional Lamar-Ocmulgee Fields collection. It is probable that the Lamar sherds are the remains of a casual and temporary occupation of the plateau by the Lamar period peoples.

THE HISTORIC TRADING POST

Following Fairbank's historical outline above, when the Creeks moved into the Ocmulgee River area from the Chattahoochee drainage, it was at just about the same time as the establishment of a trading post on the Macon Plateau by a trader from
the Carolinas (Fairbanks 1958:40). This heavy trade in deer skins and other hides created a commercial center around the trading post. "The whole appearance of the material remains is that of a people rapidly moving toward a barter economy under the influence of English trade and eventually turning to a log-cabin-farming economy in the closing years of the 18th century" (Fairbanks 1958:15).

THE ANTE-BELLUM PLANTATION PERIOD

In 1849 George White, writing in *Statistics of the State of Georgia*, described the area which now includes the Lamar Mounds:

> About three miles above Lamar's [the present Brown's Mount] commences a chain of five artificial mounds. The two first are on the plantation of John B. Lamar, Esq. [i.e., the Lamar site]. The remaining three are at regular intervals, the last one situated near the old blockhouse at Fort Hawkins... The two [mounds] on Mr. Lamar's plantation have had the forest growth recently cleared from about them, and present a very distinct outline of circumvallations and other such works connecting them. (White 1849:113-114, quoted with clarifications in Walker 1989:3)

POST-BELLUM

In 1873, Charles C. Jones described the area around Macon in his *Antiquities of the Southern Indians, Particularly of the Georgia Tribes*. Other than a brief mention of the mounds on the Lamar Plantation, his descriptions are devoted to the larger mounds of the Macon Plateau group and the Browns Mount site fortifications (Walker 1989:4).
CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

A. Field Investigations

1933 - 1934

Beginning in December 1933 and continuing into March 1934, James A. Ford, as field assistant under Dr. Arthur Kelly, carried out explorations at the Lamar mounds and village site (Kelly 1938:46). Kelly directed excavations at Mounds C, D, and A on the Macon Plateau, while Ford oversaw excavations at the Lamar site’s Mound A and within the surrounding presumed village area. At Lamar, "Mr. Cauthorne" and "Mr. Hulgen" assisted Ford (Walker 1989:8). In describing the work done by Ford, Charles Fairbanks wrote

The first Lamar system may be classified as the Base Line System. Mound "A" was located in the Center of a 200 foot square. From the Southeast corner of this square North-South and East-West base lines were oriented with compass needle. The Village Sites, Excavation Pits and Test Trenches were tied in from the base line.


Bench Mark - concrete slab with assumed elevation of 100 ' is located 18" South of Stake No. 1, the Southwest corner of staked area on Mound "A". All mound and village site elevations taken from this bench mark.

(Fairbanks 1938).

In other words, a North-South, East-West, X-Y coordinate grid line, was placed over the entire Lamar site, so that Mound A fell into the Northwest quadrant. A benchmark was placed off the mound to the southwest, 18 inches southwest of (what was numbered) Stake No. 1. The stakes, placed along the X-axis of this grid line, were placed every 5 feet and numbered consecutively from west to east, until they reached the Y-axis. They began again 5 feet north of the last line at Stake No. 1. In each line there were 40 stakes, thus the 200 foot length, and there were 20 numbered stakes at 10 foot intervals for each north line running east-west, and this formed the 200 foot square encompassing Mound A. Elsewhere in the surrounding area, grid coordinates for trenches and pits were also based on the established X-Y axis, but labelled as 100 E (or W) and 100 N (or S).

Work was begun on the West side of the mound and consisted of taking vertical faces along the length of five foot trenches (Smith 1973:9). According to the FSU/NPS Smith report (1973:10), four 5-foot wide trenches were cut, forming a 20-foot wide exploratory trench into the "feathery edge" of the mound, rather than the mound.
slope itself. Below the mound deposits were discovered village remains, including midden materials, two burials, and numerous random post molds (Smith 1973:10). It should be noted, however that the Key Map of the Lamar Mound excavations, traced by L.K. Sessions and dated 1940 (SEAC Map Catalog 363-82,034), appears to indicate only three trenches dug on the western side of Mound A. Mention is made of a trench "0" in the typed field notes (SEAC ACC 125, Vol. 3, p.2), and perhaps this explains the discrepancy.

Work then shifted to the eastern side of the mound, where two trenches were begun: Trenches 19 and 20 (which, according to a quotation from the field notes, [cited in Smith 1973:10 as SEAC Field Book #62, but which will be cited heretofore as the above SEAC ACC 125, Vol. 3,] are stated as being started on the west side of the mound, but which is a typographical error in that work had been halted on the west side of the mound and was begun anew on the east side of the mound).

Trench 20 ... yielded an unusual number of potsherds, etc., and at an average depth of 20", ran into a layer of red clay, extending between stakes 280 and 520 [i.e., on the southeast side of the mound]. Work of trenching the mound was stopped as soon as this house evidence was discovered, and a large area was cleared in an attempt to uncover the entire floor of the structure. Trench #19 was excavated, discovering post holes extending from the village site level down into sub-soil.

(SEAC ACC 125, Vol 3:3)

No further mention is made of this "house evidence" in the field notes. At this point an estimate was made of the time needed to excavate the entire mound, and restore it, with the personnel at hand. As a result, once it became apparent that the time and cost was prohibitive, a decision was made to limit the investigation of the mound to the northeast corner. Within the confines of these northeast quarter section of the mound investigations, a pit was discovered originating from a level at a depth of 5'7" from the mound surface in Trench #12 at Stake # 832. It was described as an occupation level containing fragments of stone, potsherds, ashes, charred corn husks, corn cobs and wood, overlaid by 6 to 8 inches of burned clay which apparently had been tempered with grass and was described as "briquette-like" (SEAC ACC 125, Vol. 3:35). This has been described as "an occupation surface which was later capped and the mound broadened and heightened", and "the only clearly defined occupation surface for Mound 'A'" (Smith 1973:11).

Once off of the mound, Ford began excavations in the Village Area, targeting what he believed were house mounds below the small 15" rises on the floodplain. Excavation # 1 was a 100 ft. square which became known as Village Site No. 1. The alluvial deposits were approximately 10 inches in depth, but below 20 inches, a house site was revealed by the presence of charred logs, "briquettes", and the presence of a hard packed clay floor (SEAC ACC 125, Vol. 3:5). Numerous sherds, pieces of flint,
fragments of shell and bone, and food remains were discovered within the unit, and the post molds of charred supports outlined the structure. While digging a trench to drain off water from the unit, it was noticed that the midden deposits outside the house became deeper, so four short trenches were dug on the four sides of the excavation to investigate further. "The result is that this house appears to have been built on a plot of ground surrounded by a ditch with the spoil dirt having been used to slightly raise the level of the house area" (Smith 1973:14).

Excavation No. 2 was also a 100 foot square which surrounded most of a small rise approximately 200 feet southwest of the Village Site No. 1 unit above. Upon excavation however, it proved to contain only midden deposits and no evidence of any structure.

Ford dug 26 test units in all (Figure 6), mostly trenches (or "sections", as he preferred to label them), of which the two units above (and Excavation No. 15, below) were the only large horizontal areas opened. Excavations Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, and 19 were Test Pits 10 feet by 10 feet square. Excavation No. 13, within Village Site No. 1, was a 12 by 12 foot unit. Excavation No. 14, adjoining and north of Village Site No. 1, was a 5 foot by 10 foot trench. Village Site No. [i.e., Excavation No.] 15 was a 20 by 20 foot square, which was expanded to 40 feet by 40 feet. Excavation No. 16 was a 75 by 75 foot square. Excavation Nos. 20 and 21 were each 5 foot by 50 foot trenches cut through small ridges. Excavation No. 22 was a 5 by 50 foot test trench through small ridges west of Mound B. Excavation No. 23 was a 12 by 12 foot unit adjoining and south of Village Site No. 1. Excavation No. 24 was a 5 by 50 foot trench, cutting the circular ridge around Mound B near the foot of the mound on the north side. Excavation No. 25 was a 5 by 50 foot trench cutting the small ridges on the northwest side of the field. And Excavation No. 26 was a 5 by 85 foot trench cutting the water hole northwest of Mound A (Fairbanks 1938).

Forty burials were located during Ford's excavations, and they were distributed thus: 21 were located within Mound A, 3 were in Village Site Excavation No. 1, 9 were located in Village Site Excavation No. 2, two were found in Excavation No. 5, two were found in Excavation No. 22, and one was found in The Village Site No. 1 East Test Trench Extension (SEAC ACC 125, Vol 3:41-71).

The CWA project headed by Ford ended on February 15, 1934. The laborers were all laid off, but because the City of Macon made a request for a continuance, which was approved, work began again on February 19 (Walker 1989:9). On that day Ford started a test trench east from the East Test Cut adjacent to the house and Village Site Cut # 1. This test trench was 5 feet wide and 200 feet long and extended directly east from the above Village Site Test Cut. The last entry in Ford's field notes is that of April 12, 1934 wherein he describes a discovery located in Mound A: "Log molds showing in profile below stakes 792 and 832 which at first seemed to indicate a burial in a timber lined grave have been uncovered on this date, and it would seem
Figure 6: Key Map of Ford's Excavations
to be part of the burnt clay house material which also came out in the same profile..." (SEAC ACC 125, Vol. 3:40).

Tentative laboratory studies at that time showed a general admixture of stamped and incised sherds from top to bottom in the 16 stratified pits dug. The analysis by arbitrary levels showed no well-defined trends. The results were negative and hard to appraise, due to the marked churning of midden in successive occupation. The conception of Lamar village held then, and still maintained, was that probably several generations had lived on the site, heaping midden to varying levels at different points of the village area. (Kelly 1938:48)

"By late 1935, Kelly recognized...four cultural complexes...represented on the Macon Plateau and at Lamar...: (1) a complicated stamped complex (Swift Creek) which predated the Macon mounds, (2) a...Macon Plateau pottery complex, (3) a Lamar complex, and (4) a historic Creek complex" (Walker 1989:12).

1936

In early January, there was a visit to Ocmulgee by Philip Phillips, who had been interested in the pottery classification used in the laboratory. A subsequent visit in February by James B. Griffin, resulted in Kelly, Griffin, and John T. West (the laboratory supervisor) developing a typological classification to be used for the Central Georgia ceramics (Walker 1989:13). After a test run of some 5000 sherds, Kelly wrote to John Swanton expressing the opinion that there was a great deal of homogeneity at Lamar and that the Lamar type site established a horizon duplicated at a number of sites (Nacoochee, Etowah, Oconee, Neisler, Toa, and Kolomoki) having been in their prime at or before the arrival of De Soto (Walker 1989:14-15).

1937

In late August 1936, Gordon R. Willey was asked by Dr. Kelly to stay on at Ocmulgee as his assistant. "In December 1936, Kelly was designated as Archeologist for WPA Projects and Willey, Assistant Archeologist for WPA Projects" (Walker 1991:personal communication). When the Works Progress Administration workers were withdrawn on June 1, 1937, Kelly was made Project Superintendent for the CCC Camp, and Willey, CCC Senior Foreman Archeologist. Dr. Kelly decided to cut back on large-scale excavations and conduct a series of stratigraphic surveys in order to refine the cultural chronology and develop the stratigraphic sequence for a number of sites in the area (Walker 1989:17). Willey began the overall stratigraphic testing on June 7, 1937. From August 5 through August 18 Willey carried out the series of stratigraphic "pits" at Lamar. In explaining the rationale and methodology, he stated
Inasmuch as our objective in this survey is to do pure stratigraphy in simple situations, working primarily with potsherds as in a surface survey, our excavations at Lamar are in the form of scattered 10’ x 10’ pits. These are placed in random over the village. The only selectivity used in their placement is that they be located on “average” rather than “unusual” spots. Mounds, house mounds, declivities in the surfaces, areas in which there is a striking differential in vegetation, all of these are eliminated. In fact we hope we will be fortunate enough not to run into any house floors or burials, but confine our digging to village midden. Such will not always be the case, and in the event that any such complications come up full detail will be recorded but further excavation will not be undertaken to completely uncover the somewhat extraneous problem at hand.

(Willey 1938:2, SEAC ACC 125, Vol 4)

Willey dug 14 pits immediately, (Figure 7) and during the last week of excavations at Lamar, 6 additional pits were added and mapped into the survey, for a total of 20.

Of these, 10 gave evidence of vertical stratigraphy, 5 were negligible so far as catalogued material was concerned, and 5 showed no change. Of the five which showed no change two were much confused by burial disturbances. Another was unreliable because of faulty excavation. The discrepancies in the remaining two could not be explained.

(Kelly 1938:48)

Briefly, the stratified indications at Lamar brought out by the 1937 survey are as follows:

First. The Lamar bold incised occurs in strongest percentage in the top 6 to 9 inches of the 2-foot midden, either decreasing to the bottom or disappearing altogether.

Second. Lamar complicated stamp shows definitely better execution in the lower level. The collections from the top midden give a mass impression of the amorphous, irregular designs, which can generally not be sketched as to design elements. These are the Lamar designs thought to have been impressed with carved wooden paddles. On the other hand, the more distinct Lamar patterns in the lower levels permit of the designation, Lamar complicated stamp, as these show less evidence of a slipshod malleating technique.

