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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the ritualistic, artifact, demographic, health, and status differences exhibited in burials throughout Florida over a span of 8,000-years. The study summarizes and examines many of the ritual and biological data available for about 3,500 individuals at 40 sites (43 site contexts), and sites were from Archaic, Swift Creek, St. Johns, Weeden Island, Manasota, Alachua, Fort Walton, Safety Harbor, Mission, and Seminole Period/cultures. The different factors studied include 1) layout of sites and associated features; 2) individual burial type; 3) types of ceramics and grave goods; 4) individuals and associated grave goods, 4) sex and age; 5) dental health; and 6) other health indicators. Throughout the thesis, these factors are used to understand the status of individuals and the sites in which they were buried. In chapter 7, status markers identified in the previous chapters are used to create a system of scoring the different sites by their evidence of status and hierarchy. This methodology allows the analysis of sites in Florida and other areas with similar burial rituals from a wide variety of cultures and time periods. This thesis illustrates how burial rituals and health changed over time and often varied among the different cultures and areas of Florida. It suggests that differences of societal complexity and status were often the main motivator for differences in burial ritual, and that health cannot be used to evaluate status in Florida. The size, layers, the use of particular burial types, and presence of different grave goods were more often affected by the levels of hierarchy in society than the environment or culture of its people. At the same time, some common presumptions about health are flawed. The highest status people at some sites often suffered the worst health, and pathological conditions such as porotic hyperostosis may be caused by factors that are not often associated with them. In conclusion, this paper attempts to bring together much of what we know about burial in Florida and verifies or disproves many of the cultural and temporal association given to different sites. The thesis also includes comprehensive site summaries for all 43 site contexts in the study.
NOTE

For citation information about the data presented in the tables and figures, please refer to Appendix B: Site Summaries for specific details about each site. Each Site Summary contains all the basic data about a site, including the dates, culture, number of burials, layout, strata and features, individual burial type, sex and age demographics, its individuals’ dental and other health, and types, numbers, and associations of grave good at the site. When the letter (B) in caps is by itself or next to a number it refers to a specific burial. Each summary also includes a short bibliography of all the references that provide some information about the site, its individuals, and its other features. Some of the references at end of each summary may not have been used to create the summary, but these references still offer certain information about the site. In many of the summaries, Jerald T. Milanich’s Archaeology Precolumbian Florida (1994) is cited. This is an all purpose book for understanding Florida archaeology.
CHAPTER 1:

The State of Burial Study in Florida and a Methodology for its Analysis

For over two hundred years, people have been excavating and studying Native Americans’ burials in Florida, and the number of reported sites is in the hundreds. With this data set, the chief goal of this thesis is to collect, organize, and analyze a sample of these excavated sites to understand how both burial ritual, health, and status changed from the Archaic Period (7,500 BC) to the establishment of the state of Florida in 1845. At the same time, our knowledge about burial in Florida remains problematic, and our collection of data is still inadequately organized and missing key components. A review of the different problems in Florida burial archaeology illustrates the need to synthesize this data and how such a synthesis will allow comparative studies of changes in mortuary practices and health to be achieved. Furthermore, these comparative studies should help us resolve many of the questions we still have about Native American life in Florida. This is the overall goal of this thesis.

1. The Problems of Archaeological Analysis for Precolumbian Florida

The problems with the archaeological data can be summarized as: 1) destruction of sites and/ or outdated or improper excavations of sites by amateurs, looters, and archaeologists; 2) different methods or goals in recording data; 3) inadequate documentation (improper or lack of documentation of sites or recovered material); 4) disappearance or destruction of excavated material; 5) a lack of funds for archaeologists to properly excavate, preserve, analyze, and publish their work; 6) poor preservation of skeletal material; and 7) the nature and features of the burial types and rituals conducted by Native Americans.

Problem 1: Destruction or Excavations Without Modern Methods

The common Native American practice of building mounds has been both a great resource for archaeologists and an invitation for destruction. Mounds are highly visible and attract looters who simply dig into them in search of precious objects. This plundering has damaged many sites, compromised the contexts for understanding
features, and has left archaeologists with only parts of the true collections of artifacts and even human remains (e.g., Ruth Smith Mound, Mayport Mound, Yellow Bluffs Mound) (Milanich 1972; Mitchem 1989; Wilson 1965). Additionally, some archaeologists have made critical mistakes. C.B. Moore, who excavated in the 1890s, has often been criticized for his lack of careful, systematic excavations (Milanich 1994: 5-6; Milanich 1999: 6). While he contributed greatly to our knowledge of Precolumbian Florida, he also frequently destroyed sites, or was selective about what he collected. Thus, he prevented others from learning more from many of the sites he excavated.

Problems 2 and 3: Different Methodologies and Inadequate Documentation

These are elements of the same problem: different archaeologists and scholars often have had very different goals in their archaeological work. In the early twentieth century, scholars such as Ales Hrdlicka (1922) were especially concerned with the skull shapes of Native Americans. However, while many Native American skulls were studied by people with some level of medical knowledge, the only thing that was significantly reported, including in Willey’s *Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast* (1949), was the shape of skull and sometimes the sex of an individual. Moreover, many burial sites, especially mounds, were composed of layers that in some cases had been laid down over a span of centuries or millennia. Careless excavation of such sites could result in the mixing of material temporally separated by several hundred years. Some sites are also difficult to fully understand as the excavator left short or vague descriptions of his or her excavation and finds. Several excavators did not even report the dimensions of mounds or only reported the number of artifacts as “several,” or the types of material recovered as “miscellaneous” without an exact count (Dickel 1991; Willey 1949: 122, 134; Wharton et al. 1981: 66).

Problem 4: Disappearance of Excavated Material

Modern archaeologists are often faced with the dilemma that much of the material from previously excavated sites has been lost or distributed among so many different collections that trying to gain a clear picture of the whole is quite difficult (Luer 2002; Willey 1949). This is particularly important, since artifact typologies have changed over the last hundred years. Modern archaeologists have trouble understanding what Moore excavated because his descriptions of recovered artifacts were at times imprecise and the
actual objects have long been lost making independent identification impossible (Moore 1999a, b, and c).

**Problem 5: A Lack of Funds for Archaeological Work**

This is common for archaeologists everywhere, and for Florida, this is especially troubling. Although hundreds of sites have been excavated, there are few comprehensive publications of individual excavations. Florida State University’s Library has almost five times as many archaeological reports on the relatively short Late Roman-Early Anglo-Saxon Periods of England (AD 300-600) than for the entire Precolombian history of Florida. The State Library of Florida, the State of Florida’s Bureau of Archaeological Research, and Master Site Files have the most extensive documentation for many sites. Nevertheless, much of the available material is not detailed enough for comprehensive comparative studies. Many of the Master Site Files forms or supporting documentation are only a few pages long.

Archaeology in Florida is clearly under-funded, and this includes archaeological research for some of the most important sites such as Lake Jackson. Lake Jackson was one of the largest sites of Precolombian Florida and was the capital of one of its most socially complex societies. It is located north of Tallahassee, but near several of the main archaeological research centers in Florida. However, Lake Jackson has been discussed only in very brief publications (See Appendix B: Site Summaries). The lack of funding for archaeology in Florida is such that it was even discussed in a recent article in *Archaeology* magazine (Milanich 2005). Meanwhile, *The Florida Anthropologist* is filled with articles on excavations, but often only the most cursory observations of the health of individuals and the objects associated with them have been discussed. Many excavators do not have the funds for comprehensive studies, and have to use their available funds to save their discoveries from destruction. It is only the rare occasion that a site is fully studied, usually because of a site’s uniqueness, such as Windover Pond with its incredible preservation, or when enough of the site’s material has been collected for graduate students to study thoroughly as thesis projects (Doran 2002; Hageseth 1993; Stojanowski 1997).
Problem 6: Skeletal Preservation

The issue of skeletal preservation is linked to Florida’s natural environment. Florida’s soils are highly acidic, causing bone to completely decompose or become friable (Brown et al. 1990: 62; Miller 1994: 215; Philips 1995: 79). If an excavation is not done with the greatest of care, skeletal remains and the layout of the burials can be destroyed easily. At many sites osteologists have largely focused on studying the dental remains, as teeth are far less susceptible to decomposition than skeletal material. The most recent publications on comparative health by Hutchinson (2004) and Larsen (2001) have been focused on dental issues such as caries, alveolar infection, and enamel hypoplasia.

The lack of adequate skeletal samples also means that archaeologists frequently have to work with study samples that may not really reflect the population demographics of those buried (Estes 1988; Hutchinson 2002). For example, for 50 burials, sex or age might only obtained from 15, periostitis (skeletal infection often implying trauma or disease) for 10 out of 60 tibias, caries for only 400 out of 1600 teeth, and the ability to correlate grave goods with individuals for 20 out of the 50 burials. Even at some of the best sites for preservation such as Windover Pond, which was excavated in the 1980s, there were often such problems. For instance, although many of bodies were well preserved “bog bodies,” only 125 out of 169 burials could be examined for porotic hyperostosis (Estes 1988: 108). Therefore, only by comparing several sites can an archaeologist determine whether a sample from an individual site correctly represents the actual normal health, demographics, and even burial type of a people. While this situation is common for archaeologists in many areas, the incredibly poor preservation of samples in Florida makes comparing sites truly a necessity here.

Problem 7: Native Americans’ Disposal of the Dead

This has caused difficulties for archaeologists in understanding population demographics, burial type, and health. Evaluating population demographics is problematic as many sites, especially certain mound sites, contain highly prestigious, ritualistic forms of burials in which only the elite and their followers were buried. For example, Lake Jackson Mound 3 has almost ten times as many males as females (Storey 1993: 2002). While this site tells us about the people of Lake Jackson, it certainly does
not represent the true demographics of its population. Different groups also practiced both primary and secondary burials, and determining which type was used for an individual internment can be difficult. This is especially true if an archaeologist only has cursory notes from previous archaeologists to make an evaluation (Sears 1959; Wilson 1965). Secondary burials are particularly challenging because bundle burials, long bones, or skull burials often involve the selection of only certain bones for burial (Brown 1994: 49, 148). Cremations are even more difficult for osteologists to understand since skeletal remains are destroyed (Pearson 2001: 6-7). Thus, from an initial study, an osteologist has just a sample of an individual’s remains to analyze. Moreover, if these remains are in any way scattered before, during, or after the excavation, the osteologist may have a very hard task in even estimating the minimum number of individuals that were buried at a site.

2. Research and Goals

The seven problems discussed above clearly demonstrate the need for an organized format and methodology for understanding the different and sometimes incongruous data that exist for a study of the mortuary behavior of Florida’s Native American inhabitants. The research for this study included reviewing issues of *The Florida Anthropologist* from 1948 to the present, locating publications available at the Florida State University Library and the State Library of Florida as well as material from the Florida Bureau of Archaeological Research, the Florida Master Site File, and the Florida State University Department of Anthropology. My goal was to find Native American burial sites in Florida at which more than one body was recovered, and for which accompanying comprehensive information was available. Selected sites were examined in terms of 1) cemetery layout, 2) burial type, 3) types of artifacts and ceramics recovered, 4) individuals and associated grave goods, 5) age and sex of the individuals, and 6) their overall health.

Many of the sites did not meet these criteria requiring a sample of sites to be generated for which there was adequate documentation and analysis for just two or three of the selected variables (See Appendix A: Sites not Used). The final goal of my thesis is to examine both ritualistic and health changes over as much of the span of Florida’s Native American occupation as possible. As a consequence, certain sites were chosen
because they were good representatives of their respective periods and cultures. Specific areas of Florida, especially the Tampa Bay area and St. Johns River estuary, feature prominently in my study because of the extensive archaeological work done in those regions of the state. The Tampa Bay area is arguably the best archaeologically documented area in Florida, and a majority of the sites in this study came from this region. The Tampa Bay area is also one of the few regions, largely because of the work of Dale Hutchinson, that has been systematically studied for evidence of basic health conditions (Hutchinson 1991, 1993, 2002, 2004). The St. Johns River estuary was one of the first areas heavily settled by Europeans and Americans and has received extensive investigation since the 1870s (Wyman 1973 [1875]).

With these issues in mind, a sample of 40 sites (3 sites had also two separate temporal or physical contexts) and with a total between 3,000 to 4,000 individuals was selected (Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2 and Table 1.1). The 40 sites were divided into 6 geographic regions that are at times combined into three major regions (Figures 1.1 and 1.2). The geographic region with the most sites was the Gulf Coast Peninsula: 1) Citrus to Manatee and Hardee Counties (13 sites) and 2) Sarasota to Charlotte Counties (6 sites). This region was divided because of the large number of sites; the disputed southern boundary of Weeden Island culture on Florida’s Gulf Coast, which arguably ends in Manatee County; and the fact that there have been a number of modern studies of the Sarasota County burial sites during the last decade (Dickel 2002; Hutchinson 2002; Luer 1999; Luer 2002; Milanich 1994: 221-222).