Third. There is a marked and consistent increase in semipolished or smoothed plain ware as one proceeds from top to bottom in the midden.

(Kelly 1938:48-49)
Figure 7: Partial Key Map of Willey's Excavations
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Kelly interpreted the stylistic degeneration of the stamping technique, from bottom to top, and the correlated decrease in better stamped and polished wares, as an indication of a period of decline during the Lamar occupation (Kelly 1938:49).

Degeneration is seen in the technical loss of skill in making distinct pottery stamped impressions. Percentage distributions from bottom to top in the stratigraphic pits shows a gradual but perceptible change. Concurrently, with the changes in the Lamar stamp is noted the sudden appearance of a boldly executed incised ware in the upper midden zones" (Kelly 1937:2).

He also saw the presence of "hybrid" vessels in the upper levels, incised on the upper rims or shoulders and set off from stamping on the body and base by punctated lines, as "striking confirmation of the idea that Lamar is a refocalization of cultural elements coming from different areas, presumably the result of intermingling of trait complexes belonging to the lower Mississippi Basin and the native Southeast respectively" (Kelly 1938:49).

1938

In March of 1938, Willey returned to Lamar to carry out further stratigraphic survey and testing "as a back check to strengthen stratigraphic relationships of Lamar stamp in relation to Lamar incised" (Willey 1938:77_A, SEAC ACC 125, Vol.4). Four 10' x 10' pits were started with 2 1/2 foot-wide outlining trenches on March 4, 1938. The units were dug slowly with a careful eye to detail concerning any archeological features such as post molds, etc. Soil samples were taken from both natural and arbitrary levels, and burials were to be treated as separate units (Willey 1938:77_A). The units were designated as the "A" series, and numbered consecutively as 1A, 2A, 3A, and 4A (Willey 1938:87). Apparently, if and when features were encountered that might need further investigation, they were designated as Special Units, and are written up in association with the "A" series notes as Special Unit No. 4A (Pit 3A), for example. Nine of these Special Units were dug. Burials were also numbered sequentially as, for instance, Burial 1A (Pit 2A). Five burials were recorded.

An example of the intricate provenience classification can be seen in the following excerpts from Willey 1938:85-85, SEAC ACC 125, Vol. 4:
Special Unit No. 9
3/24/38

Special Unit No. 9 is an attempt to excavate a refuse pit which is shown in the outside profile pit 2A [...] a 5 foot square was laid out contingent to south outside profile of 2A at a point 18" east of outside southwest corner and corresponding 78" east of same point for other side of square [...] 

3/31/38

A southern extension with total width 15" to be added on excavation for special unit 9 with catalogued provenience of AA [...] This is an attempt to remove soil over Burial 5A left of block at 38" BS. Special Unit No. 9 to be catalogued later as Burial 5A.

The March 31, 1938 entry above is the last for this particular stratigraphic survey at Lamar. The other stratigraphic survey fieldwork ended in late April, and Willey began analysis of the data (Walker 1989:19). It should be noted that it was at this time that the site designation of 2Bi7 for the Lamar site, used on all notes and correspondence up to this time, was changed to 2Bi11 as of May 1938, and all site references after that date reflect that change. When national State site standardization was implemented in the 1960s the site became was listed as 9Bi2.

"Archeological data recovery began April 19 at the Lamar site in areas which would be affected by construction of a levee around the site. This work, which was supervised by James H. Jackson, continued throughout the year" (Walker 1989:19). In anticipation of construction of the proposed levee, a plot plan of the Lamar property was drawn up in June 1938 which created an overlay or grid system, upon which any new archeological work would be based. The levee test excavations were begun using this system, and by August the system was firmly in place and proven to be effective. Later it was succinctly described by Fairbanks:
THE NEW SYSTEM AS OF AUGUST 1938

The grid system of 100' squares is used at Lamar Mounds. The Southwest corner is used as the starting point for the system. The alphabetical numbering is used in the North and South direction beginning with Station "D" and increasing from South to North to Station "O"-61.6'. The numerical numbering is used in the East and West direction beginning with Station 10 and increasing from West to East to Station 25. The orientation of the system is not exactly North-South, East-West. The North-South lines are off to the West about 2 degrees.

In any measurement the first group of figures will indicate distance North of the lettered stations on N-S axis; as D-20 refers to point 20' North of D line. The second group of figures refers to distance east of numerical lines on E-W axis; as 17-50 is 50' East of 17 line. Thus (D-20, 17-50) is a stake 20' North of D-line & 50' East of 17 line. Inside 100' master squares smaller squares are staked out as needed. These stakes are indicated as above thus; D-10, 11-10 in 10' N. of D, 10' E. of 11 lines.


Kelly left Macon during the summer of 1938 to assist instructing a field school at Chaco Canyon for the University of New Mexico. While there he was offered and accepted the position of Chief, Archeological Sites Division, National Park Service, and Willey became CCC Senior Foreman Archeologist at Ocmulgee. Willey left Macon on September 15, and shortly after his departure, Charles H. Fairbanks came in as the CCC Senior Foreman Archeologist and began supervision of the laboratory staff (Walker 1989:21).

1939

The Lamar levee data recovery project, begun in the spring of 1938, was halted on January 25, 1939 because of flooding. The waters receded quickly however, and the crew went back to work on February 1 (Walker 1989:23). The levee archeological reconnaissance and excavations were completed on February 15 (Job # 105 Completion Record, SEAC ACC 125, Vol. 12) In a paper on recent excavations at the Lamar site, delivered before the Annual Meeting of the Society for Georgia Archaeology on April 14, 1939, Jesse D. Jennings, then-Acting Superintendent at Ocmulgee National Monument, wrote
Lamar, [...], has been the scene of exploratory excavation for the past eight months. This exploration consisted of running 2 1/2 foot trenches around the four sides of the forty acre tract in order to determine what, if any, archaeological data extended to or beyond the limits of the property. We desired this information so that construction of a levee contemplated around the edge of the tract could proceed without fear of destroying or covering data eventually necessary to a complete archaeological story of the area. Our practice was to explore fully any phenomenon encountered during the digging of the exploratory trenches. This work has been completed, though it was not considered at any stage a thorough excavation program. This intensive excavation work must await the completion of the levee so that our work and any exhibits prepared therefrom will be protected from the frequent inundations which occur at this point.

(Jennings 1939:46)

At that time, although the levee (or actually, the property line) testing had been completed (Figure 8), and a few features noted, the palisade had only been encountered on the south side of the property for a distance of 300 feet, running in a straight line northeast-southwest (Jennings 1939:46). The palisade here was given the designation of Feature 9. Another feature noted here on the south perimeter, alongside the palisade, was an "elongated basin or pit which contained Indian midden material" (Jennings 1939:46). This feature was designated Feature 10.

The excavation of Feature 10 occupied our attention for some time and a preliminary analysis of the material revealed a stratified situation. In order to check this situation, ten stratigraphic blocks were cut. [...] A five foot square was blocked out, all earth cut away from it and the block cut down in arbitrary [3"] levels. The sherds thus obtained were isolated and catalogued separately.

(Jennings 1939:51)

In the subsequent analysis, which dealt only with known types, Lamar materials were recognized in all the levels, whereas the Macon Plateau types never lay above the eighth arbitrary zone. This verified the suggestion that "Lamar's position above, and more recent than Macon Plateau is probably correct" (Jennings 1939:51). Jennings, therefore, was the first to report the finding of Lamar ceramics above Macon Plateau wares in stratigraphic tests (Walker 1989:22).

It was in this paper (1939) that Jennings further postulated that the Lamar site exhibited the geological attributes of an Eocene clay erosional remnant, "about which the Ocmulgee River lashed and twisted, but never erased," and suggested that it was in fact, "an island sanctuary, surrounded by river swamp" (Jennings 1939:52). He went on to state, "Assuming that the island hypothesis is acceptable, the next logical
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Figure 8: Key Map of Fairbanks' Excavations
question arising is the time involved in reduction of the swamp and island to level river terrace land," and after a comparison of profiles from the levee excavations of Feature 5 (described as a "recently dug drainage ditch... some 600-700 feet long,... dug since the beginning of intensive settlement of the Ocmulgee River valley"), he concluded that, "We can safely say that the 'Isle of Lamar' would have been visible as an island as late as 1800..." (Jennings 1939:54-55).

Stratigraphic blocks were also cut in sections of Feature 5. Only Lamar type-specimens were recovered. Comparative analysis indicated that the horizontal distribution here was the same as that observed in Feature 10, where "the Macon types occur close to the bank of the original shoreline, with the Lamar sherds lying further out. It may also be that the Macon period settlement was small, concentrated near the south edge of the island; the subsequent Lamar village was more extensive, or more long-lived" (Jennings 1939:55).

Under the direction of Charles Fairbanks as Senior Foreman Archeologist, "During 1939 further excavations at Lamar traced the palisade completely around the area for a total distance of 3,560 feet. The area enclosed was about 21.5 acres. The palisade followed in general the edge of the island which had been postulated on the basis of the lagoons [on the north and west sides]" (Fairbanks, letter to Kelly, 8/13/40). The palisade post molds showed a line of posts 6 to 12 inches in diameter, with the average post postulated to be about 8 inches thick (Fairbanks 1940a:n.p.). "They arose from the middle portion of the humus band representing the Lamar occupation and were 12 to 18 inches deep" (Fairbanks 8/13/40). Two or three lines of post holes or trenches were observed, sometimes separated by a foot or so, and this was believed to be the result putting in new posts prior to removing the old posts (either rotten or termite-ridden). The presence of double lines of posts did not appear to indicate a multiple palisade, as they often crossed over, especially on the northern and southern sides, and the continual replacement of posts suggested that the palisade was in use over a considerable period of time (Fairbanks 1940a: n.p.). "On the north side an entrance wing is indicated extending to the swamp muck" (Fairbanks 8/13/40).

All excavations were carried out with proper vertical controls and, for about half the circuit of the area, reserve blocks were left for future stratigraphic checking. The method of using exploratory trenches at right angles to the palisade line enabled us to leave these blocks for future checking with village levels. [...] Stratigraphic tests were made in areas which were indicated to possess more than one pottery type.

These indicated the following stratigraphic sequence:
"During the course of the palisade excavations the depressions located to the north of Mound 'A' and south of Mound 'B' were found to have been connected from within the protohistoric village to the swamp with the palisade running across them" (Smith 1973:17). Although it was evident that the features were intentionally excavated, their function was not so clear. They were described as "fish ponds", or storage ponds for fish taken from the nearby river, as these had been described historically elsewhere. Their original excavation was considered to possibly represent barrow pits for the earth from which the mounds were created, but apparently there is more soil in the mounds than could have been removed from the sinks. They were also hypothesized to be water sources to be used in times of emergency, such as while under siege. It was also suggested that the narrow, deep depression with fairly regular sides found on the southeast side, described as the "slough" or lagoon feature (as was a smaller one to the west), may possibly have been a "naturally swampy margin to the island that was partly deepened by the Indians as a defensive measure, or even a barrow pit for clay to plaster the palisade posts" (Fairbanks 1940a), although it seems problematical to consider plastering a palisade wall with spaces of up to a foot between posts. It was finally concluded that the best explanation was that a combination of uses were employed in the function of these features.

While excavating the palisade line, Fairbanks also looked at the proposed parking area to be constructed at the Lamar site. This area was to "cover a space 500 feet by 135 feet inside the levee, [with] the narrow extension (135 feet) out into the Lamar Village site" (Fairbanks 8/9/39). (This proposed parking area is outlined in pencil on the Key Map of Lamar Mounds, traced by L.K. Sessions, February 1940 [SEAC Map 363-82,034], although when the parking area was sketched onto this particular site map is unclear.) In the letter referencing this work, Fairbanks strongly suggested "that the width of the parking area be cut from 135 feet to approximately 75 feet" (Fairbanks 8/9/39), explaining further that...

there is little chance that important archeological features will be encountered in this 75 foot strip. It is important however, that the area be fully excavated, as this is one of the sections at Lamar which revealed a non-ceramic level. Also the open space appears to lie within the confines of the Lamar village and it is probable that rather extensive village remains will be found along the edge of the parking area.

(Fairbanks 8/9/39)
Upon completion of the palisade excavations, Fairbanks wrote to A.R. Kelly (8/13/40) and stated "Sufficient archeologically sterile area outside the palisade was present on the west side for the parking area."

1940 - 1942

Data recovery excavations continued at Lamar throughout 1940 (Walker 1989:23). During December 1940 however, Fairbanks was named Junior Archeologist, National Park Service, with his duty station at Ocmulgee National Monument. The Emergency Relief Act field crews at Lamar then continued work through March 1941 under the direction of the General Foreman, James H. Jackson. In April, the CCC Senior Foreman Archeologist position which had been vacated by Fairbanks was filled by Karl Schmitt, who was assigned to prepare the final report on the Lamar palisade excavations (Walker 1989:25). This final report was apparently never completed (or perhaps published) as no reference to a manuscript by Schmitt can be found, although draft materials on the palisade work such as field notes and drawings, which can clearly be ascribed to Schmitt and Fairbanks, are contained within the SEAC Accession files.

Mr. Schmitt did however submit an article on the silt deposit stratigraphy of a drainage ditch investigated in the fall of 1941 at the Lamar site "on the ground of the proposed south section of the levee" (Schmitt 1943:296). In the article Schmitt described the various silt deposit lenses observed, where "Profiles were made across a drainage ditch which was occasionally visible as a depression approximately six inches below the general land level, [and] bordered by ridges of spoil dirt approximately six inches above the general level" (Schmitt 1943:296). Based on a statement in the *Soil Survey of Bibb County* (1926:1117) which said that the area could be profitably farmed "if drainage ditches were dug", and knowing that the area had been cleared for plantation farming in 1849 (White 1849:113-114), Schmitt felt it highly probable that the ditch dated "from a period between 1840 and 1848" (Schmitt 1943:297). Ceramic sherds located in a lower stratigraphic context (Grady Clay), provided a further reference to the rate of silt deposition. Schmitt concluded that

The sherds in the upper Grady Clay, and the clay itself, would date roughly from 1650. This indicates that during a period of approximately two hundred years (1650 - 1840) only four to six inches of silt were deposited, while during the next approximate one hundred year period (1840 - 1941) twenty-four to thirty inches were laid down... The heavy silt deposition, with associated heavy erosion, is undoubtedly correlated with intensive cultivation in central Georgia, and is a demonstration of the rapidity with which relatively recent cultural remains may be buried beneath a deep overburden. (Schmitt 1943:297)
While carrying out the palisade excavations it was discovered that the Lamar site boundaries extended beyond the original area designated within the Ocmulgee National Monument boundaries, and on June 13, 1941, after an additional 5 acres on the southern side which contained the remainder of the site were donated by a local landowner, then-President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued a proclamation adding the property to the Monument (Walker 1989:25-26). Excavation of that part of the palisade then began on August 19, 1941, and continued until October 20. Schmitt resigned in March 1942 when the CCC camp was removed from under National Park Service jurisdiction as a result of World War II defense-related efforts (Walker 1989:26).

1962 - 1973

No other archeological work was carried out on the Lamar materials for over thirty years following the WPA/CCC/ERA excavations described above. Developments instead concentrated on the question of chronology. In June, 1962 for instance, though no work was carried out at the Lamar type site, results of data recovery for pre-construction testing of Interstate 16 indicated there was a fairly heavy Lamar occupation of the bottoms in contrast to almost none on the plateau (Walker 1989:37; Nelson, Swindell, Williams 1974). It might be mentioned here that, again, although no archeological investigation was carried out, the levee and village area of the Lamar site was reportedly cleared of forest cover around 1964 (Fischer 1990: personal communication). Jack Walker, in a Georgia Department of Transportation study written in 1971, which described the known archeological sites in the vicinity of Macon, Georgia, found that instead of there being only two sites with ceramics generally ascribed to the Macon Plateau period there were at least seven, including the Lamar site (Walker 1989:43), and further, "...that there was a Macon Plateau occupation of the site had been previously discussed by Jennings (1939:51) and Fairbanks (1940:n.p.)" (Walker 1991: personal communication). Walker further stated that, besides the evidence at Lamar for the two major periods of occupation, early Mississippian (Macon Plateau) and late Mississippian (Lamar)...

There is also, however, evidence for minor occupations during middle Woodland (Napier Complicated Stamped pottery) and middle Mississippian (Etowah Complicated Stamped pottery) times and for a relatively large occupation during Historic (Ocmulgee Plain and Ocmulgee Fields Incised pottery) times.

(Walker 1971:5)

In January 1973, a contract for the analysis and a report on the Lamar materials recovered from the 1930s WPA/CCC excavations was let to Florida State University under the direction of Dr. Hale G. Smith as the principal investigator. Dr. Donald L. Crusoe was the Government Technical Representative for the contract,
#500031136, which was completed in May of that year (Walker 1989:44). The sample of materials chosen for analysis first were from Ford's excavations, and the first and largest group were handled as a general "surface collection." "In the ceramic analysis of the Lamar Site 24,261 sherds were handled as a 'surface collection.' This material either had no provenience, the location had been lost or was actually collected as a general surface collection" (Smith 1973:19). "The artifacts comprising the general surface represents about 90% of the nonprovenienced material from the Lamar Site" (Smith 1973:23), and included the Mound A materials. Ford's excavations were chosen to be dealt with first "since they represent the only field work done in both the village area and in Mound 'A'. It was hoped that they would reveal culturally significant spacial [sic] and/or temporal factors in 'Lamar'... such as if the mound-building complex "lasted through the whole duration of Lamar; if there were changes in burial practices through time, etc." Due to perceived problems with the quality and completeness of Ford's field notes however, the research design for the analysis was changed to incorporate a number of different excavation units including Willey's, as well as the above "surface collection". This change in perspective was described as follows:

...excavation units studied are from both Ford's and Willey's field work. Ford's particular units ("excavations") were chosen because they best represented random distribution within the site. In addition such units as Pits 1, 2, 4 and Excavations 6, 7, and 9 were used in an attempt to delineate areas of activity near the palisade; and to determine the geographical extent of the other components discovered by Fairbanks [1940:2] during the palisade excavations. Due to the completeness of Willey's field notes, 8 of his SS [Stratigraphic Survey] pits (hereafter referred to as 'Pits') were analyzed in an attempt to seriate the ceramics. (Smith 1973:22)

With the exception of Excavation 1 (Ford's Village Site 1), the units analyzed were 10 feet square, and the data shown represented the total sample. In the case of Village Site 1 (V.S. 1), which was a 100 foot by 100 foot square, a 25% sample was analyzed (Smith 1973:22-23). The materials recovered from the massive excavations for the testing of the levee and the excavation of the palisade were not studied (Smith 1973:9). Therefore, "The ceramic analysis of the excavation units consisted of 9 of Ford's Excavations and 8 of Willey's Pits" (Smith 1973:25), which are listed below.
Excavation Units From Which Ceramics Were Analyzed By FSU in 1973

Ford's Excavation Units

1. Excavation 1, Village Site 1, 100' x 100' unit, to 40" below surface, 25% sample
2. Excavation 3, 10' x 10' unit, 8 sections (levels) to 37" below surface
3. Excavation 4, 10' x 10' unit, 12 sections (levels) to 49" below surface
4. Excavation 5, 10' x 10' unit, 10 sections (levels) to 37 1/2" below surface
5. Excavation 6, 10' x 10' unit, 7 sections (levels) to 28" below surface
6. Excavation 7, 10' x 10' unit, 8 sections (levels) to 29" below surface
7. Excavation 8, 10' x 10' unit, 5 sections (levels) to 25" below surface
8. Excavation 9, 10' x 10' unit, 7 sections (levels) to 31" below surface
9. Excavation 10, 10' x 10' unit, 9 sections (levels) to 36 " below surface

Willey's Excavation Units

10. Pit 1, 10' x 10' unit, 1 level (0) to 12" below surface
11. Pit 2, 10' x 10' unit, 1 level (0) to 23 " below surface
12. Pit 3, 10' x 10' unit, 7 levels to 27" below surface
13. Pit 5, 10' x 10' unit, 7 levels to 32 " below surface
14. Pit 6, 10' x 10' unit, 7 levels to 29" below surface
15. Pit 7, 10' x 10' unit, 8 levels to 28" below surface
16. Pit 8, 10' x 10' unit, 7 levels to 29" below surface
17. Pit 16, 10' x 10' unit, 12 levels to 43" below surface
"Two of these units had represented a large number of sherds and seemed relatively undisturbed. In an attempt to discover temporal changes at Lamar these two samples, [Ford's] Excavation 5 and [Willey's] Pit 16, [were] used as being the most reliable" (Smith 1973:25).

From the subsequent analysis of the ceramics, comparisons of intrasite relationships were drawn. For instance, a late Archaic component was represented in 6 of the 17 squares studied, where "Excavations 6, 7, and 9 contained fiber-tempered ceramics... South of Mound "A" Pits 3, 5, and 7 form a 'triangle of Archaic activity" (Smith 1973:35). "The presence of Stallings Island ceramic types indicate a late Archaic occupation. Several squares have high lithic concentrations without fiber temper ceramics in association suggesting some pre-ceramic habitation" (Smith 1973:108).

Elsewhere, in considering activity/use patterning, it was concluded that

The small quantity of materials in Pits 1 and 2 and Excavation 3 shows that there was little domestic activity in the western end of the site near the palisade ... compared to the relative quality of material in Pits 5 and 6 and Excavations 8 and 9, there was a greater amount of activity in the southern and northeastern end of the site near the palisade wall.

(Smith 1973:35)

Another intrasite relationship is made where "Excavation 5 and Pits 7, 8, and 16 when viewed from a standpoint of late ceramics (i.e. Ocmulgee Fields and Walnut Roughened) correspond to V.S. [Village Site] 1 in time as well as space" (Smith 1973:34).

Although it had been stated earlier in the above report that ..."it cannot be determined with any certainty the extent to which various sections of Mound A were involved" (1973:9), and further, "Due to the poor provenience of the artifactual remains from the mound they could not be properly studied and we can thus not try to use the location of different pottery treatments in a vertical sense to document different temporal relationships for stages or mantles of Mound A" (1973:12), it is nevertheless stated in the Summary that "Ceramic indications are that Mound 'A' was constructed exclusively within the Lamar time period" (1973:108). "The appearance of Etowah II trade wares and Savannah designs suggests a beginning date for mound construction at about AD 1200" (Smith 1973:108). When comparing the high percentage of Ocmulgee Fields Incised on Mound A in relation to Excavation 1, the Village Site, it was indicated that "there was probably mound building into the period of indirect European contact" (Smith 1973: 35), while the presence of European materials "indicate a terminus of occupation at approximately 1750" (Smith 1973:108).
Finally, in summing up the features noted in the village area and Mound A which seemed to point to the final days of the Lamar site, the statements ring of a tragic end.

From all available evidence it would seem that the burned areas noted in the field logs indicate that the Lamar Site was attacked and destroyed by fire... This evidence of burning coupled with other burned areas in the village site leads to the possibility that the Lamar site was sacked at least once... Mound 'A' contains a high quantity of burials in relation to other Southeastern temple mounds... In some ways the burials indicate that the group may have been suffering from an epidemic of some sort and the people were dying too rapidly for 'proper' burial.

(Smith 1973:108-109)

In a comparison of eight sites throughout central Georgia and using the materials recovered from Gordon Willey's general Stratigraphic Survey (except for one site which utilized only Kelly's 1938 materials), Christopher Hamilton, in his 1977 Florida State University Master's Thesis in Anthropology, ran a series of Statistical analyses between the various sites in order to try and determine the development of Lamar period ceramics in central Georgia (Hamilton 1977:14, Walker 1989:47). From the Lamar type site he utilized the material recovered from Gordon Willey's later Stratigraphic Survey "A" series, which were the "pits" numbered 1A through 4A, and included Special Unit 9 as well (Hamilton 1977:46).

The problem addressed in the thesis stemmed from the 1938 report by A.R. Kelly wherein he stated that Lamar Bold Incised decreased in percentage as one measured from top to bottom in the soil column (Kelly 1938:49), and therefore the task was to "show conclusive evidence that Lamar Bold Incised does, in fact, exhibit an increase in percentage as we move forward in time during the Lamar period in Georgia (Hamilton 1977:55). In a statistical comparison of the two most common ceramic designs evident on the sites for the Lamar period, Lamar Complicated Stamp and Lamar Bold Incised, Hamilton noted a significant "hiatus between the two sites with ceremonial structures, Lamar and Stubbs, versus the rest of the sites which are village sites" (Hamilton 1977:63).

Also, in comparing the designs and frequency in time with their generally associated vessel types (Lamar Complicated Stamp with conoidal to globular jars and Lamar Bold Incised with the casuela form), and following the premise put forward by Ralph Linton between a semi-nomadic subsistence trait of open-fire boiling jars and the more sedentary cooking over coals with casuela style bowls, Hamilton conjectured "What we might be witnessing in this statistical picture of Lamar ceramic
development in central Georgia is the gradual replacement by agriculture of an economy based on hunting and gathering" (Hamilton 1977:69-70).

1984


1988

In response to observed impacts of animal disturbance and vandalism at the Lamar mounds, installation of protective fences around the two mounds was proposed. Prior to installation of the fences, Beth Horvath of the National Park Service's Southeast Archeological Center carried out shovel tests of the perimeters of the two mounds in November of 1988. Twenty-five shovel tests at 20-meter intervals were dug around the two mounds. Later that same month, Horvath and crew returned to monitor the post-holes for the fence installation as they were augered. These were 9 inch auger holes dug to a depth of 2 to 2.5 feet. A 5-gallon sample of soil was taken from each post hole and water screened, with a total of 120 post holes sampled around the two mounds. A report on the results of the sampling analysis is pending under SEAC Accession file 815.
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Key to Photo Series

01 = aerial photos  06 = microfilm
02 = 35mm negatives  07 = color slides
03 = 35mm negatives  08 = computer tapes
04 = oversize negatives  09 = computer disks
05 = 35mm negatives

Accession 125

Volume 1:  06-053-148
Engineer Book 18/
"Lamar Mound 2Bi7". (Indian Mounds, Lamar Group)

Volume 2:  06-053-149
-F.C. Etheridge
Sketches of Lamar.
-J. Jackson
Sketches of Burials.
=Photos; #54,59,142-145.