The next major region was the lower St. Johns River area and the Atlantic Coast south of the John’s River: 1) Nassau to Volusia Counties (9 sites), and 2) Brevard to Miami-Dade Counties (4 sites), respectively. This region was split into two areas because the northern half was largely inhabited by St. Johns’ culture peoples and the southern half by Glades culture peoples (Jones 1981; Milanich 1994: 243-244, 277-279). The last major area of study was the Florida Panhandle and North Central Florida: 1) Escambia to Dixie Counties (6 sites) and Columbia to Alachua counties (4 sites), respectively. This division was selected since the Panhandle was the center of Fort Walton culture and North Central Florida was a border area between the Panhandle and the St. Johns’ area (Milanich 1994: 355-357). North Central Florida was also inhabited by the Alachua
FIGURE 1.1 LOCATIONS OF SITES
(Map without site locations: entnemdept.ifas.ufl.edu/teneb/florida_checklist_map.htm)

1. Windover Pond
2. Tick Island (Harris Creek)
3. Republic Groves
4. Bird Island
5. Gauthier
6. Santa Maria (Lewis Site)
7. Bay Cadillac
8. Perico Island
9. Mayport Mound
10. Pierce Mound A
11. Manasota Key
12. Dent Mound
13. Gauthier (Intrusive)
14. McKeithen Mound B
15. McKeithen Mound C
16. Turtle Shores
17. Palmer Mound
18. Sowell Mound
19. Weeden Island
20. Benton Mound
21. Thomas Mound
22. Jones Mound
23. Bayshore Homes Mound B
24. Mackenzie Mound
25. Browne Mound
26. Woodward Mound (Tacoma Mound)
27. Aqui Esta Mound (Alligator Creek Mound)
28. Englewod Mound
29. Tierra Verde Mound (Cabbage Key Midden)
30. Walker Point Mound
31. Sarasota Bay Mound
32. Tatham Mound (Pre-Contact)
33. Lake Jackson Mound 3
34. Parrish Mound 2
35. Yellow Bluffs-Whitaker Mound
36. Goodman Mound (McCormick-Goodman Mound)
37. Safety Harbor
38. Tatham Mound (Post-Contact)
39. Weeki Wachee Mound
40. Snow Beach
41. Fig Springs (San Martin de Timucua)
42. San Pedro y San Pablo Patale
43. Quad Block
FIGURE 1.2 REGIONAL LOCATIONS OF SITES/SITE CONTEXTS
(Total Number of Sites/Site Contexts: 43)
Table 1.1 Summary: Age, Culture, Type, Size, and Burial Population of Sites*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>SITE # BP</th>
<th>PERIOD/CULTURE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TYPE OF SITE</th>
<th>SHAPE</th>
<th>HEIGHT (M)</th>
<th># INDIVIDUALS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED* STUDIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>8Br246 7400</td>
<td>MIDDLE ARCHAIC</td>
<td>BREVARD</td>
<td>POND</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>336+</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND (HARRIS CREEK)</td>
<td>8Vo24 6084</td>
<td>MIDDLE ARCHAIC</td>
<td>VOLUSIA</td>
<td>MOUND/MIDD EN</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>833.95</td>
<td>184+ (1,000S MORE?)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>8Hr4 4595</td>
<td>MIDDLE-LATE/TRANSITIONAL ARCHAIC</td>
<td>HARDEE</td>
<td>POND</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>SEVERAL HUNDRED TO OVER A THOUSAND</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>8Di52 4570</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC</td>
<td>DIXIE</td>
<td>?MIDDEN?*</td>
<td>VERY DISTURBED</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>8Br193 4340</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC</td>
<td>BREVARD</td>
<td>CEMETERY</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA (LEWIS SITE)</td>
<td>8Da132 2900</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC</td>
<td>DADE</td>
<td>CEMETERY</td>
<td>VERY DISTURBED</td>
<td>11163</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>8H2398 2800</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC-TRANSITIONAL ARCHAIC</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH</td>
<td>CEMETERY</td>
<td>VERY DISTURBED</td>
<td>292.78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND: MOUND 1 AND CEMETERY</td>
<td>8Ma6 2100</td>
<td>EARLY MANASOTA</td>
<td>MANATEE</td>
<td>1 MOUND, 1 CEMETERY</td>
<td>CONICAL</td>
<td>1.5 MOUND 263.02, CEMETARY 467.59</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>8Du96 1800</td>
<td>SWIFT CREEK</td>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>ELIPT.</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>182.41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>8Fr14 1800</td>
<td>SWIFT CREEK, LATE?</td>
<td>FRANKLIN</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>RECT.</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>690.54</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>8So1292 1730</td>
<td>TRANSITIONAL - EARLY-LATE MANASOTA, CALOOSAHATCHEE I</td>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>CEMETERY</td>
<td>VERY DISTURBED</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>8Du110 1610</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS IA-IB, SWIFT CREEK</td>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>176.71</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>8Br193 1600</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS I</td>
<td>BREVARD</td>
<td>CEMETERY</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>8Col17 1596</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>572.56</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>8Col17 1480</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>346.36</td>
<td>72+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>SITE #</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>PERIOD/CULTURE</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>TYPE OF SITE</td>
<td>SHAPE</td>
<td>HEIGHT (M)</td>
<td>BASE AREA (M²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>8So2</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND/ MID-LATE MANASOTA</td>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>DOME</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>406.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>8sj3262</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>ST. JOHN I</td>
<td>ST JOHNS</td>
<td>?MIDDEN/ MOUND?*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>357.67</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>8By3</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>BAY</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>?CIRC?</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>8Pi1</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>PINELLAS</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>182.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>8Fl16</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS IB</td>
<td>FLAGLER</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>314.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>8Hi4</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND- EARLY SAFETY HARBOR &amp; (SAFETY HARBOR-POST CONTACT?)</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>IRR. CIRC.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>357.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>8Hi4</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND- EARLY SAFETY HARBOR/ POST SAFETY HARBOR CONTACT?</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>357.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE HOMES MOUND B</td>
<td>8Pi41</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND- EARLY SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>DOME</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>8Du62</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS IIA</td>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>DOME</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>8Mr64</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS IIA, LATE WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>410.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>8So1</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND, EARLY SAFETY HARBOR (ENGLEWOOD PHASE), GLADES</td>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>DOME</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>881.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND (ALLIGATOR CREEK MOUND)</td>
<td>8Ch68</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN- EARLY SAFETY HARBOR (ENGLEWOOD PHASE), CALOOSAHATCHEE II</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>OVAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>SITE #</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>PERIOD/CULTURE</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>TYPE OF SITE</td>
<td>SHAPE</td>
<td>HEIGHT (M)</td>
<td>BASE AREA (M²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND (TACOMA MOUND)</td>
<td>8A147</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>ALACHUA (HICKORY POND PHASE)</td>
<td>ALACHUA</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>182.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND (CABBAGE KEY MIDDEN)</td>
<td>8Pi51</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>EARLY SAFETY HARBOR (ENGLEWOOD PHASE)</td>
<td>PINELLAS</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>DOME</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>729.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>8Na43</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>ST. JOHN I-II</td>
<td>NASSAU</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CONICAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>358.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>8So44</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>EARLY TO LATE PRE CONTACT SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>962.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRECONTACT)</td>
<td>8Ci203</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR (PINELLAS PHASE)</td>
<td>CITRUS</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>SEE POSTCONTACT TATHAM</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>8Le1</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>FORT WALTON</td>
<td>LEON</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2304.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS-WHITAKER MOUND</td>
<td>8So4</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>SEMI SAFETY HARBOR (PINELLAS PHASE) / GLADES III / MANASOTA</td>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>RECT.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1073.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>8Ma2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR POST CONTACT? (AD 1200-1500)</td>
<td>MANATEE</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>DOME</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1231.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND (MCCORMICK-GOODMAN MOUND)</td>
<td>8Du66</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>VERY LATE ST. JOHNS IIB</td>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1590.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>8Pi2</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR (PINELLAS PHASE)</td>
<td>PINELLAS</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>467.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>8He12</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR POSTCONTACT (TATHAM PHASE)</td>
<td>HERNANDO</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CIRC.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>147.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POSTCONTACT)</td>
<td>8Ci203</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR POSTCONTACT (TATHAM PHASE)</td>
<td>CITRUS</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>289.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>SITE #</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>PERIOD/CULTURE</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>TYPE OF SITE</td>
<td>SHAPE</td>
<td>HEIGHT (M)</td>
<td>BASE AREA (M²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>8Wa52</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>FORT WALTON (VELDA PHASE- SAN LUIS PHASES)</td>
<td>WAKULLA</td>
<td>MOUND</td>
<td>CONICAL 2.6</td>
<td>410.43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS (SAN MARTIN DE TIMUCUA)</td>
<td>8Co1</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>SPANISH MISSION</td>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>CEMETERY</td>
<td>CHURCH 300</td>
<td>900+</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE (SAN PEDRO Y SAN PABLO PATALE)</td>
<td>8Le152</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>SPANISH MISSION</td>
<td>LEON</td>
<td>CEMETERY</td>
<td>CHURCH 225.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>8Hi998</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>SECOND SEMINOLE WAR</td>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH</td>
<td>CEMETARY</td>
<td>FORT CEMETERY</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*“Estimated” refers to the number of burials that archaeologists believe originally existed at site. “Studied” refers to the number burials that archaeologists or osteologists have studied. Due to erosion and construction, Bird Island and Turtle Shores archaeologists are unsure about the original conditions of these burial sites.

Abbreviations: CIRC. = Circular, ELIPT. = Elliptical, IRR. = Irregular, RECT. = Rectangular
people who were clearly immigrants from Georgia around AD 600 (Milanich 1971; Milanich 1994: 331-333).

3. Analysis and Methodology

For each site, I created Microsoft Excel spreadsheets in which the basic information about the site was categorized and calculated. For many sites, the available literature did not discuss the percentages of the population interred in a specific burial position, their ages or sexes, accompanying grave goods, or an assessment of health conditions. Afterwards, they were recorded in master spreadsheets for analysis: 1) Layout of Sites, 2) Individual Body Layout, 3) Grave Goods and Ceramic Types, 4) Individuals and Associated Grave Goods (which became part of Grave Goods in the thesis itself), 5) Sex and Age, 6) Dental Health, 7) Other Health Indicators, and eventually, 8) Overall High Status, which synthesized data from the other studies. Each of the spreadsheets was next divided into additional spreadsheets for a closer examination of different features and characteristics. More importantly, all spreadsheets, tables, and figures were organized chronologically to see if there were changes and/or patterns over time (Table 1.1). Finally, in many of my tables, only the percentage of population that was affected by a certain factor is listed, and this is done for two basic reasons (Table 1.2). As mentioned before, it is rare to have a complete burial collection, and so usually an archaeologist has to rely on studying the proportions of a sample to estimate what the full collection would have been originally at burial. Secondly, in many publications, especially when health issues are discussed, the archaeologist or osteologist only reported the percentage of the affected population and did not provide an exact count of the burial studied. With these issues resolved the question now is what exactly I did with the data I collected.

Layout of Sites

This topic was concerned with several issues: type of site, dimensions of site, nearby features (such as middens, temple, and other burial mounds), number of burials, and the actual construction and internal layout of the site. Sites were analyzed to determine if the types of structures used for burials had changed over time. In Florida, archaeologists have encountered burials deposited in ponds, mounds, middens, rock formations, sand dunes, and plain cemeteries (burials simply placed in pits in the ground.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>CARIES (%)</th>
<th>DENTAL CHIPPINGS (%)</th>
<th>PATHOSTRIA (%)</th>
<th>ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA (%)</th>
<th>ALVEOLAR INFECTION (%)</th>
<th>PREMOR TOOTH LOSS (%)</th>
<th>REABSORPTION/PERIODONTAL DISEASE (%)</th>
<th>PERIODONTAL DISEASE (%)</th>
<th>ABCESES (%)</th>
<th>HYPERCEMENTOSIS (%)</th>
<th>CALCULUS (%)</th>
<th>DENTAL WEAR HEAVY PRESENT 1=HEAVY 0=LIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>4570</td>
<td>12.7 PROV.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 PROV.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>CARIES (%)</th>
<th>DENTAL CHIPPING (%)</th>
<th>PATHOSTRIAE (%)</th>
<th>ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA (%)</th>
<th>ALVEOLAR INFECTION (%)</th>
<th>PREMOR T TOOTH LOSS (%)</th>
<th>REABSORPTION/PERIO. DIS. (%)</th>
<th>PERIODONTAL DISEASE (%)</th>
<th>ABCESES (%)</th>
<th>HYPERCEMENTOSIS (%)</th>
<th>CALCULUS (%)</th>
<th>DENTAL WEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HEAVY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1= HEAVY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0=LIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRECONTACT)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 BURIALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POSTCONTACT)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SEVERAL refers to several reported cases of a condition.
Abbreviations: PERIO. DIS. = Periodontal Disease, PROV. = Provenienced
without any additional features). Site dimensions are an important issue as burial mounds were constructed in a variety of sizes and shapes. One question that can be asked is, “do the larger mounds reflect greater hierarchy and status or the simple need to contain larger populations?” Different cultures constructed particular site layouts, so determining what other features were associated with a specific burial mound can help identify its builders. Similarly, burial sites, such as mounds, were built in different ways, and can be analyzed using a variety of criteria. In this thesis, sites were noted for the presence of certain structural mantle features such as stratification with prepared soils (layers of clean sand or shell, hematite or ochre), “killed” (deliberately broken) pottery, general midden layer composition, and/or the use of grave pits and charnel houses, which might aid in understanding the social organization and cultural identity of a site.

**Individual Body Layout**

For this category, the main concerns were the issues of primary versus secondary burial and exact burial type. Primary burial types were extended supine or prone, and flexed burials, and possibly cremations. Secondary burials were either bundle or isolated skull burials, and sometimes, cremations. In extended supine burial, the body is laid on its back; prone burials are laid on the abdomen. In flexed burial, most of the body (especially the legs) is bent or drawn together tightly under the chin. Cremation, bundle, and isolated skull burials are all destructive or uninformative about the complete skeleton. Cremation involves burning the body and, depending on the intensity of the fire, may or may not destroy the complete skeleton. In bundle burials, a body is allowed to rot until the flesh has decomposed, and afterward, all or some of the bones are gathered together and wrapped for burial. Finally, in isolated skull burial only the skull of an individual is preserved for burial. At many sites the archaeologists could not determine the exact type of each burial, and therefore, percentages of each known burial type were compared. Burial orientation was also considered, but these data was especially difficult to determine among secondary bundle burials and bodies were sometimes mixed or even crushed in mounds. Given the poor preservation of skeletal remains, few archaeologists have consistently noted orientation in their studies. Various burial types were used, and my goal was to see how they differed over time, among cultures, and whether or how population size, social organization, or religious practices affected burial type.
Grave Goods and Ceramic Types

This topic emphasized two main issues: the most common types of ceramics and the other artifacts recovered from a burial site. The issue of ceramics is crucial to this thesis because where ceramics are present, they have been the key material used to identify a site both chronologically and culturally. However, it is a problematic issue as the context the ceramics may be unclear. For example, some sherds may have been part of the fill, and thus predate the actual site’s construction by hundreds or thousands of years. Other ceramic material may be placed with the individual or placed in a cache representing a more corporate arrangement. For sites excavated before 1950, archaeologists have the problem of very small samples to study and current pottery type names that did not come into use until well after Willey’s 1949 book.

The study of grave goods other than ceramics is very important because the analysis of these artifacts enables archaeologists, not only to see if different peoples preferred certain objects for burial deposition, but also if there were clear signs of status, technological change, environmental differences, or ritual behavior (Binford 1971: 21-26; Hatch 1987: 9-12; Rothschild 1979: 668-670; Tainter 1978: 122-127). Status could be detected by the presence of exotic or complexly crafted objects, technological change by better crafted or new types of objects, environmental differences by an emphasis on certain tools such as shell instead of stone, and ritual behavior detected by the presence of such things as red ochre, copper breast plates, or shell cups. The analysis of different artifacts was complicated, however, because sometimes the excavator of a site used words such as “several,” “few,” “the usual set,” or “hundreds” in reference to the number of artifacts recovered rather than providing a precise count. Therefore, for certain sites, the number of artifacts could only be estimated. At the same time, since the study covered almost the entire span of Florida’s Native American history, the variety of artifacts requiring examination became difficult to analyze and plot. The use of specific artifact types clearly changed over time, and when Native Americans began to encounter Europeans, their selection of objects for mortuary use changed dramatically. At Quad Block, a Seminole cemetery from the 1840s, the large quantity of European materials meant that the artifacts could not be studied in comparison to the earlier burial sites because they were so different from Pre-Contact material (Piper et al. 1982a).
Individuals and Associated Grave Goods

This is one of the most important topics related to ritual and social organization, and examined which sites had 1) individual furnished burial, 2) the percentage of burials at a site with furnished burials, 3) the sex and ages of those individuals, and 4) the types of grave goods associated with them. Furnished burial is important to study because it is often believed that burials with numerous or certain grave goods reflect higher social status and hierarchy (Rothschild 1979: 561-562). In addition, by determining the age and sex of those individuals buried with goods, one may be able to determine the level of social complexity of a society. For example, if only a few burials contain numerous or special grave goods and these included people of different ages and sexes, it might suggest the society had privileged families. Likewise, if all the furnished burials are older men it might suggest a “big man” society where status was earned (Binford 1971: 22-24; Kottak 1999: 138-139; Milanich 1994: 169, 174; Tainter 1978: 122-136). Lastly, if all the furnished burials are children it might imply that the young were sacrificed or enjoyed special status (Jordan 1963: 42-43; Pearson: 2001: 103, 104; Puttock 2002: 22, 37-39).

The Biological Study of Burial

After the ritual elements of burial were examined, the physical nature of the skeletal remains was analyzed and categorized under three main subjects: 1) Sex and Age, 2) Dental Health, and 3) Other Health Indicators. Sex and Age was split into Male, Female, Infant, Subadult/Child, Adult, Senile/50+ years, and Unknown (serving as a category for both sex and age). The issue of the size of the study sample was especially important to note in this analysis, as sex and age could not be examined for the entire skeletal population of many of the sites. For example, for one site, Thomas Mound, less than 10 percent of the population was sexed, and for several sites such as Mackenzie Mound, Parrish Mound 2, and Englewood Mound, none of the burials was sexed by osteologists (Sears 1959; Willey 1949). Therefore, this study used the percentages of people of each category, and the main goal was to determine if there was any bias toward people of a certain age or sex in the burial setting. Furthermore, where the archaeologists had provided specific ages for individuals, average ages of deaths for the different populations were calculated to determine how mortality varied over time and among societies of different social structures or environments.
All aspects of Dental Health were noted and studied under 12 main categories: caries, dental chipping, pathological striae, enamel hypoplasia, alveolar infection, premortem tooth loss, reabsorption, periodontal disease, abscesses, hypercementosis, dental calculus, and dental attrition (Table 1.2). The percentage of a population with a particular affliction was noted and where it was possible, the percentage of males and females of each population with a certain condition was also documented. Many of the sites that had been used in previous analyses had to be excluded from Dental Health, as their remains had never been studied for dental pathology. Several sites that were excavated between 1900-1950, like Englewood Mound, Pierce Mound A, and Thomas Mound, were never studied osteologically. Even sites such as Benton Mound, Browne Mound, Mackenzie Mound, Walker Point Mound, and Yellow Bluffs Mound excavated during 1950s to the 1980s have never been closely examined or the remains from these sites were too decomposed for study.

Dental conditions such as dental caries, enamel hypoplasia, chipping, and attrition were especially useful to study. By comparing the rates of caries, the diet of a population might be inferred on a relative scale because higher rates of caries are likely correlated with a greater dependence on agriculture (Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998: 404-407; Hutchinson 2004: 62-67; Simpson 2001: 147-149). Dental chipping and attrition often cause problems in the study of caries, because excessive dental chipping and attrition may prevent archaeologists from seeing the full extent of caries in a population. Severe dental chipping or attrition might reflect a diet of shellfish and meat, instead of plants. Finally, enamel hypoplasia and its subcondition of pathological striae are often evidence of poor health in childhood, and hints at excessive stresses (often environmental) in a society.

Other Health Indicators proved to be more difficult to compile because archaeologists and osteologists frequently recorded pathologies without consolidating them in discrete categories. Some bodies were described as having different types of lesions without specifying which illnesses the lesion suggested (Snow 1962: 19-20). Some physical conditions are variations of each other or suggest the presence of additional pathologies (Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998; Larsen 1997). For example, the conditions of periostitis, osteomyelitis, osteitis, skeletal lesions, and
trauma/fractures were studied. Osteomyelitis and osteitis are both forms of periostitis. Periostitis is marked by inflammatory skeletal lesions and is the result of disease or trauma and fractures. Likewise, porotic hyperostosis, cribra orbitalia, and anemia are all caused by similar nutritional problems. While porotic hyperostosis and cribra orbitalia affect different parts of the skull, a lack of iron, which can be caused by poor nutrition or internal parasites, causes them both. Many osteologists classify these conditions together because they are indicators of a common problem, and the only major differences between them, besides their location on the skull, is the age of the people that are afflicted. Anemia is an inclusive category for both conditions. Other conditions that were studied included trauma and fractures, osteoarthritis, systematic infection, and congenital defects. The studies of skeletal health suffered numerous sampling issues, especially a lack of representative samples for some sites, and archaeologists also never having all the bones of each individual excavated from a site. In the case of conditions such as periostitis or caries, archaeologists frequently evaluate the percentage of bones such as the tibiae (periostitis) and teeth (caries) for the condition, and this may not reflect the actual number of affected people in a population.

Other Health Indicators was a very informative category in this analysis, since the rate of periostitis might be evidence of infection or violence, fractures further evidence of violence and injury, and osteoarthritis might hint at the work habits of a people or the presence of older individuals in society. A study of cribra orbitalia and porotic hyperostosis could suggest an inadequate diet or an unhealthy living environment. With these seven basic topics discussed, there are still the issues of the basic dating and cultural identification of the different sites, and how all the data were combined to understand status.

**Dating and Cultural Identification**

Because a central issue of this thesis is how societies and cultures changed over time, proper dating of the sites was crucial. Three methods were used: 1) radiocarbon dating, 2) pottery types, and 3) other associated artifacts or evidence of ritual. Radiocarbon dating was used as the primary form of dating the sites, and in cases where several radiocarbon dates covered a long time span at a site, the date used for the site was either the average of these dates or the date that most closely corresponded with the
cultural materials recovered at the site. When radiocarbon was not available, pottery and other artifacts were used to establish dates. For these sites, archaeologists often provided cultural classifications, with ranges sometimes of hundreds or thousands of years based on ceramic and artifact typologies. In these cases, the mean of the date range was used, or alternatively the most common type of pottery was used to calculate an appropriate date for the site (Figure 1.3 and Table 1.3). For example, Thomas Mound was dated to the Weeden Island Period because Weeden Island Punctuated, Incised, and Plain pottery were the most common types at the site (Milanich 1994: 227, 301, 389, 397; Willey 1949: 119-121, 125). Although, several European artifacts were found at Jones Mound, the site was dated to Late Weeden Island Period because bird effigy artifacts were directly associated with many of the burials. Bird effigies were a Weeden Island cultural trait, and most of the effigies appear to have been made by the same person (Bullen 1952: 49, 57, 60-61; Milanich 1994: 175, 179-180). The dating of many of the sites is still quite tentative, and only those with several radiocarbon dates or clear historical evidence are considered the most securely dated sites. Finally, date ranges were reported for each site, but it was necessary to establish a single date for each site in order to clearly plot ritual and/ or health changes.