Volume 3:  06-053-150
WPA 62
-James Ford
Notes: Mound A.
-Cawthorne
Notes: Village Site

Volume 4:  06-053-151
WPA 95
-Gordon Willey
Stratigraphic Survey Bibb #2:
Lamar Village & Mounds.
August 5-18, 1937
Volume 5: 06-053-152
WPA 120
Lamar Series Photos.

Volume 6: 06-053-153
WPA 121
Lamar Series Photos.

Volume 7: 06-053-157
Village Site, Lamar Group: =profiles.
=excavation plans.

Volume 8: 06-053-155
WPA 133
Lamar Bibb #2: Sherd Analysis Tables.

Volume 9: 06-053-156
-Hale G. Smith
"Analysis of the Lamar Site Materials at
the Southeast Archaeological Center."
1973

Volume 10: 06-053-1205
-Karl Schmitt
"A Dated Silt Deposit in the Ocmulgee River Valley."
1942

-Charles H. Fairbanks
"A Fort 400 Years Old, The Lamar Palisade Town."
1941

-Jesse D. Jennings
"Recent Excavations at the Lamar Site.
Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia."
1939

=Annual Meeting of the Society for Georgia Archaeology.
April 1939

Volume 11: 06-053-1279
-A.R. Kelly
"Lamar & Related Site Exploration in Georgia."
Volume 12: 06-053-1280
=job applications.
=completion records.
=associated correspondence.

Volume 13: 06-053-1281
Report Related Materials:

-C.H. Fairbanks Lamar Palisades.
=typed Field Notes.
=Sherd Finds Sent Out.
=Lamar Soil Analysis.
=Engineering Laboratory.
=Ethnobotanical Identification.
=Lamar Research.
=Lamar Burials.
=Lamar Levee Plans.
=Photos, Pit & Trench Information.

Volume 14: -H.G. Smith (ed.)
Drafts & Notes from Report (see Vol. 9).

Volume 15: 06-053-1285
-Louis Daniel Tesar
Drawings.
=photos from 1974 report.

Volume 16: 06-053-1286
Computer Analysis Printouts.
from 1974 Report

Volume 17: 06-053-1386
Pottery sent to West at Central City Park
Catalog record
Finds list

Volume 18: 06-053-1476
Photos 1-121

Volume 19: 06-053-1412
Miscellaneous notes
Volume 20: 06-053-1592
Willey's stratigraphic survey notes (includes profiles, finds list, sherd location plots, and analysis sheets)

Volume 21: 06-053-1792
Lamar Symposium Transcript

Accession 215

Volume 1: 06-053-692
WPA 17
Lamar Site 2Bi11:
=Daily Log.
=June 17 to October 7, 1938
=profiles, maps, field specimen data sheets (1 to 169).

Volume 2: 06-053-225
WPA 17A
Lamar Site 2Bi11:
=Daily Log.
=October 10 to December 19, 1938
=profiles, maps.
=Photographic data sheets (1600 to 1631).
=Field Specimen data sheets (170 to 396).

Volume 3: 06-053-226
WPA 56
2Bi7:
=Daily Log.
=December 21, 1938 to February 13, 1939
=Field Specimen data sheets (397 to 563).

=Paper for the Society for Georgia Archaeology.
=April 14, 1939

=Blueprints:
profiles
map of Lamar Tract
feature plot summary of types
probable flood occurrence
Volume 4: 06-053-227
WPA 57
2Bi11 Lamar:
=Profiles and Notes.

Volume 5: 06-053-228
WPA 91
2Bi11 Lamar Village Site:
=Daily Log.
February 16 to December 22, 1939
=maps.
=Field Specimen Data sheets (537 to 630).

Volume 6: 06-053-229
WPA 17
Lamar Village Daily Log.
June 17 to December 19, 1938

Volume 7: 06-053-230
WPA 134
Lamar Village Site 2Bi11:
=Daily Log.
January 2 to June 11, 1940
=F.S. Data Sheets (631 to 882).
=maps, profiles.

Volume 8: 06-053-231
WPA 135
Engineer Book/
Lamar Mound A Survey Data.

Volume 9: 06-053-232
WPA 148
2Bi11:
=Field Specimen Data sheets 925 to 1084).
=Daily Log.
August 7, 1940 to October 20, 1941

-Schmitt
"Summary of Excavations at South Sections of Levee."

=profiles.

53
Volume 10: 06-053-233
"1938 Lamar Site Find and Pit Catalogue."

Volume 11: 06-053-234
Engineer Book/
Daily Log.
October 10 to October 20, 1941

Volume 12: 06-053-235
Engineer Book/
"Profile Records of Lamar Village Site."

Volume 13: 06-053-236
Engineer Book/
"Reference Book of B.M.'s at Different Sites:
=Lamar
=Museum
=Gravel pit
=Mound D & S.R.R. near Lamar."

Volume 14: 06-053-1163
2Bi11: Note Cards (5x8)
=Feature and Location.

See also: Accession 125, Volume 9: Analysis of the Lamar Site.
Accession 255, Volume 2.

Accession 548

Volume 1: 06-053-983
WPA 128
Publicity Series Photos.

Volume 2: 06-053-984
WPA 127
Photo Series: =Publicity
=Central City Park
=Napier
=Horse Shoe Bend
=Ft. Hawkins
=Adkins Mound
=Dunlap
=Mossy Oak
Volume 3:  06-053-985
WPA 151
OCMU Photo Series:  =Construction
=Scenic
=Special Exhibit
=Lamar
=Trail
=Curb
=Museum
=Road
=Entrance Road

Volume 4:  06-053-986
WPA 130
Sherd Analysis Tables.

Volume 5:  06-053-987, 06-070-1376
WPA 118
Mile Track Extension: Flint Plantation Study; notes

Volume 6:  06-053-988
WPA 124
Collections by Counties.

Volume 7:  06-053-989
WPA 125
Alabama & Georgia: Site Survey Forms.
1934 to 1940

Volume 8:  06-053-990
WPA 164
=Pottery Classification Forms:  =Macon Complex
=Ocmulgee Fields
=Swift Creek
=Lamar
=Unknown

=Shell Rock Cave: Notes and Finds List.

Volume 9:  06-053-991
WPA 165
=District #3: Cataloging Indian Mound Relics.
-John West, Supervisor
Daily Work Reports.
Volume 10: 06-053-992
WPA 161
Pottery Analysis Drawings and Codes.

Volume 11: 06-053-993
=Explanations of Record Keeping Systems:
  =Photos
  =Artifacts, Vessels, Conservation
  =Sites
  =Acquisitions
  =Mapping
  =Georgia Counties
  =etc.
=Engineering Data:
  =Mound C & Village Site
  =Mound D Plateau & Mound D Staking
  =Middle or Central Plateau
  =Brown's Mount
  =Stubbs Mound
  =Swift Creek: Mound A & Village Site
  =Mile Track Extension: Central City Park
  =Adkins Mound
  =McDougal Mound
  =Shell Rock Cave
  =Deer Park Extension: Central City Park
  =Indian Mound Project (Lamar group)
  =Kasita
  =Key to Cataloging Indian Mound Relics (to Sept. 15, 1938).
-Griffin & A.R. Kelly
set up classification code

Volume 12: 06-053-1011
WPA Photo Series Index: =Series File
  =Missing & Damaged
  =Descriptions

Volume 13: 06-053-1025
Monthly Reports of Archaeological Activity.
January 29 to August 54
Volume 14:  06-053-1128
-Christopher Everett Hamilton
Development of Lamar Period Ceramics in Central Georgia.
March 1977 (Florida State University Thesis)

Volume 15:  06-053-1129
-A.R. Kelly
Glimpses of a Macon Chronology; A Statement of Progress at the End of Three Years of Field Work.
1941? (3rd draft of MSS)

Volume 16:  06-053-1546
-John W. Walker
Known Archaeological Sites in the Vicinity of Macon, Georgia.
1971

Volume 17:  06-020-1197
-C.H. Fairbanks
"Quarterly Report of Work Accomplished by Works Projects Administration No. 5551 from January 1 to April 1, 1941."
="Material Sent to Dr. A.R. Kelly." (file).
="Photographs" (file).
="Aerial Photographs" (file).

Volume 18:  06-070-1377
Unidentified burials catalog record
Miscellaneous survey catalog record:
- Neisler Farm Byronville Golf Links
- Kirksey Farm Tarver's Place
- Cowarts Landing Turkey Creek
- Red Bluff Bullards Bluff
- Tobesofkee Johnson Bluff
- Stubbs Mund Hartford Mound
- Gum Creek

Volume 19:  06-070-1397
Willey's Survey catalog record
Volume 20: 06-053-1398
Misc. Ocmulgee records
  Elevations - Village Site E Annex Moat
  Misc. ceramic notes
  Misc. work notes
  Employee and equipment information
  Site/Box inventories

Volume 21: 06-053-1405
Kelly's notes and analysis notes

Volume 22: 060-053-1413
Provenience guide (?) by level and site: West Plateau Survey

Volume 23: 06-070-1419
Ten Mile Walk profiles and notes

Volume 24: 06-070-1420
General misc. material from various unknown sites (mysteries)

Volume 25: 06-053-1414
Misc. OCMU material
  Middle Plateau catalog list
  Mound A misc. notes
  Find sheets
  Semi-monthly reports

Volume 26: 06-053-1415
OCMU specimen catalog and stratigraphic forms:
  Middle Plateau East

Volume 27: 06-070-1421
Ceramic notes (key to all analysis) and curatorial methods (Filing Systems, Central Archeological Lab, Alabama) 1938

Volume 28: 06-070-1422
Correspondence
Volume 29: 06-070-1423
Daily reports: May 17 - December 16, 1937; December 21, 1937 to December 16, 1938
Labor reports; 2-6-38 to 1-5-39
Semi-monthly labor reports; December 21, 1937 to December 21, 1938
Reports on workers sent to E.R.A. on June 15, 1938, 6-6 to 7-7-38

Volume 30: 06-070-1424
Artifact and reconstruction drawings (in metal file drawers and flat map case)

Volume 31: 06-070-1425
Miscellaneous newspaper articles related to CWA/WPA excavations (in flat map case)

Volume 32: (do not microfilm)
Glass plate negatives (see lists in Acc. file for descriptions)
Color Lantern Slides (stereo), excavations at Macon

Accession 815
Beth Horvath, SEAC
Shovel and auger testing around Mounds A and B, Lamar Unit, prior to erection of protective fencing.
In progress.
### Auxiliary Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Map Title/Description</th>
<th>Drawn By/Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>363-A008</td>
<td>Lamar Mounds Levee Index - 15 Sheets</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1938 OCMU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Park Area Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing # &amp; Park</th>
<th>Map Title/Description</th>
<th>Drawn By/Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Acc #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82,022 363</td>
<td>Lamar House #1</td>
<td>Ford/Willey/ Kelly</td>
<td>1935 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,029 363</td>
<td>Lamar Mound Key Map</td>
<td>J. Tamplin</td>
<td>1930 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,030 363</td>
<td>Mound A Lamar Profile - 3</td>
<td>WPA</td>
<td>1930 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,031 363</td>
<td>Lamar Mounds Key Map</td>
<td>J. Tamplin</td>
<td>1938 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,032 363</td>
<td>Lamar Mounds/Village Site Detail Map</td>
<td>L. Sessions</td>
<td>1930 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,033 363</td>
<td>Lamar Palisades</td>
<td>WPA</td>
<td>1942 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,034 363</td>
<td>Lamar Mounds Key Map</td>
<td>L. Sessions</td>
<td>1940 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,035 363</td>
<td>Lamar Mound Key Map</td>
<td>L. Sessions</td>
<td>1930 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,036 363</td>
<td>Lamar Mounds - 2</td>
<td>W. Oliff</td>
<td>1934 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,604 363</td>
<td>Key Map Lamar Village Site</td>
<td>L. Sessions</td>
<td>1930 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,632 363</td>
<td>Lamar Prof - Mound A St. 1-1601</td>
<td>WPA</td>
<td>1930 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,640 363</td>
<td>Lamar Prof - Mound A St. 760-752</td>
<td>SEAC</td>
<td>1984 0125</td>
<td>OCMU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Smithsonian Institution Collections

Artifacts

At the Smithsonian Institution there are a number of artifact collections for WPA excavations carried out from 1934-1941. Among these are sets of material recovered from the Lamar site. These are curated under the following U.S. National Museum Catalog Numbers: 385595; 385596; 385597; and 385598.

Skeletal Material

Skeletal material from the Lamar site, other than that curated at the Southeast Archeological Center (see Appendix A), is at the Smithsonian Institution and listed under the following U.S. National Catalog Numbers:

385914
385915
385916
385917
385918
385919
385920
385921
385922
385923
385924
385925
385926
385927
385928
385929
385930
385931
385932
385932A
ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH TO DATE

FORD'S 1934 EXCAVATIONS

General Problems

There are several problems with the overall results of James Ford's work from 1934. These are both general and specific and relate to the applicability of the data as recorded to more recent research studies. The general problems were enumerated by Stephen Deutschle in Smith (1973:7), as a result of efforts employed in analyses of the Lamar materials by FSU in 1973.

The following is a limited sample of the problems encountered in the field notes:

1. Descriptions of the individual excavation units are too general and vague;
2. The map of the excavations have more units plotted than are contained in the notes;
3. Typographical errors were overlooked in critical areas such as stake numbers and coordinates for the location of excavation units (in one case it appears that the map [map, sic] was made from one part of the field notes and one 10' by 10' excavation was plotted accordingly, yet in another part of the notes the same unit was given its coordinates on the grid system and discussed in such a manner that there was no doubt that it really should have been plotted 400 feet to the north and 410 feet to the east);
4. None of the profiles for the village area can be located in the Park Service files; and
5. There is only limited discussion of the various soil types encountered during the excavation.

Other general problems (these noted with the collections) in 1973 included the following:

For example, faunal remains were collected but not consistently throughout the site as was the case with botanical material. Therefore, we cannot say much about the subsistence patterns for these people. [...] In many cases the artifact cards have no recorded provenience or excavation unit. Some of the artifacts have had their catalog numbers
changed and these could not be tied in with the old system. A significant number of complete vessels, pipes, etc., were not available for study. Some of these are now located at other institutions; others are listed as simply "missing". (Deutschle, in Smith 1973:6)

Re-establishment of the Base Line Grid

Many of the problems concerning the map, provenience, and location of excavation units are directly related to the fact that the projected Base Line System established by Ford has yet to be definitively relocated. Present locational data are taken from the map traced by L.K. Sessions, dated 1940. The original 1934 grid was based on magnetic north (of that year), with the X-Y grid lines intersecting at a point to the southeast of Mound A. A concrete slab benchmark was located 200 feet west of the intersection along the east-west grid baseline, and then 18 inches south. To definitively re-establish Ford’s grid this concrete marker should be relocated. This could be accomplished with a metal detector if the slab contained iron reinforcing bars ("rebar"), and if it is still in place. Another method of re-establishing the grid (though somewhat problematical) would be to open one of Ford’s known units, establish a corner and two walls, and project the grid from there. Until such time as Ford’s grid can be definitively re-established however, the data from his field investigations cannot be confidently matched with current provenience information.

Mound A Excavations

The field notes for the excavations of Mound "A" are most inadequate: they total approximately 1296 words. The difficulties involved in using them to determine anything about the mound are compounded by numerous mistakes in stake designations and directions of the compass. Nowhere is there a good description of the overall plan for the work on the mound. On the original map most of the mound had been staked off but only a portion of it was actually investigated. From the notes and profiles it can not be determined with any certainty the extent to which various sections of Mound "A" were involved. (Deutschle in Smith 1973:9)

Though the above is stated somewhat strongly (since a number of these problems are solvable) suffice it to say that there is some difficulty in determining the location of the 1934 archeological investigation’s impact to Mound A. The re-establishment of the Base Line Grid however would provide a basis on which to make comparisons with stake designations as outlined in Ford’s notes. This, coupled with digitization of known landmarks from aerial photos, can also help to re-establish the location of the mound excavations.
The "house evidence" described by Ford during the trenching on the east side of Mound A was not described adequately at that time, and this should be kept in mind for future investigations in that area. Again, relocation of this particular house floor will depend upon re-establishment of the base line system above. The value of further assessing this particular feature is that, since it was encountered below what has been termed "the feathery edge" of the mound, it would suggest evidence to support the idea that, "Apparently part of the Lamar mound was built over the Lamar village" (Deutschle, quoted in Williams 1989:13).

Burials

The burials located by Ford were not analyzed and their provenience information is minimal. Though the analysis (and cataloguing) of some of the human remains is being remedied somewhat through a current cooperative agreement with Florida State University's Department of Anthropology, the lack of detailed provenience can only be attributable to field methodology. Granted, the research orientation for Ford's work was mostly concerned with the exposure of features and house sites; however, the informational value and impermanent nature of the burials should have required more substantial and complete record-keeping. This is also true for the "log tomb", or "burial in a timber lined grave", which was noted among other features that were "simply mentioned as having been encountered" (Deutschle, quoted in Williams 1989:13).

Maps and Notes Missing or Destroyed

Finally, a number of maps and profiles were reportedly destroyed by a rainstorm which came through the roof of the old dormitory at Wesleyan College, which was used as a field laboratory by Ford and his workers (Kelly, quoted in Williams 1989:14). Not recognized as having been lost until 1973, these maps and profiles were never recovered, repaired, or reconstructed.

WILLEY'S 1937 STRATIGRAPHIC PITS

General

Gordon Willey's 1937 investigations at Lamar are generally considered to be excellent work. His stratigraphic records and profiles are very good and this detailed recording of provenience is reflected onto the artifact catalog cards, thus making overall correlations a straightforward task.
Draft Report

It should be noted that there is a draft report on the stratigraphic testing which he carried out at Lamar. Unfortunately, this draft report (SEAC ACC 125, Vol 4), dealing only with the Lamar testing and not the larger comparative stratigraphic study which he carried out in the Ocmulgee basin, has not been published, and this should be considered a major omission in interpreting the site. One reason for a lack of interpretation based on the draft report was due to the lack of an overall site map which gave the location of Willey's "pits". To date this has been corrected only in part, where a small single-page and hastily sketched map is included in the Accession folder with the report. This is believed to be the "excavation map" provided by Dr. Willey to the FSU/NPS team which carried out the analysis of some of the Lamar materials in 1973 (Smith 1973:ii, 4, 6). The map lacks certain details however, that would be necessary to make it definitively correlative to either the 1937 Base Line Grid, or the 1938 grid system.

1938-1940 LEVEE AND PALISADE EXCAVATIONS

The Levee Investigation

The establishment of the 1938 overlay, or grid system, in anticipation of the levee construction, was a marked improvement in controlling provenience at Lamar. The levee investigations were carried out rather quickly as an archeological clearance project, and although features were noted and investigated, "it was not considered at any stage a thorough excavation program" (Jennings 1939:46). Fairbanks' notes and profiles are adequately detailed and in very good shape however, and, if studied in conjunction with Willey's stratigraphic study notes, can provide an excellent subsurface record of the area. Unfortunately, the notes by Fairbanks (contained in draft form in SEAC ACC 548, Vol 11) give no summary conclusions. In effect, they are a rich source of data waiting to be analyzed, synthesized, and published. They are spread over three Accessions and should be considered within the larger problem of sorting the various WPA/OCMU/Lamar field notes and other records.

Section 106 Compliance

The levee work was significant in that it did not impact the village proper, and provided a diachronic view of the ground-building processes surrounding the perimeter of the site. Early pottery types were also encountered, evidence of earlier, though more sporadic, occupations. The primary function of the levee testing, and later, the parking lot testing, (i.e., to clear these areas for construction), must be re-evaluated in light of current standards for Section 106 compliance. Therefore, the
data contained in the notes should be analyzed with an eye to modern compliance requirements, and any proposed reconstruction of the levee may require further testing.

The Palisade Investigation

The Palisade, discovered during the levee testing, and excavated through 1939 and 1940, comprised a curious investigation problem, since it was involved with recording a known disturbed context (the palisade construction and repair trenches). Features discovered during the investigation were explored adequately, and numbers of cross-sectional stratigraphic blocks were cut and excavated by arbitrary levels. Documentation was exceptional, although as before with Willey and Ford, an overall report was never published from the voluminous data collected. The only article published by Fairbanks on this work, which contained summary results only, was the 1940 article in the *Proceedings of the Society for Georgia Archeology*. The argument herein is not to criticize the quality of the work carried out in the levee and palisade excavations, but rather to re-state the obvious: the quality of the work being very good and thorough, albeit by 1939-40 standards, and considering the lack of a published synthesis, the interested graduate student or involved professional has an opportunity to make a significant contribution from the data collected. With today's technology, these data can provide new, substantive, and meaningful results.

THE 1973 FSU ANALYSIS OF THE LAMAR SITE MATERIALS

General

"The analysis here presented could be classified as laboratory salvage archaeology" (Smith 1973:i).

The initial plans for this project were theoretical and included a study of the position of "Lamar" in the archaeology of the Southeastern United States. Upon getting into the collections and field notes, however, it was found that practically all of the plans had to be either abandoned or drastically modified. Thus, this report does not meet our expectations nor does it satisfy what might be considered the current standards for archaeological reporting in 1973. (Deutschle in Smith 1973:5-6)
As can be seen from the above, the 1973 FSU/NPS contract for analysis of the Lamar materials was undertaken with a great deal of high hopes, yet ended with less-than-expected results. Part of the problem began with the choice of samples to be analyzed. Since the entire collection from all previous work was too large to handle, the choice was made to sample material by investigator. Ford’s excavations were chosen first as they represented both Mound A and the village, or “random distribution within the site” (Penman in Smith 1973:22). But once involved with the analysis they began having some difficulty with the provenience as recorded by Ford, so that “By the time the situation was grasped too much very limited time had been invested to permit a switch to one of the other collections” (Deutschle in Smith 1973:8). Willey’s stratigraphic pit excavations, although done in excellent detail, were not chosen due to not having the site map for placement of the 20 pits. Later, the site map and notes were received from Willey, and ceramics from 8 of his 20 pits were analyzed.

The massive excavations for the construction of the levee were not studied for various reasons. Foremost among these were the time limitations and the fact that some of the material would have been recovered from a necessarily disturbed context.

(Deutschle in Smith 1973:9)

The fact that Ford’s Mound A materials were also from a disturbed context (fill for mound construction) was apparently not considered, except to state:

Due to the poor provenience of the artifactual remains from the mound they could not be properly studied and we can thus not try to use the location of different pottery treatments in a vertical sense to document different temporal relationships for stages or mantles of Mound A.

(Deutschle in Smith 1973:12)

Ceramic Analysis

"The dating of the Lamar Site in this report leans heavily on ceramic types and their temporal relationship to other sites in the Southeast" (Smith 1973:108).

In the ceramic analysis of the Lamar Site 24,261 sherds were handled [sic] as a "surface collection". This material either had no provenience, the location had been lost, or was actually collected as a general surface collection. This quantity of material was used in the hope that, even though temporal data could not be attained, a high number of possible attributes could be realized... [italics supplied]

(Penman in Smith 1973:19)
The "surface" collection was actually all of Ford's excavated material for which no provenience could be determined, and this was estimated to be about 90% of all the unprovenienced material from the Lamar site (Penman in Smith 1973:23). Along with these unprovenienced materials, "The ceramic analysis of the excavation units [italics supplied] consisted of nine of Ford's Excavations and eight of Willey's Pits" (Penman in Smith 1973:22).

In every case but one, data shown for excavation units represents the total sample, the exception being Village Site [Ford's] Excavation 1. In the case of Village Site 1 (V.S. 1) approximately 25% of the material recovered is represented...

(Penman in Smith 1973:22-23)

Two units, Ford's Excavation 5 and Willey's Pit 16, contained a large number of sherds, appeared undisturbed, and had been dug in comparative levels. Considered the most reliable, they were used "in an attempt to discover temporal changes at Lamar" (Penman in Smith 1973:25). In this endeavor it appears they were unsuccessful, at least as far as the site type ceramic, Lamar Bold Incised, might be concerned:

As to the temporal placement of Lamar Bold Incised it cannot be said with regard to the pits analyzed [sic] in this report that there is an obvious evolutionary sequence present at the Lamar Site. In Kelley's [sic] report (1938:48) he saw Lamar Bold Incised as being at peak development in view of the data recovered by Ford. However, after the work by Willey the consensus [sic] was that Lamar Bold Incised could be seen evolving while stamping became more decadent (Kelley 1938:48-49). It should be pointed out that present findings which are in contradiction to Kelley's could be due to sampling error. [italics supplied] Kelley (1938:48) notes that 10 of the first 20 of the squares dug by Willey were undisturbed. In all 24 units were excavated by Willey and the present study has dealt with only one third of the total. In Pit 16, which was apparently undisturbed, there is no evidence of the obvious development of Lamar Bold Incised and further its decrease or disappearance in lower levels which Kelley mentions (1938:49) can not be observed when viewed in relationship to the quantity of stamped sherds in corresponding levels. Therefore with these factors and the placement of Lamar into the protohistoric period it would be best to assume that Kelley's original statement with regard to Lamar Bold incised as [is, sic] correct. It is hoped that future research on the 1937 materials will produce conclusive evidence to clarify the doubt resulting from the sample site examined in this report. [italics supplied].

(Penman in Smith 1973:39)
Radiocarbon Dates

In an attempt to date the house a sample of carbonized material was submitted to the laboratory at the University of Georgia; for technical reasons it was rejected. We are thus left with only the cultural materials upon which to establish the dates for the Lamar site.

(Deutschle in Smith 1973:18)

To date, there are no radiocarbon dates for the Lamar site.
RESEARCH POTENTIAL

There are several factors which significantly contribute to the future research potential for the Lamar site. The Lamar site has been the focus of three major archeological excavations (Ford, Willey, and Jennings/Fairbanks). Because these excavations were done in the 1930s and 1940s, the information gathered from them served as the basis for many ceramic type descriptions and cultural phase definitions. It is also fairly clear from this work that the Lamar site was an important urban center during the time of its major occupation (Late Mississippian period). Another factor which contributes to the significance of the site, is the suggestion by Hudson, Smith and DePratter (1984) that Lamar may be the site of the main town of the province of Ichisi visited by De Soto during his exploration of the southeast.