Cultural identification was obtained through methods similar to those used for dating the sites, but a greater emphasis was placed on the recovered artifacts, the layout of sites, and their locations in Florida. Cultural identification was also more challenging because many sites contained artifacts from several cultures due to trade, exchange, or the site’s long occupation span. For most sites, the identified culture was taken from the most recent publication discussing the site, and where there was little information or extensive controversy about the site’s cultural identity, I made an assignment based on the available information. This is one area where this thesis may be especially helpful for archaeologists because, by comparing data from several sites, it should possible to see different ritualistic and health trends geographically, temporally, and culturally. Thus, sites with questionable dates or cultural identification are noticeable and can be corrected. My methodology of plotting and comparing various ritualistic and physical aspects of Florida’s Precolumbian Native Americans should greatly aid our understanding of how Florida’s Native populations changed over time, and help determine if certain sites have
FIGURE 1.3 CULTURES/PERIODS*
(Total Number of Sites/ Site Contexts: 61)
*Several Sites/ Site Contexts were tied to more than one culture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>DATING METHODS</th>
<th>CITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>MIDDLE ARCHAIC (8,120-6,980 BP UNCORRECTED, 9,000 BP-7,929 BP CALIBRATED)</td>
<td>NUMEROUS C-14 SAMP. FROM VAR. TYPES OF MAT.</td>
<td>DORAN 2002: 72; DICKEL 2002: 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>MIDDLE-LATE/TRANSITIONAL ARCHAIC (4600-500 BC)</td>
<td>C14 FROM STAKES: UNCOR: 5745 BP +/- 105YRS, 2485 BP +/- 80YRS, OTHER SAMPS.: 6430BP +/-80YRS, 6520 BP +/-65YRS</td>
<td>WHARTON ET AL. 1981: 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>4570</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC (2620 BC-UNCORRECTED)</td>
<td>1-C-14 SAMP (2620 BC- 4570 BP +/-110YRS-UNCORRECTED), LACK OF POTTERY, &amp; STRATIFICATION</td>
<td>STOJANOWSKI 1997: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC</td>
<td>C-14- 4340BP +/-170YRS</td>
<td>MAPLES 1987: 2; MILANICH 1994: 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC</td>
<td>C-14 5 SAMPS. (2780-3110 BP)</td>
<td>CARR ET AL. 1984: 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC-TRANSITIONAL (910-790 BC)</td>
<td>C-14- 4 SAMP., ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>AUSTIN ET AL. 1992: 129-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>SWIFT CREEK (AD 85)</td>
<td>1 C-14 DATE- AD 85 +/- 95YRS, POTTERY</td>
<td>WILSON 1965: 31; MILANICH 1994: 141-144; THUENEN AND ASHLEY 1995: 5; SWIFT CREEK DOES NOT BEGIN UNTIL ABOUT AD 150- SO ADJUSTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>PERIOD</td>
<td>DATING METHODS</td>
<td>CITATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>TRANSITIONAL, LATE MANASOTA/ (CALOOSA HATCHEE I AD 220)</td>
<td>4-C-14 SAMS. OF HUMAN BONE AND SHELL ABOUT 1,730 BP</td>
<td>AUSTIN ET AL. 1992: 173; MILANICH 1994: 224; DICKEL 1991: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS I-IB (AD 100-500), SWIFT CREEK</td>
<td>2-C-14- AD 340 +/- 70YRS &amp; AD 590 +/- 60YRS, ARTIFACTS- AD 100-800</td>
<td>ASHLEY 1995: 13, 25-26; THUNEN AND ASHLEY 1995: 5; ASHLEY 1998: 206-211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS I</td>
<td>C14-1600BP +/-190YRS</td>
<td>MAPLES 1987: 2; MILANICH 1994: 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>3 C-14- AD 354 +/- 43YRS</td>
<td>MILANICH 1997: 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUNDS (MDS A-C)</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>AV. OF 1 C-14 DATE - MOUND A &amp; DATES FROM MOUNDS B &amp; C</td>
<td>MILANICH 1997: 99, 109, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND (AD 450-480?)</td>
<td>SEV. C-14 SAMPS. AD 200-750, POTTERY</td>
<td>MILANICH 1997: 91, 115, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>ST. JOHN I (500 BC- AD 800)</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>HAGESETH 1993: 25, 26, 29, 35, 45; COMMON POTTERY: ST JOHNS PLAIN, WHILE ST. JOHNS CHECKED FOUND- NO WEEDEN ISLAND OR DUNNS CREEK POTTERY, - SIMILAR TO BENTON MOUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND (AD 500-800?) / MID-LATE MANASOTA (AD 400-800)</td>
<td>AD 910 &amp; 400 BC-C14/ POTTERY, SHELL TOOLS, LITHICS</td>
<td>HUTCHINSON 2004: 47; LUER 1999: 3; BULLEN AND BULLEN 1976: 50-51; LUER AND ALMY 1982: 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>1 C-14 DATE, POTTERY</td>
<td>ROBBINS 1994: 11, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>WILLEY 1949: 113; MILANICH 1994: 222, 226; SEARS 1971: 56, 59, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS Ib (AD 500-800)</td>
<td>POTTERY, MOUND CONSTRUCTION, 1 C-14-AD 680 +/- 80YRS (SH. USED FOR C-14-UNRELIABLE?)</td>
<td>MILLER 1994: 207, 215, HAGESETH 1993: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>PERIOD</td>
<td>DATING METHODS</td>
<td>CITATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND- SAFETY HARBOR CONTACT? (AD 1100-1600)</td>
<td>POTTERY, ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>BULLEN 1952: 59-61; MILANICH 1994: 227, 389- BULLEN PUTS IT 1100AD- BUT ITS MANY BIRD ARTIFACTS MAKE IT SEEM MORE WEEDEN ISLAND AND IN 1952- WEEDEN ISLAND WAS DATED AS ENDING BY AD 1300, NOT AD 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND/ ST. JOHNS IIa) (AD 800-1200)</td>
<td>POTTERY, BURIAL STYLE</td>
<td>SEARS 1959: 1; MILANICH 1994: 247, 162-163, 389- TO ADJUST DATE FOR ST. JOHNS IIA AND LATE WEEDEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>LT WEEDEN ISL./ ST. JOHNS IIA (AD 800-1200)</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>SEARS 1959: 1; MILANICH 1994: 247, 162-163, 389; TO ADJUST DATE FOR ST. JOHNS IIA AND LATE WEEDEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND (HICKORY POND)/ ST. JOHNS IIA</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>BULLEN 1949: 61; MILANICH 1994: 338, 343, 346, 347; MOST COMMON POTTERY-PRAIRIE CORD IN MOUND AND ALACHUA FOR SITE AREA, BUT OTHER MATERIAL POINTS TO ST. JOHN IIA AND WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>PERIOD</td>
<td>DATING METHODS</td>
<td>CITATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqui Esta Mound</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Late Weeden-Safety Harbor Enfield Phase (AD 1000-1200) &amp; Pinellas Phase (AD 900-1250), Caloosahatchee II (AD 700-1200)</td>
<td>Pottery and C-14-4 dates-1 available-800-1100 uncorrected BP</td>
<td>Hutchinson 2002: 183, Luer 1999: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Verde Mound</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Safety Harbor (AD 900-1350)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Hutchinson 1993: 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Point Mound</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>St. John IIA (AD 1100-1200)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Hemmings and Deagan 1973: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota Bay Mound</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Safety Harbor (Early Safety-AD 1000-Precontact AD 1500)</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Luer 2005: 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jackson Mound 3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Fort Walton (AD 1250-1500)</td>
<td>C-14-15 samp., artifacts</td>
<td>Jones 1994: 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrish Mound 2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Safety Harbor Post Contact? (AD 1200-1500)</td>
<td>Pottery, artifacts</td>
<td>Willey 1949: 150-152; Milanich 1994: 389, 403; Though Eur. Mat. found- much of the pottery older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman Mound</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Very Late St. Johns IIB</td>
<td>Pottery, artifacts, animal bones</td>
<td>Jordan 1963: 42-44; Milanich 1994: 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>PERIOD</td>
<td>DATING METHODS</td>
<td>CITATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR POST CONTACT (AD 1525-1550)</td>
<td>C-14 -OVER 9 SAMPS., SPANISH ARTIFACTS, POTTERY</td>
<td>MITCHEM 1989: 329; HUTCHINSON 2004: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR POST CONTACT (AD 1525-1550)</td>
<td>SPANISH ARTIFACTS, POTTERY</td>
<td>HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1996: 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>FORT WALTON: VELDA- SAN LUIS PHASES (AD 1500-1704)</td>
<td>FORT WALTON AND SPANISH ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>MAGOON ET AL. 2001: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>17TH CENTURY SPANISH MISSION</td>
<td>HISTORIC DOCUMENTS, ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>WEISMAN 1993: 171-172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>17TH CENTURY SPANISH MISSION (AD 1633-1704)</td>
<td>HISTORIC DOCUMENTS, ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>JONES ET AL.1991: 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>SECOND SEMINOLE WAR FORT (FORT BROOKE)</td>
<td>HISTORIC DOCUMENTS, ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>PIPER 1982a: 306-307; PIPER 1982b: 122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations:  
C-14 = Radiocarbon C-14 Test  
EUR. = European  
MAT. = Material  
SAMP. = Sample  
SEV. = Several  
SH. = Shell  
VAR. = various
been misinterpreted in the past. The study itself examined sites from 11 major cultural/temporal contexts: the Archaic (10) - 7 sites purely Archaic and 3 sites from the Archaic Transitional Period), Swift Creek (3), St Johns (8), Manasota (8), Weeden Island (11) - 1 site early Weeden Island and 10 sites Weeden Island II/Late Weeden Island), Safety Harbor (12), Glades (3), Alachua (1), Fort Walton (2), Mission Period (2), and Seminole (1) (Figure 1.3).

**Status and Hierarchy**

Evidence of status and hierarchy was examined in all aspects of burials. By status, I mean higher rank or clearly greater symbolic meaning invoked in the burial and, therefore, human sacrifices were studied with the same approaches as “big men” or chiefly burials in this investigation. Many of the methods used have been applied by archaeologists for decades, such as in Binford, Saxe, and Brown’s seminal works in the 1960s and 1970s (Binford 1971; Brown 1971; Brown 1995; Saxe 1971). In the Southeastern United States, Anderson, Milanich, Scarry, and Sullivan have also been significant (Anderson 1996; Milanich 1994; Rodning 2001; Scarry 1996; Sullivan 2001). The methods included: 1) the size of the mound, 2) the ratio of its size to the population placed in it, 3) its specific layers, 4) the ratio of female to male or young to old burials, and 5) grave goods. For grave goods, the presence or absence of goods, the variety of goods, and the number and types of grave goods with certain individuals were studied. Furthermore, as stated above, different grave goods were considered to be high status goods because they were exotic and difficult to obtain because of distance or value, clear evidence of ceremonial purpose or use, or their use for personal adornment. Health was also analyzed as a possible indicator of high status because it would be expected that the more powerful people in a society would have access to better food than their lower status counterparts. I shall demonstrate, however, that this is not necessarily true. In the end, all the evidence for status in burials at sites was plotted and calculated to rank the sites by variability in the demonstration of social complexity, and to determine if a broadly applicable method for evaluating status evidence at sites from a wide variety of locations and time periods was possible. My hope for this thesis is not only to analyze ritual and health differences among different Florida societies, but also to test new ways
to evaluate and understand status in prehistoric Florida. These techniques may also be applicable to various regions that shared similar burial practices to Florida.

4. Conclusion

This thesis explores the ritual, material culture, demography, health, and status differences demonstrated by burial evidence over almost the entire span Florida’s occupation by Native Americans groups. This is accomplished by collecting and tabulating distributions of different variables according to time and region. Certain patterns involving time, location, or culture should become clear. The study is laid out in seven chapters. Chapter 1 explains the methodology and strategies employed to understand burial in Florida. Chapter 2 summarizes the various cultures and periods of Florida’s Native American history. Chapter 3 explores the issue of site layout, including each site’s dimensions and presence or lack of ritualistic components. Chapter 4 tracks the use of different burial types such as primary vs. secondary and specific burial types including extended supine or prone, flexed, bundle, skull or cremation burial. Chapter 5 examines the presence of grave goods at site, the use individual furnished burial, and the type of grave goods and ceramics found at each site. Chapter 6 deals with the biological study of the burials. It analyzes the presence of male, female, children, adult and 50+ years burials. It also attempts to understand various health differences between populations through Dental Health and Other Health Indicators.

In Chapter 7, status and hierarchy, all of the data from Chapters 3-6 are synthesized to determine if sites can be ranked and evaluated by their variety of high status features such as the use of clean layers of shell instead of food debris, the presence of individual burial, furnished ritual objects, or personal ornaments. By doing this, a methodology was created to rank and understand how status was manifested at sites from various locations, cultures, and time periods in Florida’s Native American history. The results of this methodology not only correlate with our knowledge of the status of certain Florida sites, but may also present a new way of understanding the expression of social or ritual status at sites throughout the Southeast or in other areas that practiced burial rituals similar to prehistoric Florida. Finally, Chapter 8 discusses what important pieces of information my thesis verified or discovered, and specific issues or questions needing further research and analysis. Just as important, the chapter also demonstrates how all the
various data was effectively used to verify or sometimes change the cultural affiliation and/or dates of the different sites. Ultimately, understanding Florida’s Precolumbian history is certainly a daunting task, and my goal is to present a clear picture of how variable its native societies were in culture, ritual, environment, health and political and social organization over the last 8,000 years.
CHAPTER 2:
Environments, History, Periods, and Cultures of Florida

1. Environment of Florida

The environment and geology of Florida had a critical influence on the
development of Native American society in Florida and resulted in cultural and
subsistence differences between much of Florida and the rest of the American Southeast.
Florida is not even the same size that Native Americans first encountered 12,000 years
ago (Milanich 1994: 37). The Florida peninsula is part of the Florida Plateau, which
extends from the Piedmont section of Georgia and includes a now submerged shelf in the
Gulf of Mexico (Brown et al. 1990: 35; Hageseth 1993: 7). During Paleoindian times,
this submerged shelf was above water, and Florida was as much as 150 miles wider in
some places (Milanich 1994: 38-39). After 8,000 BC, the seas gradually rose and Florida
shrank to its current size. This dramatic loss of land has meant that many of the sites once
occupied by Paleoindians are now underwater, and the scarcity of such sites is why this
particular study begins with sites occupied in the Archaic Period.