The major limiting factor for the research potential for the site is the condition of the collections. The collections for the Lamar site are now at least fifty years old. None of the collections conform yet to present standards for storage or documentation. Unfortunately, most of the information about the overall condition of the collections is not well documented. There are reports of a water damage caused by a leaky roof, which occurred in the basement of the Wesleyan College dormitory. The dormitory was serving as the lab for the Lamar workers at that time. Kelly reported that most of the profiles from Mound A were being drafted when the deluge occurred and that they may have been destroyed at that time. Kelly also reported that the artifacts from Ford’s work were stored in shoe boxes on wooden racks in the basement and that some of the racks were knocked over, spilling the boxes and potentially compromising the provenience control for some of the material (Kelly in Williams 1989:14,25) However, there is no documentation as to which of the artifacts may have been affected and which are still usable. Also, the 1973 report by Hale Smith describes some other problems with Ford’s work such as missing provenience information on the catalog cards, unlabeled or missing profile maps and poor fieldnotes. There has been no documented attempt to reorganize all of the materials from Ford’s excavations. Rumors that the Lamar collections had been high-graded were confirmed by John Penman, now with the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, in a letter (10/8/90) where he states “I believe that approximately 30% of the ceramics from the ‘Village’ and Mound excavations were discarded. Hale Smith used some of these as driveway fill at his home. I used some to fill the potholes in my sidewalk at 32 F.S.U. Trailer Park. I do not know whether we obtained all of the discarded collection”. No one however, has ever made a list of exactly what was disposed of or where it came from, although a number of the WPA-era catalog cards for plain sherd lots from Ford’s work are marked “Discarded” and this is presumed to be from the 1973 FSU analysis.
There are similar problems reported for the collections from Willey's and Fairbanks' work. The lack of a key map for Willey's work seems to be a major problem. There are Key Maps of the work at Lamar in the collections. One was drawn in 1940 by L.K. Sessions (Key Map of Lamar Mounds [SEAC Map 363-82,034]) and the other was done in 1938 by J. Tamplin (Lamar Mounds [SEAC Map 363-031]). On the Sessions map, all of the excavations were eventually plotted on the map, although only Ford's work was plotted by Sessions. However, in the case of Willey's work, there are major discrepancies between the map and Willey's fieldnotes as to where the units are located. It is not clear exactly who plotted the excavations on the maps since some are in ink and some are in pencil. Some of these maps were redrawn for the 1973 FSU analysis contract.

It seems clear that the collections from Lamar have not fared well over the last fifty years. It would be irresponsible to try to assess the usefulness or research potential of the collections until their integrity can be determined. At some point these collections must be put back together, inventoried and assessed as to completeness and integrity. This sentiment was voiced by Kelly during the 1973 Lamar symposium:

...I do think that you have an obligation to extract everything you can out of [the collections] and I really think that you are going to get some useful information. I'm simply saying that it's going to be ... a frustrating experience and ... you'll feel like you have exerted a lot of effort and done a hell of a lot of work for the quantum of knowledge you get out of it, but I still think this is a necessary thing to do. Right now you need to go through those collections. As time goes by they get into even worse condition so you better get at it! (Kelly in Williams 1989:57).

One major task which must be accomplished is the re-microfilming of all of the original documents in the collections. These documents were microfilmed in the past but the quality of the microfilmed copies is so poor as to be considered unacceptable (see also Management Issues). Also of major concern is the questionable accuracy of the Key Maps as noted above. It should be possible to re-establish the grids set up over the Lamar site but it may be that the original datums must be relocated before this can be done (see also Chronological List of Archeological Research). Once the collections have been re-organized and assessed, the questions as to their usefulness can be answered in greater detail.

The Lamar site itself has the potential to answer many research questions concerning the Lamar period and the archeology of the Ocmulgee River area in general. Hale Smith included as an appendix in the 1973 report, an outline of suggested future research at the site (Smith 1973:131):
A. Excavation

1. Work in village and mounds to obtain a better view of the cultural developments

2. Intensive excavations in both mounds, to obtain temporal sequence and stages of mound construction. The spiral mound is unique and should be fully investigated.

3. Study of burials to obtain Paleopathological, Anthropometric, and social structure data. Also look for evidence of Lamar being an intrusive physical type.

4. Intensive excavations of areas outside palisade to determine the location of agricultural fields, borrow pits, and other house sites.

B. Collections at Southeastern [sic] Archeological Center

1. Follow up work of material which has not been analyzed in this report (about 25% of the collection is represented here). Analysis of material still in collection will confirm and/or reject hypotheses established in this report.

2. Levee and palisade excavations should be studied for density, spatial distribution and relationship of other cultural manifestations.

Recommendations for further work were also discussed during the Lamar symposium which took place at Florida State University in 1973. The tape recordings of this symposium were transcribed by Mark Williams and sent out in draft form in 1989. A recommendation to do more excavations in the village and mound areas was made by Stephen Deutschle, a Florida State University graduate student who worked on the report, and Frank Fryman, of Florida Archives and History. Apparently, Ford's excavations uncovered only one house site in its entirety, that being the Village Site One house (Williams 1989:52). Kelly suggested that the settlement patterns within the stockade line needed to be defined (Williams 1989:53). Due to the loss of the profile drawings from Mound A (the flood at Wesleyan College), Kelly and Deutschle both suggested that more work be done in and around both mounds to determine their time periods and construction phases. Kelly estimated that Ford actually excavated less that one quarter of Mound A (Kelly and Deutschle in Williams 1989:53).

While Hale Smith recommended intensive excavations in the village and mound areas, it may be more reasonable to consider some general testing over the whole site first. A systematic testing scheme may be the best way to determine both the full
extent of the village occupation as well as a preliminary idea of the settlement pattern found within the stockade line. A systematic approach would also insure that the area around Mound B would be investigated more thoroughly than it has been in the past. Mark Williams of the LAMAR Institute (1991:personal communication) has recommended the following investigative scope-of-work:

First, a better contour map of the site needs to be made. The 2 foot contour interval on existing ones is grossly too large. The interval should be no greater than 20 centimeters (ca. 6 inches). This may show the locations of low rises that may indicate the locations of previously unrecognized low house mounds.

Second, the site must be systematically and completely tested, probably by standardized-sized shovel tests, but perhaps by 1 by 1 meter units. The interval should be fairly small, about 15 to 20 meters. The ceramic data from such tests could be used to determine the distribution of the several components across the area of the site as defined by the levee. From this we can learn how the site increased and/or decreased in size through time, particularly within the Lamar period...

Third, a well-excavated (10 centimeter levels) test pit of at least 2 by 2 meters in size should be excavated to sterile soil in the garbage dumps at or just off the northeastern edge of both Mounds A and B. The existence of these dumps at the Lamar site, just as at most other Lamar period mound centers, was made clear to me for both mounds by my visit to the site when Horvath's 1989 work was in progress. The fact that Ford dug away much of Mound A's northeastern corner will make it more difficult to find an appropriate place there for this excavation, but I am certain a spot can be found. A pit can be placed on the edge of Mound B without interfering with its wonderful and unique spiral ramp. The reason for these two excavation pits is to determine the periods of occupation of the site and the sequence of the utilization of the mounds. This technique has worked well in many other Lamar sites in recent years, and should permit the gathering of trustworthy fine-scale ceramic data from the site.

A single 2 by 2 meter excavation pit, to a depth of perhaps only 30 cm should be excavated on the summit of both mounds to recover a ceramic sample form the summits. This will aid in determining when the mounds were last used. The pits should not be placed in the center, but closer to the mound summit edge to avoid any possible structural remains located on the summits.
Finally, a simple cross-section excavation of a small portion of the Mound B spiral ramp might be made to determine how this feature was constructed. This, as with the other minor excavations, must be properly reconstructed and stabilized after excavations are completed. The only time of the year to conduct the excavations at the site would be in late-summer through mid-fall, when the water table at the site is at its lowest.

I see no reason to open any large block excavations at the site in the near future, nor the excavation of any structures or burials there. The important thing about this site is its chronological information and its physical/temporal layout...

Both mounds will need some kind of testing in the future. Since Ford was the only one to work at Mound A and it is his collections that are reportedly in the worst shape, more information about this mound will probably need to be gathered. One question that was raised at the 1973 symposium concerned the age of the mounds. Ford reportedly found Lamar period village materials under Mound A. However in 1973 Smith was still unwilling to commit to a Lamar period construction for Mound A. This was probably due to the problems Smith found with Ford’s collections. Since no official archeological work has been conducted at Mound B, no attempt has been made to date it. Walker (1991:personal communication) has recommended that "In studying Mound B, the circular feature surrounding it [a slight rise] (which was described by Ford and is evident in early photographs) should be cross-sectioned, recorded, and perhaps even reconstructed."

Another research question suggested by Smith concerned a study of the skeletal materials excavated at Lamar. The Florida State University is currently analyzing all of the skeletal materials housed at SEAC. This collection includes some of the skeletal material recovered from Lamar. However, only a small portion of the Lamar skeletal material is currently housed at SEAC (see Appendix A for a list). Much, if not most, of the skeletal material is housed at the Smithsonian. If the collection is to be analyzed as a whole, then obviously the remains will have to be located and returned to SEAC or to Ocmulgee. The work on the SEAC materials being conducted by FSU will be done under the direction of Dr. Robert C. Dailey. The analysis will consist of taking osteometric measurements, determining age and sex when possible, and recording all pathologies. This work is expected to be completed by the end of 1991. Material at the Smithsonian will be analyzed and catalogued by that institution.

The final research question requiring excavations suggested by Smith involves work outside the park boundaries. Smith suggested that intensive excavations be done outside the palisaded area in order to locate agricultural fields, borrow pits, and
house sites. This issue was also addressed during the symposium (Deutchle, Morrell, Larson, and Walker in Williams 1989:55). Charles Fairbanks had suggested that there must be farm plots just outside the palisade that supported the population of the village (Fairbanks 1940:n.p.). During the symposium there was some discussion as to whether the food source for the village consisted of actual fields worked by the village inhabitants or if there were small farmsteads spread out around the village. This issue was not resolved during the symposium but Kelly suggested that the survey data needed to answer the question already existed. Kelly's suggestion was that Gordon Willey's CCC Mobile Survey should be able to provide the information necessary to determine the settlement patterns around the Lamar village site. This survey contains data on over 80 sites that Willey found in the Ocmulgee River basin. Kelly also suggested that the collections and notes from Willey's survey should be farmed out to several graduate students to work up as Masters Theses or Dissertations so the data could be published in a timely fashion (Kelly in Williams 1989:56).

Smith's recommendation for further artifact research concerned the collections from Fairbanks' levee and palisade work. This is the collection that is scheduled to be re-cataloged following the completion of Willey's collection. There are extensive fieldnotes for Fairbanks' work; however, they only contain information about how the trenches were excavated and on what days the work was done. There is no information as to what kind of materials were recovered from which areas and not all of the soil profiles were completed. In addition, there are numerous small errors in the sections which describe where the trenches were placed, and this has created problems in attempts at digitizing the palisade excavations onto a newer, more accurate computerized map. Fairbanks' crews moved an amazing amount of earth, yet his collection is the smallest as far as recovered artifacts are concerned. Also, most of Fairbanks' excavations took place outside of the palisade line and therefore outside of the Lamar village area proper. It is hoped that the collection is in good enough shape to get some areal and density information from the spoke-like excavation trenches perpendicular and outside the disturbed palisade trench. However, because these materials were recovered from the periphery of the site, their use in answering research questions about the village will be limited.

Aside from the shape of the collections, there are other reasons that new investigations at Lamar may be necessary. The most pressing reason will be the possible development of the Lamar unit for interpretative purposes. In order for any interpretive development to take place that will accommodate the general public, the levee should probably be reconstructed and the site cleared. Both of these operations will require section 106 clearance and it is clear that the work performed in the 1930s and 40s does not conform to today's standards of work. In addition, Historic Structures Reports will have to be prepared for both mounds if they are to be impacted by the development. It is not clear if enough information can be salvaged from Ford's collection to adequately prepare a HSR for Mound A. New excavations
may be required in order to determine the construction phases, function, and date of the mound. Since no data is available for Mound B, some investigation will be necessary to determine its construction phases, function, and age. Any investigations into the mounds should include radio-carbon dates. No C-14 dates exist for Lamar and it appears that any datable materials recovered from previous investigations have been conserved in such a way as to prevent them from being carbon dated (Fairbanks 1939:29). In addition to the lack of C-14 dates, archeological recovery techniques from the WPA days did not include such things as column samples to obtain faunal and pollen samples. These samples are necessary in order to reconstruct the diet and environment of past cultures.