Florida is unique in the United States, as it stretches from a temperate zone into
warm tropical seas. This partially explains how Florida has the most diverse number of
plants and animals in any state east of the Mississippi River, including 425 species of
birds, 3,500 plants, and 65 snakes (Ewel 1990: 4). Likewise, Florida contains a wide
variety of environments including pine flatwoods and dry prairies, scrub and high pine,
temperate hardwood forests, large fresh and saltwater marshes, tropical mangrove forests,
several large lakes such Lake Okeechobee, Lake George, and Lake Kissimmee, and the
longest shoreline in the United States (Brenner et al. 1990: 364; Hutchinson 2004: 16;
Myers and Ewel 1990: v-vii). Along its coastline, Florida has complex environments of
dunes, barrier islands, saltwater marshes, mangrove forests, and large offshore coral
reefs. This natural diversity was important to Native Americans, as Florida’s soil was not
well-suited for prehistoric agricultural methods.

While Florida contains a wide range of habitats, much of its soil is not very fertile
or rich in nutrients, and it is amazing it can support so many rich environments (Ewel
Most of Florida is composed of sand that is very porous, infertile, and acidic, and the most common types of soils are acidic spodosols soils. Spodosols are nearly level, poorly drained soils with dark sandy subsoils layers, and normally support ecosystems such as flatwoods and wet to dry prairies with ponds and cypress domes (Brown et. al. 1990: 45, 62). Flatwood forests, especially the pine flatwoods, are so common in Florida that they cover about 50 percent of state, and nearly all of the sites in this study existed in these areas (Abrahamson and Hartnett 1990: 103-106, 116). The flatwoods are extensive in the southwestern lowlands, the east coast lowlands, the northern Gulf Coast region, and the north-central peninsular region. The animals that are common to this environment include the white-tailed deer, black bear, the box turtle, eastern diamondback rattlesnake, the pine warbler, and the great horned owl.

While the natural environment and animals of the flatwoods had major influences on Florida’s peoples, it is the acidic and nutrient deficient nature of the flatwoods’ soil that is truly significant in the attempts made by archaeologists to understand Precolumbian society. The nutrient poor soil meant that much of Florida was not suitable for agriculture until the introduction of modern methods in the late nineteenth century. Similarly, when the different societies of Florida are explored in this thesis, it will be noticeable that none of the cultures living in the flatwoods environments practiced extensive agriculture at the time of Contact. The acidic soil has even affected modern archaeological work as it has prevented the good preservation of human skeletal remains.

As the soil could not support prehistoric agriculture, many Precolumbian societies directed their energy toward harvesting the rich riverine and marine resources of Florida. In fact, most of the sites in the study are located either along the St. John’s River estuary or the Tampa Bay area coastline. Florida’s river fauna includes at least 60 species of clams, 83 species of snails, and 126 native fish species (Nordlie 1990: 407, 409). Meanwhile, the various inshore marine habitats provided Precolumbian peoples with plentiful supplies of clams, mussels, oysters, shrimp, crab, mullet, black drum, bonefish, manatees, and turtles (Livingston 1990: 551, 563-568; Hutchinson 2004: 17-19; Montague and Wiegert 1990: 508).

One area of Florida could support prehistoric agriculture, the Florida Panhandle, and this area is largely composed of ultisols soils. These soils are predominately level to
sloping well-drained loamy soils and sandy soils with loamy subsoils (Brown et al. 1990: 44). These types of soil are good agriculture and for the preservation of bone material as they are not excessively acidic in nature. The natural ecosystems are generally mixed hardwoods and pine forests, and much of the soil is nutrient-rich (well-suited for agriculture). Fittingly, this is the only area in the study that contained cultures in which Precolumbian peoples did practice intensive agriculture, and it is quite clear that Florida’s soils help to influence the lifeways of its peoples (Milanich 1994: 364-365, 368; Willey 1949: 454-456).

2. History and Culture

I. Paleoindian Period: 12,000-9,500 BP

Partially due to the environment and climate, the burial record for the Paleoindian Period in Florida is quite sparse and the number of sites with good human remains is still less than ten after over a century of study (Clausen et al. 1975: 192-193; Clausen et al. 1979; Cockrell and Murphy 1978: 3, 7; Hutchinson 2004: 19-20; Milanich 1994: 40-41; Table 2.1 Florida Timeline). Some sites such as Vero Beach, Melbourne, and Osprey were also excavated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century when excavation techniques were often quite primitive. At this time, the idea of Paleolithic people existing in the Americas was only beginning to be realized, and the leading physical anthropologists were openly discouraging the idea of an early settlement of the Americas. Even the study of sites excavated sites more recently has been handicapped by the fact that major sites such as Little Salt Springs and Warm Mineral Springs are underwater springs, and the technology (SCUBA) and methods for studying them have not been available for many years. Moreover, none of the Paleoindian sites has yielded more than fifteen bodies, leaving archaeologists and osteologists with a very small sample to study (Brown 1994: 148-149; Cockrell and Murphy 1978: 4-6). What is clear, is bodies, at least in South Florida, and especially in the Gulf Coast Peninsula, were often placed in sinkholes. Today these sinkholes are deep underwater because of sea level rise and a change in climate from drier to wetter conditions, beginning with the Archaic Period. Grave goods such as lithic points and tools, shell and bone atlatls, bone needles and other bone tools, and animal bones were recovered in association with these burials. At Warm Mineral Springs at least one body had been laid in a flexed position. Finally, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR PERIODS AND CULTURES OF FLORIDA</th>
<th>ST. JOHNS RIVER AREA</th>
<th>CENTRAL GULF COAST PENINSULA</th>
<th>NORTH CENTRAL</th>
<th>PANHANDLE</th>
<th>SOUTH FLORIDA: 3 AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PALEOINDIANS</td>
<td>SWIFT CREEK</td>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>DEPTFORD</td>
<td>DEPTFORD</td>
<td>BELLE GLADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000-9,500 BP</td>
<td>AD 150-350</td>
<td>AD 200-400</td>
<td>500 BC- AD 200</td>
<td>500 BC- AD 200</td>
<td>500 BC- AD 1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHAIC</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS</td>
<td>MANASOTA</td>
<td>YENT COMPLEX</td>
<td>SWIFT CREEK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7500 BC (9500 BP)</td>
<td>500 BC- AD 1565</td>
<td>AD 300- 700</td>
<td>AD 100</td>
<td>AD 150- 350</td>
<td>CALOOSAHATCHEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSITIONAL</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS I</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>SWIFT CREEK</td>
<td>SANTA ROSA-SWIFT CREEK</td>
<td>500 BC- AD 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-500 BC</td>
<td>500 BC- AD 100</td>
<td>AD 200- 1000</td>
<td>AD 150- 350</td>
<td>AD 300- 500</td>
<td>CALOOSA. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPTFORD</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS Ia</td>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>500 BC- AD 650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 BC- AD 200</td>
<td>AD 100- 500</td>
<td>AD 900-1725</td>
<td>AD 200- 1000</td>
<td>AD 200- 1000</td>
<td>CALOOSA. Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWIFT CREEK</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS Ib</td>
<td>ENGLEWOOD</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND I</td>
<td>EARLY WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>AD 650-800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 150-350</td>
<td>AD 500- 750</td>
<td>AD 900- 1100</td>
<td>AD 250- 700</td>
<td>AD 200- 750</td>
<td>CALOOSA. Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. JOHNS</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS IIa</td>
<td>PINELLAS</td>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND II</td>
<td>WAKULLA PERIOD</td>
<td>AD 800- 1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 BC- AD 1565</td>
<td>AD 750- 1050</td>
<td>AD 1100-1500</td>
<td>AD 700- 1000</td>
<td>AD 750- 950</td>
<td>CALOOSA. III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS IIb</td>
<td>TATHAM</td>
<td>CADES POND</td>
<td>FORT WALTON</td>
<td>AD 1200- 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 300-700</td>
<td>AD 1050-1513</td>
<td>AD 1500- 1567</td>
<td>AD 100- 600</td>
<td>AD 1000- MISSION</td>
<td>CALOOSA. IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS IIc</td>
<td>BAYVIEW</td>
<td>ALACHUA CULTURE</td>
<td>CAYSON</td>
<td>AD 1350-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 200-1000</td>
<td>AD 1513- 1565</td>
<td>AD 1567- 1725</td>
<td>AD 600- 1539</td>
<td>AD 1000- 1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>HICKORY POND</td>
<td>SNEADS</td>
<td>GLADES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 900-1725</td>
<td>AD 600-1250</td>
<td>AD 1200- 1400</td>
<td>500 BC- AD 1513</td>
<td>GLADES I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT WALTON</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALACHUA</td>
<td>AD 1400- MISSION</td>
<td>GLADES I EARLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 1000- MISSION PERIOD</td>
<td>AD 1250-1539</td>
<td>LAKE JACKSON</td>
<td>500 BC- AD 500</td>
<td>GLADES I LATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALOOSAHATCHEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUWANNEE VALLEY</td>
<td>AD 1100- 1400</td>
<td>GLADES IIa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 BC- AD 1500</td>
<td>AD 750- 1539</td>
<td>VELDA</td>
<td>AD 500- 750</td>
<td>GLADES IIb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELLE GLADE</td>
<td></td>
<td>AD 1400- MISSION</td>
<td>GLADES IIa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 BC- AD 1700</td>
<td></td>
<td>AD 1400- MISSION</td>
<td>GLADES IIb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLADES</td>
<td></td>
<td>AD 1400- MISSION</td>
<td>GLADES IIb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 BC- AD 1513</td>
<td>AD 900- 1100</td>
<td>MISSION PERIOD</td>
<td>GLADES IIc</td>
<td>AD 1100- 1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION PERIOD</td>
<td>AD 1565-1704</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLADES IIIa</td>
<td>AD 1200-1400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMINOLE PERIOD</td>
<td>AD 1704-1845</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLADES IIIb</td>
<td>AD 1400-1513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Refer to chapter pages on each period or culture for citation information).
1. CALOOSA=CALOOSAHATCHEE
Paleoindian people of Florida were mobile hunter-gathers who lived in a relatively dry environment and subsisted on almost anything that was edible including large and small game, shellfish, birds, fish, various plants, reptiles, and even amphibians (Milanich 1994: 46-48).

II. Archaic Period: 7,500- 500 BC

The Archaic Period began around 9,500 BP (7,500 BC) and was characterized by several things: 1) a decrease in arid conditions in Florida, 2) a change from lanceolate points to stemmed points, 3) a more diverse tool kit, and 4) an increase in population (Milanich 1994: 63-64). As Florida became wetter, its environment became more habitable for Native Americans, and groups were able to change from a completely nomadic subsistence pattern to one of a more sedentary lifestyle along coastal and riverine environments (Doran 2002: 10). Instead of hunting big game, subsistence turned to the abundant and diverse riverine, pond, and marsh resources with more extensive use of large and small terrestrial resources (Milanich 1994: 63-64, 75, 85). These changes in environment and lifestyle allowed populations to grow and necessitated an even greater exploitation of diverse resources. The Archaic Period is divided into Early (7500- 5000 BC), Middle (5000- 3000 BC), and Late Archaic (3000- 500 BC), based on changes in environment, culture, and population.

The Archaic Period is significant as the sample of human burials expands considerably. Initially, at least in South Florida, the common type of burial appears to have been the deposition of bodies in shallow ponds and marked by wooden stakes (Dickel 2002: 75-76; Hutchinson 2004: 21). Bodies were frequently buried in large groups, and individual burials were flexed and often possessed grave goods such as bone and stone tools, jewelry, and animal bones. Some burial sites were quite large. For example, the Early Archaic site of Windover Pond has yielded at least 168 individuals and hundreds of artifacts. The use of wet cemeteries continued into the Middle and Late Archaic, and sites such as Bay West and Republic Groves contained similar forms of burial (Beriault et al. 1981; Hutchinson 2004: 20-21; Wharton et al. 1981). However, much is unknown about the Bay West because simple dredging was used to recover the human remains and artifacts.
The exact end of the Archaic Period is still unclear, because Florida societies changed quite gradually, and there has been much debate over the idea of a “Transitional Period” of 1000- 500 BC (Milanich 1994: 86, 88). One problem with the “Transitional Period” is that it is largely based on the appearance of ceramic manufacturing techniques, but in several areas of Florida this is quite unclear. Many chronologies, in fact, have the Late Archaic or “early Transitional period” beginning at 2000 BC, when the use of pottery started, and ending at 500 BC (Austin et al. 1992: 179; Thunen and Ashley 1995: 3). Beside the use of pottery, the Late Archaic/Transitional period is characterized by a dramatic change in type of burial sites. During the Late Archaic, the use of wet cemeteries ceased, and dry plain cemeteries, or burials in middens or mounds became increasingly common (Jones and Carr 1981; Milanich 1994: 83-88; Russo 1994). The end of the Archaic Period is often given as 500 BC because it is around this time that gradual increases in population and changes in pottery resulted in dramatic evidence of regional cultures or traditions. These traditions included: Deptford (Northwest Florida), St. Johns (Central and East Florida), Manasota (Central Peninsular Gulf Coast), Caloosahatchee (South Peninsular Gulf Coast), Belle Glade (South Central Florida), and Glades (Southern Tip of Florida). After 500 BC, the history of Florida became very complex with different cultures, periods, and subperiods, and my discussion will only focus on those that impacted this study.

III. Deptford Culture: 500 BC- AD 200

In the case of northern Florida, the earliest post-500 BC sites included in this study were of the Swift Creek and St. Johns’ cultures. The Swift Creek culture dates to between AD 150-500 in parts of northwest Florida, and was an outgrowth of the Deptford Culture of 500 BC-AD 200 (Milanich 1994: 111-135, 141-145). The Deptford people are especially recognizable by their checked-stamped, quartz-tempered pottery. They frequently lived in oak-magnolia hammocks, adjacent to salt marshes on the coast and used small interior sites for the gathering of certain resources. Deptford peoples used the marshes and hammocks to obtain edible plants such as palm berries, wild grapes, hickory nuts, and animals such as deer, rabbit, turtles, and bear. Like many other Florida cultures, however, they especially depended on fish and shellfish. The Deptford peoples lived in oval houses, composed of posts in trenches, and many of their sites were used year round...
as people were better able to live without constantly moving in search of food. Although there is evidence of Deptford ceremonial life in the form of mounds, these mounds date to the late Deptford period of AD 100 and overlap with the Swift Creek culture. At the same time, no Deptford sites were selected for this study on burials, for the simple reason that very few sites with clear Deptford culture burials have been found.

IV. Swift Creek Culture: AD 150-500

The Swift Creek culture is identifiable by its specific pottery types (such as Swift Creek complicated stamped), its villages (inland sites: horseshoe shaped or circular midden; coastal: rectangular or linear shell middens), its burial mounds, and its distinctive lithic tools including the Swift Creek point, a bifacial knife with a triangular blade (Anderson 1998: 276-277, 282-283; Milanich 1994: 141-145). Like their Archaic and Deptford predecessors, Swift Creek peoples depended on a variety of foods, including various terrestrial animals, shellfish, fish, and nuts. Greater populations led to a very complex ceremonial life among Swift Creek peoples.

Large mound complexes and constructed circular burial mounds ranging from 32 feet (10 m) to 64 feet (20m) in diameter and 160 feet (49 m) by 65 feet (20 m) for oval burial mounds; all of which were, at the most, 6 feet (2 m) in height were constructed (Anderson 1998: 282-283; Milanich 1994: 148-149; Willey 1949: 369-370). Early Swift Creek mounds appear to have been built in several ceremonies, in which burials and caches of artifacts were deposited, and then covered with additional layers. Within these mounds, burials were generally flexed, but sometimes, bundle or single skull burials are present. Charnel houses may have been used to temporarily store bodies, and by the Late Swift Creek, mounds were constructed in a single ceremony. Unlike Archaic burials, Swift Creek peoples rarely practiced individual furnished burial. Instead, they deposited several caches of artifacts such as pottery, shell drinking cups, and mica sheets into a mound (Wilson 1965: 28-30). Finally, many of the Swift Creek burial traditions shared traits with a number of Florida’s different cultures, and the frequency and continuation of these traits will be become clearer in this study.

V. St. Johns Culture: 500 BC- AD 1565

While the Swift Creek culture was predominant in northwest Florida, it interacted with the St. Johns culture of east and central Florida. At least one of the sites in the study,
Dent Mound, has been tied to both cultures (Ashley 1995: 26-28; Thunen and Ashley 1995: 5). The St. Johns Period or culture covers an enormous timeframe, 500 BC- AD 1565 and is divided into two main periods: St. Johns I (500 BC- AD 750) and St. Johns II (AD 750-1565) (Hageseth 1993: 24-29; Milanich 1994: 247). Like the Archaic, St. Johns I people depended upon a wide of range resources, and their intense exploitation of large oyster beds on the coast and river mussels on the St. Johns enabled them to support larger populations than ever before. Overall, the St. Johns periods are defined by changes in ceramic and social complexity (Hageseth 1993: 24-29; Milanich 1994: 260-262; Thunen and Ashley 1995: 5). St. Johns I sites are generally shell middens and/or low sand mounds typically between 8 feet (2.4 m) to 12 feet (3.7 m) in height. Burial mounds were often cone shaped, and charnel houses were used before burial deposition. St. Johns I burial patterns were somewhat more varied than in other parts of Florida. Like other areas of Florida, bundle and single skulls were the most common burial types, but unlike most of Florida, primary extended inhumations and cremations were frequently included.

Other characteristics of St. Johns I burials included: the use of red ochre to line pits or areas of the mound, the scattered depositing of grave goods throughout the mound, only a few individuals with personal grave goods, broken or “killed” pottery scattered throughout the mound, and the use of fire pits in ritual behavior (Hageseth 1993: 24-29; Milanich 1994: 260-262; Thunen and Ashley 1995: 5). While grave goods were similar to Swift Creek goods and Swift Creek pottery is often found in these mounds, the most common pottery was undecorated St. Johns Plain. Furthermore, St. Johns I mounds can also be identified as these mounds rarely contain decorated pottery. Decorated pottery is normally found solely in St. Johns I villages. Finally, as St. Johns I progressed and populations became larger, there was increasing evidence of hierarchy. Some mounds, such as Queen Mound and Rose Hammock, have been found with log tombs, and certain individuals, “big men or women,” were buried with individual grave goods.

St. Johns II is marked by the appearance of checked stamped pottery in the St. Johns region at about AD 750, but otherwise changes were quite gradual and the artifact evidence shows a clear continuity between populations (Milanich 1994: 262-265). During St. Johns II, however, several major developments occurred including the use of agriculture in St. Johns IIb to grow maize, gourds, and squash and the harvesting of
acorns. St. John II also witnessed the birth of even larger and more complex societies. St. John II is, in fact, distinguished by having the largest coastal shell middens in the United States (Hageseth 1993: 27). The St. Johns II mounds were usually larger than their St. Johns I predecessors, and Shields Mound from this period is estimated to have been 214 feet (65 m) in diameter and 18 feet (5.5 m) high (Thunen and Ashley 1995: 6-7). These mounds also contained many rare and exotic artifacts such as copper plates and jewelry, bird effigies, and large numbers of spatulate celts characteristic of Mississippian culture. Many of these artifacts were associated with individual burials, and indicative of hierarchy.

The St. Johns peoples differed from Mississippian cultures in some ways, however, the most significant being that agriculture, while practiced, was never extensively used in the St. Johns’ area because the soil simply could not support it. (Milanich 2004: 22). In regards to exact burial type, contemporary archaeologists have problems defining types since many of the high status St. Johns II mounds were excavated by Moore at the turn of the century (Milanich 1999: 6-7). Nevertheless, St. Johns II burial ritual shared many similarities with St. Johns I (Hageseth 1993: 27-28; Milanich 1994: 269). Burials were extended, flexed, single skull, cremation, but bundle was still the most common type. Red ochre and charnel houses were still used, and one of the St. John II sites excavated in the early 1970s, the Walker Point Mound, contained all of these features (Hemmings and Deagan 1973: 34-39).

VI. Manasota Culture: 500 BC- AD 800

For post 500 BC south Florida, this study included sites of the Manasota, Glades, and possibly the Caloosahatchee cultures. The Manasota culture was based largely around Tampa Bay and Charlotte Harbor and dates from between 500 BC- AD 800 (Luer and Almy 1982: 34). The Manasota culture includes a Deptford and early Weeden Island component which has been called the Perico Island Period, and Late Manasota is part of the Weeden Island II culture complex (Milanich 1994: 221, 227). Manasota society was sedentary, and villages were either on slightly elevated ground on the coastline and barrier islands within estuaries and pine flatwoods, or inland by sources of freshwater sources where different habitats were accessible (Luer and Almy 1982: 40-42; Milanich 1994: 224-225). Beside hunting various animals and gathering wild plants, the Manasota...
people had access to several large bays, which provided enough fish and shellfish to sustain relatively large populations. In fact, some of the clearest of evidence of Manasota peoples are their shell middens. For their artifacts, the Manasota people largely made undecorated sand tempered pottery and used shell as a main source for tools such as shell hammers, sinkers, scrapers, celts, and the shell cups, common to most Florida societies.

In terms of burial ritual, the Manasota culture changed significantly from burials in shell middens and cemeteries between 500 BC- AD 200 to burial mounds from 200-AD 800 (Luer and Almy 1982: 42, 46, 47; Milanich 1994: 227; Willey 1949: 172-180). For example, Perico Island, dated to about 150 BC, contained both a regular cemetery and a burial mound component. Initially, in Manasota, burials were primary flexed burials and occasionally extended, but by AD 300, secondary bundle burials had become the standard type. The types of pottery found with burials also changed, as undecorated sand tempered pottery was eventually replaced by decorated Weeden Island styles and Wakulla and St. Johns Checked Stamped pottery. At the same time, throughout the entire Manasota period, burial sites were associated with few grave goods, and those goods that were deposited were scattered throughout the site. Finally, Manasota culture was clearly interacting with other regional cultures, and in its later stages, it became part of the much larger Weeden Island culture complex. In fact the actual site of Weeden Island is an area full of Manasota cultural sites, and may not be a full Weeden Island cultural site (Milanich 1998: 94).

VII. Caloosahatchee Culture: 500 BC- AD 1500

Directly south of the Manasota culture was the Caloosahatchee culture, and several sites such as Manasota Key appear to have elements of both cultures. Like the St. Johns culture, the Caloosahatchee culture has numerous temporal divisions and begins at 500 BC and ends with Contact at AD 1500. Caloosahatchee culture was centered on the southwest Florida coast from Charlotte Harbor to Estero Bay just south of Fort Myers (Milanich 1994: 311-321; 1998: 129). Its people appeared to have subsisted largely on the shellfish and fish of the area. These people used shell to construct huge middens of various shapes, shell causeways, large shell mounds, and dug canals. Unlike other groups, some of these shell mounds were composed of a single species, and others had distinct species layers that must have been intentionally constructed. Although the
mortuary practices of the Caloosahatchee are not well documented, they do appear to have been similar to their neighbors, meaning that continuously used sand burial mounds containing flexed burials were used between AD 700-1200 (Hutchinson 2004: 28).

Finally, what is clear about Caloosahatchee people is that by about AD 800, populations grew to the point that hierarchical chiefdoms evolved (McGoun 1993: 11-23; Milanich 1995: 49-50; Milanich 1998: 131-132). By the time of the Contact in the sixteenth century, the chiefdoms were so strong that the head of Calusa was often referred to as a king by the Spaniards. In the Spanish records, the Calusa king controlled large swaths of south Florida, had numerous servants, and often demanded respect from even Spanish governors.

VIII. Belle Glade Culture: 500 BC- AD 1700

Like the Caloosahatchee, the Belle Glade culture also built complex structures, and these structures included mounds, middens, canals, borrow pits, circular ditches, linear embankments, and geometric-shaped earthworks (Griffin 2002: 149-150; Milanich 1994: 279, 297; Milanich 1998: 116). Belle Glade culture was centered upon the wetlands of Lake Okeechobee, and a few archaeologists believed that many of the earthworks were constructed to enclose and drain fields for agriculture (Sears 1982: 129, 193). Belle Glade people built truly massive earthworks, and the site of Big Circle had linear embankments of 180 to more than 580 feet in length (Milanich 1998: 122). The Belle Glade peoples appear to have had major interactions with other southern Florida group as their pottery is found in significant quantities in coastal Manasota and Safety Harbor sites (McGoun 1993: 97).

In addition to possible agriculture, the Belle Glade people depended on a wide range of animal and plant resources, and contact with the coast gave them access to its rich marine resources. Lastly, few Belle Glade sites have been extensively excavated, and the large site of Fort Center has served as an example of Belle Glade culture (Griffin 2002: 149; Milanich 1994: 281). Fort Center had earthworks, burial mounds, middens, and a charnel platform that was adjacent to, and also over a pond (Milanich 1994: 291-297; Sears 1982: 130-183). Some burials have been found in the pond, and there is still a debate on whether these burials were intentionally deposited in the pond or simply fell in when a platform collapsed. Unlike the wet cemeteries of the Archaic, however, these
burials were secondary bundle burials (McGoun 1993: 81). Eventually, like much of Florida at the time of Contact, burial types in the Belle Glade region had changed to individual furnished burial in mounds, and some furnished burials contained European objects (Milanich 1998: 122).