Another possible research question which may be answered with further testing is the question of Lamar as the site of the main town of the province of Ichisi. For the past several years Charles Hudson, Marvin Smith and Chester DePratter have been working on reconstructing the route of Hernando De Soto on his journey through the southeastern United States from 1539 to 1543 (Hudson, Smith and DePratter 1984). Using new documents, maps of Indian trails, and old maps, Hudson, Smith and DePratter attempted to retrace De Soto’s route from Apalachee to Chiaha. In doing so, they suggested that the main town of the province of Ichisi which was visited by De Soto on April 1, 1540, was located on the Ocmulgee River (Hudson, Smith and DePratter 1984:70). The 1939 De Soto Commission’s route would have placed this town near Albany, Georgia, south-southwest (almost south) of the Macon/Ocmulgee area. While the new route for De Soto’s journey is far from certain, being able to find some of these towns archeologically would help refine the route. Unfortunately, De Soto stayed only one day at Ichisi (Hudson, Smith and DePratter 1984:70). Even if Lamar is the site of Ichisi, there is a only a minute chance that any archeological evidence would be left from such a short stay. However, Hudson, Smith and DePratter (1984:70) also pointed out that the name "Ichisi" sounds quite similar to "O-chesse-hatche" which is the eighteenth century Creek Indian name for the Ocmulgee River, "hatche" meaning "creek".

The name remained associated with the river in the form of Ocheese Creek (and other spellings) applied during the Ocmulgee Fields era. No town with a name similar to Ochisi / Ocheese moved to the Ocmulgee from the Chattahoochee, yet a town by that name was burned by the Spaniards during a raid on the Ocmulgee towns in 1695, and a town by that name moved to the Chattahoochee from the Ocmulgee after the Yamassee War (1715-16) when the other towns moved back. (Flowers 1990-1:personal communication)

Any new investigations conducted at Lamar should be done with a view toward answering research questions concerning the regional archeology of the Ocmulgee River Valley area. These questions should be formulated based on knowledge gained
from recent excavations in the area as well as data from the previous work done at Lamar. Some of the themes which may be applicable include a study of the architecture and settlement pattern within the village area; a study of the subsistence base of the Lamar people; investigations into the construction phases and functions of the mounds; and a study of Lamar as an urban center.
ARCHEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

In considering the issues which must be dealt with at the Lamar site, as only a part of the Ocmulgee National Monument, it seems appropriate to use the outline format in relation to that of a Resource Management Plan, as this will be readily adaptive to an overall RMP, and sets up an hierarchical management summary. The primary goals and objectives are to be reflected in major servicewide issues, and then each item will be discussed individually. Cultural resource codes will follow the systemwide issue codes outlined in the RMP Guidelines. If the issue has been identified in the draft RMP for the park, then the project statement number from the RMP will also be used.

1. Documentation Issues
   C01 Inadequate Planning Documents

   General Management Plan Update. Within the General Management Plan for Ocmulgee National Monument the Lamar Site unit should be addressed more adequately in light of an archeological synthesis of acquired information. Plans must be formulated for protection, development, interpretation, maintenance, research, and monitoring of known archeological contexts and features within the site boundaries.

   Development Concept Plan. (OCMU-C-013) A Development Concept Plan must be prepared which will provide a comprehensive view of the proposed undertakings needed to interpret and protect the prehistoric Lamar site village and mound complex, including any proposed reconstruction. This will lend guidance to any archeological research design, and will clarify any proposed Section 106 requirements.

   One question which should be initially addressed in any Development Concept Plan is that of the levee reconstruction. According to Executive Order 11988 "Floodplain Management," and its implementing guidelines (40CFR300), prior to any development there will be the need to protect the entire Lamar site from further flooding by the Ocmulgee River. This could entail rehabilitation of the levee constructed in 1939-1941. Although further massive archeological excavations to clear the levee area are probably not necessary, if any archeological interpretation within the Lamar site (such as the Village Site 1 House Site) is planned, then the levee rehabilitation becomes an important initial concern. This also brings up the question as to what extent the archeological clearance of
the levee, which was carried out in 1938-1939, would be considered adequate for present day Section 106 requirements.

**C02 Inadequate Archeological Overview and Inventory, Including Archeological Identification and Evaluation Studies, Overview and Assessments**

**Archeological Overviews and Assessments (OCMU-C-011)** The present document should support this issue as far as an Overview and Assessment for the Lamar unit is concerned.

**Report of Past Investigations / Archeological Synthesis** An Archeological Identification and Evaluation Study would bring the information garnered in the three major studies carried out from 1934 through 1942 into the present and provide a focus for future studies. This will be a three stage process. The first stage, the cataloging of the Lamar WPA artifacts, is currently being done under a cooperative agreement between SEAC and Florida State University. The second stage will involve an assessment of the condition and integrity of the Lamar collections including field records and other documentation. Finally, an analysis report of all of the past investigations should be written up providing an archeological synthesis of the Lamar site. This document would then serve as the basis for formulating any new research questions or data recovery projects. Any interim archeological research should be limited to a program of testing to verify and/or supplement work which has already taken place, until such time as new research questions are developed which will significantly address the Lamar "problem" and which cannot already be answered with the voluminous data at hand.

**Archeological Survey and Inventory** The Lamar unit of Ocmulgee has not been properly surveyed and inventoried as per the requirements of EO11593 and the National Historic Preservation Act (as amended 1980).

**Analyze Collections (OCMU-C-033 and 055)** This will be done as part of the archeological synthesis as stated above. The cataloging currently being done by FSU should not be considered an analysis or assessment of the materials or collections since no new information is expected to result from this work. This work will, however, serve as the baseline data for the analysis report and archeological synthesis of the Lamar site.
Update the Cultural Sites Inventory (OCMU-C-006) Ongoing.

Prepare an Archeological Base Map A number of historical maps dealing with survey and excavations within the Lamar unit are in the SEAC map collections. Some data on early archeological work are missing. Currently, the information on much of this early work is being digitized at SEAC. An overall effort, however, should be made to digitize all existing data maps in conjunction with the archeological synthesis report described above.

C03 Incomplete Cataloguing of Museum Collections (OCMU-C-032 and 055)
Backlog cataloging is currently being conducted under Subagreement One of the new (1990) cooperative agreement between SEAC and the Florida State University Anthropology Department. Cataloging of the first part of the Lamar material was to include all of Gordon Willey's collection. It is expected that all of the Lamar material will eventually be cataloged by FSU. This would encompass both Ford's and Fairbanks' collections, including that portion of Ford's collection that was analyzed by FSU in 1973. The classification scheme used by FSU has not added any new type descriptions to the existing Lamar typology; however, the descriptions of the sherds contain information on all of the characteristics now considered to be diagnostic as to phase markers for the Lamar period. Consequently, should new ceramic types ever be formally recognized and described using these measures, the catalogued material will be able to be placed into the appropriate types using the descriptions on the catalog cards. To date, most of Willey's material has been catalogued. The next group of materials to be cataloged will be from Fairbanks' work.

Under Subagreement Two of the cooperative agreement, the skeletal remains of approximately 322 Native Americans, currently housed at SEAC, will be catalogued and analyzed. The skeletal remains recovered from the Lamar site at SEAC are on the inventory of remains to be cataloged and analyzed under this subagreement. Only a portion of the burials recovered from Lamar are currently housed at SEAC (see appendix A). In order for the collection to be cataloged and analyzed as a whole, the remains need to be tracked down and reassembled. Currently some of the skeletal remains are at SEAC, and some are at the Smithsonian.
C04 Need for Ethnographic Overviews and Assessments, Oral Histories and Life Histories

Ethnic Affiliation of the Lamar Inhabitants. It has been generally accepted for sometime that the Ocmulgee Fields occupation of the Macon Trading Post and the Lamar site was of Creek Indian ethnicity. It has also been generally assumed that the preceding Lamar occupation was also of Creek ethnicity; this assumption, however, is open to question. The "Lamar as Creek" question has been discussed in the literature for sometime (Fairbanks 1941, 1952; Russell 1973; Williams 1975, 1980 etc.). There does not appear to be a clear material cultural link between Lamar ceramics and Creek ceramics. Fairbanks attempted to define a link between Lamar and Ocmulgee Fields ceramics in a series of articles (1941, 1952), but most of his arguments have not held up to later research (Williams 1980). Some similarities between Lamar ceramics and later Cherokee ceramics have also been noted in the literature (Chance 1973, Smith 1973). Regardless of the outcome of the Lamar/Creek/Cherokee question, the Lamar site may be affiliated with a surviving Native American tribe. The archeological questions should be studied further prior to the preparation of any Ethnographic studies.

C05 Need for Historic Structure Reports, and Assessments of Condition

(OCMU-C-057 Historic Structure Report for Lamar Mound A)
(OCMU-C-058 Historic Structure Report for Lamar Mound B)

If the Development Concept Plan for the interpretation of the Lamar site includes any impacts to the Mound structures at Lamar, Historic Structure Reports must be prepared. The Historic Structure Reports should be done following the completion of the archeological synthesis as that study should shed some light on the construction phases and composition of Mound A. No archeological studies have been conducted at Mound B so some limited testing may be necessary to assess its condition. Jack Walker has suggested that "In studying Mound B, the circular feature surrounding it (which was described by Ford and is evident in early photographs) should be cross-sectioned, recorded, and perhaps even reconstructed" (1991: personal communication). Again, this would be dependent on the recommendations following an Historic Structures Report.
C06 Need for Historic Structures Preservation Guides
(OCMU-C-059 Historic Structure Preservation Guide for Lamar Mound A)
(OCMU-C-060 Historic Structure Preservation Guide for Lamar Mound B)
These guidelines should be based on the results of a mound tree removal and stabilization study (see C11). The preservation guidelines will actually be part of the study as they will serve as the test of the recommendations made for cyclic maintenance of the Mounds.

C07 Inadequate Historic Structures Survey and Inventory (LCS)
Both Mound A and Mound B are included on the List of Classified Structures (LCS# 01186 HS-11 and LCS# 05092 HS-12 respectively). The mounds are listed as being in management category A; (i.e., they must be preserved.)

C08 Need for Historic Resources Study and Administrative Histories

Need for an Administrative History The park has an Administrative History listed as current and approved.

Need for an Historic Resources Study An Historic Resources Study should be prepared for the Lamar unit of the park. One of the main focuses of the study should be the issue of the Lamar site as the site of the town of Ichisi as described by the DeSoto chroniclers. Other subjects which could be included in the study might concern the Lamar site as the focus of large scale and longterm work during the WPA relief efforts, the antebellum plantation period of Lamar, and the post-bellum use of the Lamar site.

C09 Need for Collections Management Plans, Collections Storage Plans, and Collections Condition Survey

Finalize the Collections Management Plan (OCMU-C-028) The museum at Ocmulgee holds the collections from several WPA projects conducted at other sites in the southeast area. These collections contain materials which were often the source of definitions of new archeological periods and ceramic types. These collections are a valuable and irreplaceable resource which should be properly managed and maintained. The approval of a Collections Management Plan is the first step in this process.
Review the Scope of Collections Plan (OCMU-C-029) This document should be revised and updated as part of the proper management of the collections at Ocmulgee.

Prepare a Collections Housekeeping Plan (OCMU-C-030) This document details the housekeeping and maintenance of the collections area.

Do an Emergency Preparedness Plan for the Collections (OCMU-C-031) An emergency plan is recognized as necessary to prepare for such occurrences as flood, fire, or other disasters that could affect the collections.

Prepare an Access and Use Policy for Library (OCMU-C-037) The library at Ocmulgee contains many rare and unique documents. An access and use policy should be done in order to control the security of the library materials.

Upgrade Accountability of the Photo Collections (OCMU-C-038) The photo collections are recognized to be an important asset in resource management as well as interpretation. Efforts should be made to identify, catalog, and duplicate the photos and slides at OCMU, with some coordination with the curatorial staff at SEAC.

Upgrade Accountability of the Documents Collection (OCMU-C-039) The above efforts concerning the photo collections should be duplicated concerning the documents collections.

Acquire Copies of Documents at SEAC (OCMU-C-040) The documentation (fieldnotes, catalog cards, weekly reports etc.) for most of the archeological work conducted at Lamar is currently stored at SEAC. All of these documents have been microfilmed. However, the quality of the these reproductions are so poor as to be considered unacceptable. New copies must be made of all of these documents, many of which are in fragile condition. The documents have not been properly cataloged yet. Both the cataloging and the reproduction of the documents should be done in conjunction with the reorganization of the accession files at SEAC. Currently, the artifacts and documents from all of the WPA work are subsumed together under three accession numbers. In this situation, more than one project is contained in each accession number and materials from a single project are found in more than one accession number. Although it would not be a simple matter to reorganize the accession files so that each project has its own accession number as per the current accessioning procedures, the reproduction and cataloging of
the materials would be most efficiently accomplished during this reorganization.

C10 Need for Specialized Studies for Unique or Complex Management Issues

Settlement Pattern Analysis The study of settlement patterns around the Lamar site is a special study in that it will involve work in areas outside the park. It is not exactly clear how this study would be funded or conducted but it is a worthwhile project. The archeological synthesis of the Lamar site will provide much needed information but will be limited in scope to the site itself. A settlement pattern analysis would help place the Lamar site in a regional context within the Ocmulgee River valley. "The need of a settlement plan study assumes some urgency because of the plans for construction of a multi-lane highway with a major intersection with I-16 in the area between Lamar and the Macon Plateau" (Walker 1991:personal communication).