IX. Glades Culture: 500 BC- AD 1513

The southernmost culture on the Florida mainland was the Glades culture, which began around 500 BC, and was located in most of Florida, south and east of the Okeechobee and Caloosahatchee regions (Milanich 1994: 298-302). The Glades culture covers 500 BC to AD 1513, and is divided into several subperiods, with the main three, being Glades I (500 BC- AD 750), Glades II (AD 750- 1200), and Glades III (AD 1200-1513). Glades people lived in an environment of wetlands and mangroves forests and consumed a diet mostly of fish, shellfish, reptiles, and fruits such as cabbage palm, hog plum, and sea grape (Griffin 2002: 298-309). Their sites were quite variable, and archaeologists have found middens of shell or earth representing short- and long-term settlements. Burials were placed in sand and stone mounds, and in or beside middens (Milanich 1994: 308-310). Moreover, as time progressed, populations increased, and in Glades II, charnel houses began to appear. Glades sites are frequently identified and dated by their ceramics, which changed from plain sand tempered varieties in Glades I (e.g., Glades Plain) to incised in Glades II (e.g., Key Largo Incised), and finally to undecorated, with some St. Johns Check Stamped and Safety Harbor pottery in Glades III. Finally, south Florida does not contain deposits of chert, so most tools and objects were made from shell or bone.

X. Weeden Island Culture: AD 200- 1000

Around AD 200, much of northern Florida was dominated by the Weeden Island culture, and this culture is used to identify cultures that included the coastal plain of northwest Florida and adjacent portions of Georgia and Alabama; a panhandle coastal Weeden Island culture; the north Florida McKeithen Weeden Island culture; the late Weeden Island Wakulla culture of northwest Florida; a northern peninsula Gulf coast culture; the middle and late Manasota periods culture; and the Cades Pond culture in north central Florida (Milanich 1994: 162-163; Milanich et al. 1997: 10). Depending on the region, Weeden Island dates between AD 200-1000, with the subperiods of Weeden
Island I (AD 250-700) and Weeden Island II (AD 700-900/1000). In the case of Florida’s Panhandle, Weeden Island was the direct successor of Swift Creek.

Weeden Island culture is largely recognized by its distinctive decorated pottery, such as Weeden Island Incised, Red, and Punctuated and also by its ceremonial life. Weeden Island settlements, especially of the McKeithen Complex, were normally small villages composed of several households, which over time grew in population, and from which new kin-related villages budded off (Milanich et al. 1997: 35-36, 40-41). All of these villages were located near a permanent source of water, and depending on their environment, their inhabitants exploited a wide range of resources. Coastal sites were associated with large shell middens and interior sites relied on various game and hardwood nuts and fruit trees (oak, hickory, wild plum, etc.) for food. Unlike many other Florida cultures, archaeologists believe that northern Weeden Island I cultures practiced agriculture as maize, squash, and gourd ceramic effigies have been found at their sites, and by Weeden Island II, agriculture had likely become important to the societies.

Meanwhile, Weeden Island ceremonial life was deeply affected by settlement organization and kinship relations (Milanich 1994: 169; Milanich et al. 1997: 188-189). Village fissioning created new villages, each continuing to be linked by kinship and culture to the original village. One way in which lineage or other kin ties were demonstrated was through mound burials, and villagers who shared kin ties were interred in kin-related burial mounds, associated with each village cluster. Many of these mounds such as McKeithen Mound C had charnel houses that allowed groups of bodies to be stored until they were interred at the same time. Weeden Island sites also have clear evidence of religious specialists and paraphernalia such as large numbers of bird and animal effigy pottery, the presence of hearths, posts, and platforms on mounds. Several mounds, including McKeithen Mound B, contained tombs for a single individual buried with ritual objects (Milanich et al. 1997: 106-109, 188-189).

Unlike later Mississippian cultures, Weeden Island sites and culture were not as stratified, were managed by ritual experts and “big men,” and the majority of mounds contained individuals of equal status without individual grave goods (Milanich 1994: 179-192; Brown 1994: 152-153). Weeden Island burials were normally secondary bundle burials, but occasionally flexed and single skull burials have been excavated at these
sites. Above these burials would be layers of soil, killed pottery, hearths that were used for ritual fires, shells cups, and pottery caches (often on the east side of the mound).

Finally, by late Weeden Island II, most Weeden Island cultures became more stratified, leading to the development of the Mississippian Fort Walton culture of North Florida and the Safety Harbor culture of the Gulf Coast Peninsula.

**XI. Alachua Culture: AD 500-1539**

One culture from north Florida that does not appear to have been directly linked to Weeden Island or St. Johns society is the Alachua culture of north-central Florida (Milanich 1994: 333). The Alachua culture dates to between AD 600-1539 and is divided into Hickory Pond (AD 600-1250) and Alachua (AD 1250-1539). The Alachua culture appears to have replaced the Weeden Island Period Cades Pond culture in both culture and population. Whereas the Cades Pond people had been hunter-gatherers, who depended on wetlands for food, the Alachua villages were located on good agricultural soil, and the people subsisted on a limited variety of animals for food (Dolan 1959: 25). Alachua’s distinctive pottery even suggests that these people were originally from Georgia (Milanich 1994: 333).

Although only two Alachua burial mounds have been excavated and one tested, they show clear differences from their Weeden Island predecessors (Bullen 1949: 49-61; Milanich 1971: 9-11; Milanich 1994: 343, 346, 347). For example, the most common type of burial was flexed or extended prone burials, and single skulls or bundle burials represented only a minority of burials. At the same time, although while several burials had red ochre or other grave goods, these mounds lacked the ritual paraphernalia and effigies of the Weeden Island sites. However, like the Weeden Island sites, hearths and rituals fires appear to have been used.

**XII. Fort Walton Culture: AD 1000-1600**

Around AD 900, Mississippian culture arose, and many societies of the American Southeast were part of or influenced by it. In Florida, there were two major examples: the fully Mississippian Fort Walton culture and Mississippian-influenced Safety Harbor culture. Fort Walton dates between AD 1000/1100- (to the Mission period depending on the area), and was the successor to Weeden Island in the Panhandle. It was also the most politically complex culture in Florida’s Precolumbian history with the highest population
densities ever achieved (Milanich 1994: 355, 361, 364-365, 368). The Fort Walton people evolved from previous Weeden Island societies, and this is represented by many of Fort Walton’s tools, pottery, and subsistence. Nevertheless, Fort Walton society represented significant changes in technology, subsistence, settlement pattern, sociopolitical integrations and ideology. Unlike their predecessors, the Fort Walton peoples were major agriculturists who relied on the intensive harvesting of maize and beans (Milanich 1994: 364-365, 368; Willey 1949: 454-456). Their buildings were constructed with wall trenches, a common Mississippian feature, and their pottery was often open bowls and collared globular bowls, neither of which was found during the Weeden Island period.

The Fort Walton period and culture included clear capitol village sites such as Lake Jackson, which had a total of seven mounds, six arranged in rows, a plaza between two of the mounds, and the largest mound, Mound 2, had a base of 90 yards (82 m) by 100 yards (91 m) and a height of 36 feet (11 m) (Milanich 1994: 369). Burial mounds such as Mound 3 at Lake Jackson were clearly the resting places of the elite, as individual bodies were laid out in log-encased layer containing numerous grave goods including copper objects, effigies, jewelry, garments, and other precious materials (Jones 1994: 125-130, 135). Many of these objects, such as copper breastplates, with images like the hawkman dancer, were part of the Mississippian Southeastern Ceremonial Complex, and they illustrate how the Fort Walton culture was fully part of Mississippian culture (Milanich 1994: 372; Brown 1994: 59-60). Like many other cultures, the burial mounds themselves also often had temples on top of them. Finally, Fort Walton commoners were buried either individually (in flexed or extended position) or buried in mass graves in cemeteries (Brown 1994: 154; Milanich 1994: 370; Willey 1949: 456;).

**XIII. Safety Harbor Culture: AD 900-1725**

Whereas Fort Walton was the successor to Weeden Island on the Panhandle, Safety Harbor succeeded Late Manasota and Weeden Island on the Central Gulf Coast Peninsula. Safety Harbor culture dated between AD 900/1000-1725 with several subperiods: Englewood (AD 900/1000-1100/1200), Pinellas (AD 1100/1200-1500), Tatham (AD 1500-1567) and Bayview (AD 1567-1725) (Luer 2002: 112, Milanich 1994: 389). Safety Harbor cultures have largely been defined by 1) their types of pottery such as Pinellas, Englewood, and Safety Harbor Incised; 2) their use of pottery (like
Weeden Island, certain decorated pottery used for burial); 3) their site plans and burials mounds; 4) the inclusion of European goods as grave goods; and 5) the adoption of Mississippian iconography (Mitchem 1989: 317, 319, Willey 1949: 472-475). One example of Mississippian cultural influence is that many sites, such as the Aqui Esta Mound, had pottery with clear Mississippian derived iconography, in the form of human hands and the barred oval and scrolls (Luer 2002: 157).

At the same time, Safety Harbor culture was very much a natural progression from the Late Weeden Island and Manasota cultures of the area, and the Safety Harbor people largely continued the subsistence patterns of their ancestors. They depended on a variety of marine shellfish, freshwater and marine turtles, crabs, sea birds, alligators, sharks, fish, and terrestrial animals such as deer and turkey (Hutchinson 2004: 40). Many of the sites, including Thomas Mound, were used in both periods, and the major differences between Weeden Island and Safety Harbor were the result of increasing populations, political organization, and cultural influences from the Mississippian cultures further north (Milanich 1994: 209, 227, 397).

By the late Weeden Island period, the relatively egalitarian Manasota societies were changing into chiefdoms (Luer 1999: 19). Unlike the previous Weeden Island and Manasota sites, Safety Harbor sites were typically larger with mound and plaza complexes (Hutchinson 2004: 37; Milanich 1994: 394-396). The community plan consisted of a platform mound, likely the base of a temple or other important building adjacent to a plaza, and several village middens. The site would also contain one or more burial mounds. The heartland for the largest and most complex sites was the coastal Tampa Bay area. Platforms mounds were typically 20 feet or less in height with a base of 130 feet or less on each side. Each of these mounds had a ramp on the side facing the plaza. Unlike many of the previous cultures, archaeologists even have historical descriptions of these sites, and Spanish chroniclers discussed the size, layout, and organization of these sites and their peoples. Between this documentation and archaeological evidence, including signs of greater settlement density, it is clear that the Safety Harbor culture was controlled by chiefdoms with strong hierarchies.

The Spaniards even discussed the burial mounds in their records, and like many of the previous cultures, charnel houses were used and often placed on top of platforms on
the burial mounds (Milanich 1994: 401-404; Mitchem 1989: 324-332). Archaeological evidence of sites such as Parrish Mound 2, Tierra Verde Mound, and Tatham Mound has shown that burials were frequently secondary bundle, but that cremation and primary flexed types did occasionally occur. Evidence of hierarchy is seen by the fact many of the sites do contain individuals with personal grave goods, and occasionally, individuals were placed in log-lined pits. Common grave goods were shell jewelry, red ochre, lithics, and metal objects (especially during the Contact Period). The use of shell cups and “killed” pottery was also practiced. Evidence of hierarchy in these mounds continued into the Contact Period, as many burials, especially those from Tatham Mound, contained individuals with exotic European objects. Tatham Mound even hints at the dramatic effects the Spanish had on the Native Americans, as many of the later bodies were clearly primary burials laid out in rows (Mitchem 1989: 29-30). Archaeologists believe these were individuals who had died from European diseases.

XIV. Mission and Seminole Periods: AD 1565-1845

With the arrival of Spanish in the 1500s, many of the cultures throughout Florida either disappeared or changed as deadly diseases brought by the Europeans or Spanish military involvement affected their populations (Brown 1994: 9; Milner 1991: 5-8). By the end of the sixteenth century, Florida had entered the Mission Period. The Mission Period lasted from the establishment of the first Franciscan mission in the 1565 to 1704, with destruction of many of these sites by English and Creek forces (McEwan 1993: ix-xx). Most of the missions were concentrated on either the north Florida and Georgian Atlantic coast, or in inland north Florida as far west as the Tallahassee area (Milanich 1995: 170-181, 198-202). During this period, native groups were made part of the Spanish system through the establishment of missions. Chiefs owed tribute to the Crown through labor or goods. Agriculture was intensified, and European domestic plants and animals were introduced. Missions were established to educate, Christianize, and manage the native populations.

Political authority and religious beliefs also changed as the native chiefs’ power now depended upon their relationship with Spanish functionaries, either governmental or religious. Major decisions were made in Spain by the Council of the Indies or by local priests or government officials (Milanich 1995: 198-200). Roman Catholicism was
introduced, and burial patterns changed dramatically. Instead of mound or below house floors, internments were placed in or near churches, and were in the form of individual graves with people in an extended supine position (Jones et al. 1991: 109-113,119; Weisman 1993: 170-171). While some burials continued to have grave goods, status was now marked by how close a burial was to the church’s altar. Lastly, although, the Spaniards did make some efforts to help their native converts, Europeans diseases decimated these populations. In 1704, an expedition by English and Creek forces destroyed or forced the abandonment of most of the missions in Florida (Jones et al. 1991: 19-22; Milanich 1995: 222-227).