C11 Need for Cultural Landscape Report
(OCMU-C-023 Do Cultural Landscape Study)
If the Lamar site is to be developed for interpretation, a Cultural Landscape report must be prepared. In order to restore the historic scene at Lamar, the vegetation must be cleared from the site and from the Mounds. Obviously, clearing on this scale cannot be conducted without careful study and planning. If the Cultural Landscape report recommends large scale clearing, a tree removal and mound stabilization study will need to be conducted.

2. Treatment Issues

C12 Inadequate Preservation Maintenance Programs Including Stabilization and Cyclic Maintenance
The Lamar site has been cleared twice in its recent history. The most recent clearing took place sometime around 1964 (Fischer 1990:personal communication). During the intervening 25 years, large trees have grown up on the mounds. The root systems of the trees have undoubtedly penetrated cultural layers of the site and the mounds and disturbed the cultural remains. If these trees are to be removed for interpretation and development, a study must be conducted to determine the safest and most effective method for their removal. Once the vegetation has been cleared, some way must be found to stabilize the mounds and prevent erosion. It
has been suggested that a report out of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, *Earthworks Stabilization Manual*, may be a useful reference for this purpose. Unfortunately, this report deals only with Civil War earthworks and is not generally applicable to Indian mounds. Dr. Robert Thorne from the Center for Archaeological Site Stabilization Studies, University of Mississippi, has cited the successful use of Johnson grass for the Indian mound at Mississippi's Winterville State Park. Johnson grass is a tall thick hardy grass with a deep root structure which holds the earth and prevents erosion. It is possible that Johnson grass would work at Lamar, however, Dr. Thorne's observations are anecdotal and no controlled studies have been carried out in this regard. The tree removal and mound stabilization should be considered as a single issue since tree removal cannot proceed unless some way is found to stabilize mounds once they are cleared.

C13 Need for Rehabilitation or Restoration of Historic and Prehistoric Structures, and Cultural Landscapes
More information on the need for structure rehabilitation will be available following the completion of the Historic Structures Reports for Mounds A and B at Lamar. It is obvious that the Cultural Landscape will need work if the Lamar site is to be opened for interpretation to the general public. The methods of rehabilitation should follow the recommendations, if any, made in the Historic Structures reports and the tree removal and stabilization study.

C14 Need for Major Archeological Data Recovery (OCMU-C-012)
Future needs for data recovery should be based upon recommendations in this Overview and Assessment, and subsequent studies to be conducted (results from backlog cataloging and the proposed Archeological Synthesis of the Lamar site). No major data recovery projects should be undertaken prior to the completion of the Archeological Synthesis of all of the archeological work to date.

C15 Need for Conservation Treatment of Museum Objects
An Object Conservation Needs Assessment or condition survey is needed according to the Museum Handbook.

C16 Inadequate Storage and Environmental Controls for Museum Objects
Inadequate Storage for Museum Objects (OCMU-C-034)
The storage areas at Ocmulgee and at SEAC do not currently meet NPS standards. Efforts are underway at SEAC and at Ocmulgee to upgrade the museum storage areas.

C17 Control of Environmental Impacts
Environmental impacts, as identified in the park's Environmental Impact Assessment (1982), should be monitored for their effect on the archeological resources.

3. Monitoring Issues

C18 Control of Visitor Impacts
(OCMU-C-010 Protect and Maintain Resources at Lamar)
This is a monitoring issue, presenting a need for signs and erosion control on mounds if Lamar is cleared for interpretation.

C19 Inadequate Cultural Resources Monitoring Programs
An Archeological Resources Protection Plan - Park Technical Assist is needed in setting up a monitoring program. SEAC is prepared to provide direction and assistance in developing a monitoring program to meet the park's needs.
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SKELETAL INVENTORY OF LAMAR SITE REMAINS AT SEAC
APPENDIX A
SKELETAL INVENTORY OF LAMAR SITE REMAINS AT SEAC
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H. Sapiens

Full reconstruction of a skeleton from this collection is not possible since some of the pieces have been sent to the Smithsonian Institute.

In addition to the listed remains:

- Cat. #39-12902 contains numerous unidentifiable fragments. Recognized as faunal (most likely deer).
- Cat. #39-12898 has two fragments eventually labelled faunal, but otherwise unidentified.
- Cat. #39-12901 contains shattered cranium pieces, too weathered to get a positive placement.
- Cat. #39-12898 has a shattered cranium. Reconstruction yielded a partial left parietal and the left side of the left side of the frontal (with eye orbit). Also in #39-12898 is an innominate fragment, left side, with the sciatic notch.
- Cat. #39-12904 has two pottery shards (unidentified).

Diagnostic measurements of the skeletal remains were not taken.
# Skeletal Inventory of Lamar Site Remains at SEAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat.#</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Portion</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39-12743</td>
<td>2Bi7</td>
<td>metacarpal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-12901</td>
<td></td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>diaphysis</td>
<td>fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>humerus</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>capitus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>radius</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>distal</td>
<td>fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ulna</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>diaphysis</td>
<td>proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maxilla</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>molar</td>
<td>lower</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>molar</td>
<td>lower</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>premolar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>canine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>incisors (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>canine</td>
<td></td>
<td>root</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-12904</td>
<td>2Bi7</td>
<td>mandible</td>
<td>l-r</td>
<td>labio-palatal</td>
<td>right canine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r. 1st premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r. 2nd premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left canine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. 1st premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. 2nd premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. 1st molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. 2nd molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. 3rd molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r. upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>premolar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r. upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>central upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lateral upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r. upper</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r. upper</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lateral lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r. lower</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parietal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>2nd premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maxilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>2nd premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humerus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humerus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>capitus</td>
<td>coronoid process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humerus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diaphysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humerus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left/prox</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.#</td>
<td>Site #</td>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Portion</td>
<td>Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ulna</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>diaphysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ulna</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ulna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>radius</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>diaphysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>femur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metacarpal</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metacarpal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metatarsal</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metatarsal</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metatarsal</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metatarsal</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metatarsal</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>phalanx</td>
<td>left/prox</td>
<td>great toe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>talus</td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>phalanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-12905</td>
<td>2Bi7</td>
<td>occipital</td>
<td></td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vertebrae</td>
<td>thoracic</td>
<td>centrum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pelvis</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>femur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>diaphysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mandible</td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maxilla</td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-12898</td>
<td>2Bi7</td>
<td>mandible</td>
<td>l-r</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>l. lateral incisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. canine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. 1st premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. 2nd premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. 1st molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r. canine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r. 1st premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.#</td>
<td>Site #</td>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Portion</td>
<td>Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mandible</td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maxilla</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd molar (impacted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>occipital</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>2nd premolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>1st molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>2nd molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>frontal</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>internal protub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clavicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/orbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vertebrae</td>
<td>cervical</td>
<td></td>
<td>conoid tubercle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clavicle</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>radius</td>
<td>left/prox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>left/prox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>femur</td>
<td></td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tibia</td>
<td>left/dist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tibia</td>
<td></td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>phalanx</td>
<td>proximal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>navicular</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cuboid</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>calcaenum</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>talus</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metatarsal</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, II, III, V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tarsal</td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metatarsal</td>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, II, III, V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-12901</td>
<td>2Bi7</td>
<td>tibia (deer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-12904</td>
<td>2Bi7</td>
<td>loop appendage of pot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-12905</td>
<td>2Bi7</td>
<td>scapula (deer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-12898</td>
<td>2Bi7</td>
<td>ulna (deer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B, THE LAMAR COMPLEX
Appendix B

The following trait list was developed by Charles Fairbanks for the Lamar Complex at a time when the Trait List was considered a useful tool for defining a culture or cultural manifestation under discussion. It is included here to add a little flesh to the bare-bones archaeological and material discussion of Lamar. No doubt present-day researchers will find it inaccurate in some places and inadequate in others. Nonetheless, by looking at it as a whole, some brief semblance of 'life as a Lamarian' may present itself.

The Lamar Complex

The Lamar Complex is the most widespread in Georgia with regional differences not yet fully determined. It has been found at Peachtree, North Carolina (Setzler and Jennings, 1941), Nacoochee (Heye, Hodge, and Pepper, 1918), Turnbull (Harris, 1940), the Lamar site (Kelly, 1938), and in collections now stored at Ocmulgee National Monument, from other sites in central Georgia. An expansion of Lamar into North Carolina is indicated by Coe (n.d.). The following trait list for Lamar has been largely derived from the excavations at the Lamar site, a detached area of Ocmulgee National Monument, Macon, Georgia (Kelly, 1938; Jennings, 1939).

SUBSISTENCE ACTIVITY

Agricultural Complex
Charred corn cobs

Food Gathering Complex
Charred acorns
Charred wild beans
Animal and bird bones
Fish and turtle bones
Fresh water mussel shells, rare
ARCHITECTURAL ACTIVITY

Village Location and Plan Complex
- Village in river bottoms, usual
- Village on high terraces, rare
- Village on island or hammock in swamp
- Village palisaded
  - Vertical posts
  - Posts set in single holes
  - Overlapping entrance
- Two mounds facing across court
- Spiral ramp around circular mound
- Truncated pyramidal mounds
- Stepped ramp

House Complex
- Rectangular houses
- Houses set on low earth platforms
- Post holes set singly without wall trenches
- Wattle and daub construction
- Grass thatch
- Posts in wall trench, rare

CEREMONIAL ACTIVITY

Ceremonial Structure Complex
- Mounds as bases for public buildings
- Mounds erected by successive levels
- Mound stages capped with clay plates
- Presence of spiral ramp on small mound
- Top surfaces of mounds, slope slightly toward each other
- "Ball court" between mounds
- Rectangular structure on mounds

Ceremonial Object Complex
- Incised and pierced circular shell gorgets
- Suggested trophy heads (pipes)

Burial Complex
- Burials flexed, on side, predominately
- Burials rarely accompanied by grave goods
- Grave goods
  - Pottery vessels
  - Pipes
Knobbed shell pins
Engraved shell gorgets
Smoothing stones
Celts
Urn burials, sporadic

INDUSTRIAL AND ARTISTIC ACTIVITY

Chipped Stone Complex
  Projectile points, medium sized stemmed common
  Projectile points, small, triangular, thin, not common
  Triangular or ovate blades, large, not common

Ground Stone Complex
  Celts, small, flat cross-section, narrow poll, common
  Chisels, parallel sides, narrow, frequent
  Discs, bi-plane, polished, not common
  Pipes, equal arm, sporadic

Rough Stone Complex
  Mullers, bun-shaped, or oval, common
  Mortars, shallow, medium to small, common
  Pebbles, burned, small, common
  Hammerstones, generally unpitted, common
  Smoothing stones, small, not common

Bone and Antler Complex
  Split bone awls, common
  Bear canines, unperforated, common
  Beaver incisors, worked, not common
  Ulna awls, common
  Antler projectile points, cut ends, common

Shell Complex
  Conch columella beads, barrel-shaped, large, not common
  Hair pins, knobbed, conch columella, not common
  Gorgets, engraved, pierced, circular, rare
  Mussel shells, unmodified, rare

Wood Complex
  Structural only
Fiber Complex
   Cord, two strand, twisted, observed on pottery

Metal Complex
   Unknown

Pottery Complex
   Lamar Bold Incised
   Lamar Complicated Stamped
   Lamar Plain
   Negative painted type on effigy bottles
   Circuit coiling
   Sand temper predominate
   Shell temper rare
   Smooth interiors and exteriors
   Stamping sloppy
   Incised lines, broad, shallow grooves
   Angular-shoulde cazuela bowls, round base
      common, flat base rarer
   Rounded or conoidal base jars, moderate
      shoulder, flaring rim
   Lips on jars and bowls rounded or flattened
   Strap handles on jars, rare
   Applique nodes with reed punctate
   Folded rim strip immediately below rim
      Rim strip punched, punctuated, or noded
   Jars with four raised, noded rim points, rare
   Squared base jars, rare
   Animal or human effigies on rim of hemispherical bowls, rare
   Notched rim band on hemispherical bowls, rare
   Blank face effigy bottles, rare
   Straight neck bottles, rare

Stamp[ed] designs
   Filfot cross most common
   Bull's-eyes
   Concentric scrolls
   Figure-eight
   Loops, sporadic
Incised designs usually geometric
   Scroll
   Loop
   Table
   Chevron
   Guilloche
Pipes, equal arm, flamboyant, effigy, etc., abundant
Discs, small, cut sherd, abundant
Stamp, paddle with incised design, present

Residual Pottery Types
Irene Diamond Check Stamped
Unnamed cord-roughened type
Pensacola Incised (Willey, 1949), rare

Design Complex
Stamp designs
   Filfot cross predominate
   Scroll
   Bull's-eye
   Concentric loops
   Figure eight

Incised designs
   Alternate rectilinear and curvilinear motifs
   Scroll
   Nested tables
   Multiple line loop
   Chevron
   Guilloche

Painted designs
   Sun symbol

Incised shell
   Anthropomorphic eagle beings

Pipes
   Human heads
   Birds
   Celt
   Trophy skulls
   Phallic
Military and Hunting Complex
   Palisades
   Defensible positions, swamp islands, etc.
   Chipped stone tools
   Ground stone tools
   Bone tools
   Animal bones, bird bones, fish bones

Trade Complex
   Gulf Coast conch shells
   Gulf Coast pottery types (Pensacola Incised)