Afterward, during the 1700s and early 1800s, the surviving small native populations were gradually replaced by the Lower Creeks and runaway slaves (Milanich 1995: 233-235). These groups would become the Seminoles. Between 1820 and 1850, the Seminoles were crushed by the US Army, and many Seminoles were shipped out of Florida to the west (Bense 1994: 320). One of the depots for shipping was Fort Brooke at Tampa. An excavation of the site (Quad Block) has revealed a cemetery that contained large numbers of Seminoles. The cemetery shows both the influence of Euro-American ideas and the continuation of native practices (Bense 1994: 309; Piper et al. 1982a: 310-311, 320-326). The burials were extended supine burials in coffins (Euro-American) and most of the grave goods of Euro-American origins. However, the elaborate use and furnishing of many of the individual graves has been argued to have been a remnant of Mississippian beliefs and ideology. In the end, burial ritual and layout underwent numerous changes, reflecting Florida’s complex Native American history. The question that must be asked is how clearly we can see these changes and whether the health of the different peoples changed much during the Native American settlement of Florida.
CHAPTER 3:
Type of Site, Size, Layout, and Layers of Burial Sites

1. Type of Site

While Native Americans have lived in Florida for over 12,000 years, the basic ways in which they buried their dead can be categorized as three forms: wet/pond cemeteries, plain cemeteries, and mound burials. My sample of 40 sites/43 site contexts did not vary from the general patterns of Florida’s prehistory. As the Paleo-Indian Period and Archaic North Florida burial sites are few and poorly documented, my study begins in the South Florida Archaic. Archaic populations’ burials were initially placed in ponds marked off by the use of wooden stakes (e.g., Windover and Republic Groves). By the Middle Archaic, changes resulted in two major burial methods, which would continue throughout Florida’s prehistory: mound burials (Tick Island) and plain cemeteries (e.g., Gauthier, Santa Maria, Bay Cadillac). Plain cemeteries (burials laid in the ground without any additional features) were largely conducted in the transitional period of the Late Archaic. When the first regional cultures emerged around 500 BC, mound burial became the standard burial form, and the site in the study that best represents this change is Perico Island, the type-site of Perico Island Period/culture (Milanich 1994: 221). The site dates to about 2100 BP (500 BC to AD 200) and is the earliest site in this study with a distinctive regional cultural association, Glades I or Early Manasota. The site is composed of a plain cemetery and a mound with burials.

After 2100 BP, until the establishment of the Missions by Spanish in the late sixteenth century, all but three of the sites (30 sites in total- Table 1.1) were mound burial sites. Identifying the burial form of two of the nonmound sites is difficult. Turtle Shores may have been a mound, but modern construction possibly removed the top layers of it (Hageseth 1993: 34-35, 45, 46). The Manasota Key site was located on a barrier island and could have been a mound composed of midden material that was scattered by storm surges (Austin et al. 1992: 172-173). The Gauthier site was the only one that was clearly not a mound, but it is located on the Atlantic coast of South Florida where many sites have been especially damaged, destroyed, or poorly documented. After Spanish
colonization, burial sites directly associated with European peoples became plain cemeteries (e.g., Fig Springs, Patale, Quad Block). Burials in Florida can be summarized as having changed from mortuary ponds (South Florida only) to cemeteries and mounds, to mounds, and finally to cemeteries.

2. Size of Site

While basic burial form came largely in only three varieties, the size, use, construction, layout, and meaning of these burial types varied considerably. Calculating the size of many of these sites was quite difficult. Volume could rarely be calculated for the mounds, because the shapes of these sites were either not well recorded or they had been changed in shape over time by erosion, human intervention (prehistoric or modern), or vegetation. Many of these mound sites were often looted or even built on before archaeological excavations (e.g., Mayport, Sarasota Bay, and Walker Point Mounds). It is not uncommon to work on a site that has had its upper layers destroyed by development or looting. Besides these problems, some archaeologists have not consistently described the exact scale of their sites, but focused on their test trenches and a very basic description of the site. As a consequence, this study was limited to using reported mound base areas and heights. By examining height and area, it was clear that there were cultural, and, possibly, hierarchical differences responsible for the scale of the mound sites (Table 3.1).

For the Archaic Period, Tick Island was the only mound site in the study. Understanding its size in context with other such sites is difficult, because for many years archaeologists did not even believe that Florida’s Archaic peoples built mounds (Russo 1994: 93-109). Furthermore, Tick Island appears to be a massive construction with a height of 3.35 m and area of 834 m², but this is likely because it was used for thousands of years, and at times, served as a midden. Many of the mound sites were likely used and rebuilt several times, and determining the exact dimensions of these different stages is often difficult. Equally problematic is the dating of the mound stages. Thus, only the final dimensions of site are plotted in this study.

Aside from Tick Island, the mound sites for later periods and cultures of Florida do show significant differences. The first clear difference is between the Swift Creek Period/culture and its successor, the Weeden Island Period/culture. For Swift Creek,
Table 3.1 Size of Mounds vs. Number of Individuals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED # INDIVIDUALS</th>
<th>AREA (M²)</th>
<th>HEIGHT (M)</th>
<th>LENGTH (M)</th>
<th>WIDTH (M)</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>*1,000</td>
<td>833.95</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>40.84</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>6034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>263.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>182.41</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>690.54</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>176.71</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>572.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>346.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>406.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>357.67</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>182.41</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>314.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>357.63</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>10.668</td>
<td>10.668</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>410.43</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>21.335</td>
<td>21.335</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>182.41</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2475.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>881.41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>729.66</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>358.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>962.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2304.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1231.63</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1073.00</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1590.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>467.59</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>289.00</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>147.41</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>410.43</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>644.14</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tick Island may have held as many as a thousand burials, but shell mining removed them (Aten 1999: 170).
mounds could be quite large, 2 m high and 980 m² in base area. By comparison, Weeden Island mounds were rarely above 1m high or 500 m² in base area. The Swift Creek cultural site of Pierce Mound A was 2.44 m by 690 m², and the only Weeden Island site of this sample that was considerably larger than it was Bayshore Homes Mound B of the Late Weeden Island Period (1429 m² by 0.91 m).

The clearest change in size of burial mounds appears to occur temporally (Figures 3.1 and 3.2). While Weeden Island culture dominated North Florida and the Gulf Coast as far south as the Tampa Bay area, the St. Johns culture was prevalent in Northeastern Florida (500 BC- AD 1565) and the Manasota culture (AD 200-700) in the Tampa Bay and Charlotte Harbor areas. For both of these cultures, mound size was quite similar, and the major changes do not occur until the end of their respective periods. For example, the St. Johns IIC Period Walker Point Mound, 800 BP (AD 1150), was 3 m tall and 358 m², and the significance of its great height will be discussed later. Likewise, Goodman Mound of the same period was much larger than its earlier St. Johns predecessors (e.g., Benton and Dent Mounds), but similar in size to Safety Harbor sites of the same era (Goodman Mound - 1590 m² by 2 m and Yellow Bluffs Mound - 1073 m² by 2.4 m). At the same time, the Manasota culture was succeeded by Safety Harbor culture (AD 900-1725) and beginning with Bayshore (which was likely a mix of Weeden Island, Manasota, and Early Safety Harbor elements) mounds on the Gulf Coast Peninsula, dramatically increased in size. Throughout the Safety Harbor period, mounds in this sample were on average 3 m high and 800 m² in base area. While several mounds were not very large, the reasons for their small size will become clear when I explore the relationship of hierarchy to mound size. Finally, in the case of North Florida and the Panhandle, mounds also expanded in height and area during Weeden Island’ successor, the Fort Walton culture (AD 1000-1600). The largest mound in the study was the Fort Walton Period mound of Lake Jackson Mound 3, which was 5 m high, and 2304 m² in base area.

3. Size and Status

Developments in hierarchy and status are likely the main reasons for changes in height and base area of burial sites throughout Florida’s history (Binford 1971: 20-22, Tainter 1978: 125-126; Table 3.1 and Figure 3.3). One of Binford’s basic tenets was
FIGURE 3.3 BASE AREA vs. NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS
that the greater the investment in the construction of the mortuary site, the higher the status of the site. This is especially in evidence when the number of burials was quite small. For Florida, the relationship of size and status was quite clear. Throughout this study the number of individuals used for comparison is the number of bodies that an archaeologist believes were originally interred at a site. In the case of Swift Creek, the analysis of Pierce Mound A’s size, mound layers, burial type and artifacts shows that the site was likely a high status site. Pierce Mound A differs in scale, burials, and artifacts from the Swift Creek sites of Mayport and Dent Mound. In both height and base, it was the largest mound in the study until Bayshore’s Mound B, which dates to the late Weeden Island Period. In later periods, different cultures added additional mounds to the Pierce Mound site, and so the location or the Swift Creek mound, itself, may have been special to later peoples (Penton 1972: 5-6). Likewise, during Weeden Island culture, the most significant mound in size, McKeithen Mound B was certainly a high status burial. The mound is almost 600 m² in area, and yet, it contains just a single body (Milanich et al. 1997: 105-109, 112-115). This mound is part of a complex including a village, a temple mound, and another burial mound, Mound C, which held over 72 bodies. Mound C, though, was only about 350 m² in area. An analysis of the grave goods will show that status was possibly more important at Pierce and Mayport, and will explain why the Swift Creek mounds were larger than their Weeden Island successors. While social status is still somewhat unclear for Swift Creek, archaeologists believe that Weeden Island groups were led by “big men” or spiritual leaders who earned their rank (Milanich 1994: 168-170). All other people in the society based their rank on lineage affiliations, not their individual rank. The size of the mounds and number of individuals contained in them reflects this and is possible evidence of differential status levels in Swift Creek and Weeden Island (with the major mounds being Pierce Mound A and McKeithen Mound B).

The issue of hierarchy reflected by the scale of mounds is also clearly seen in Late St. Johns, Safety Harbor, and Fort Walton cultures. The Walker Point mound contained at most 30 burials, but it was 3 m tall making it the tallest St. Johns mound in the study, and the fourth tallest mound of all the mounds that could be measured for height. By the St. John II Period, formal chiefdoms with individual ranked status had emerged, and so, at
least Walker Point’s great height and small number of individuals is congruent with this social development. Meanwhile, Goodman Mound’s large size may be related to its use for human sacrifice as the mound appears to have been used for burial of several sacrificed children. The use of human sacrifice at the site is supported by early French and Spanish historical records of St. Johns peoples and the nature of their burials (Bullen 1963: 61-65; Jordan 1963: 24-33). All of the child burials were placed in the mound at the same time, show no evidence of illnesses, and were well furnished with grave goods. Only a few adult burials were found in the mound, and they were clearly later intrusive burials without the ritual emphasis that the child burials had received. To return to the size issue, since most burials were deposited at the same time, the mound’s large size was not due to gradual accumulation or building, but was deliberately built on a large scale for the event at which the children were sacrificed.

The Gulf Coast Peninsula provided the best sample of sites, and displays similar changes related to the rise of a social hierarchy. As in St. Johns II, Safety Harbor culture was based on chiefdoms, and various archaeological and historic evidence suggests that a social elite existed. Every Safety Harbor mound site, except the Contact sites of Tatham and Weeki Wachee Mounds, were quite large, and by examining the ratio of burials to base area there are indications that some sites were higher status than others. For example, Yellow Bluffs Mound contained only 13 burials, but was 2 m high and 1073 m² in base area. Aqui Esta Mound, meanwhile, was a huge mound, the second largest mound in area, 2475 m², and contained about 100 individuals. Even sites that were small in area were quite tall, such as Safety Harbor, which was 3.67 m in height. It is clear from the size evaluations that Yellow Bluffs and Aqui Esta appear to be high status sites.

Two Safety Harbor sites do seem quite small in size, Tatham and Weeki Wachee, but these sites were mostly constructed after the Spaniards had arrived in Florida. Their arrival brought diseases, which could have decimated the labor populations necessary for mound construction and triggered social changes in the societies that decreased the need to build such mounds. Furthermore, a look at the grave goods from these sites will demonstrate, that even though the mounds were small, high status furnished burial was common. Lastly, the Fort Walton sites reflect high status burials and the possible effect of Spanish contact. Lake Jackson Mound 3 was truly massive, 5 m high and 48 m² in area,
but contained a mere 25 individuals (Jones 1994: 120-144). The mound was located adjacent to six additional mounds that were used for burials, temples, and possible residences of elites. The grave goods also illustrate how Lake Jackson Mound 3 contained burials with the most prestigious individual grave goods of any site studied. Although Snow Beach’s mound was about half the size of Lake Jackson, it contained only a third of the number of bodies found at Lake Jackson, and so was quite large for the number of burials it contained (Allen 1954: 12; Magoon et al. 2001: 18-19; Florida Master Site File Map for Snow Beach). Snow Beach was also constructed around the time of Spain’s colonization of Florida. The site might demonstrate how native peoples tried to maintain their traditions in the face of adversity. The Snow Beach mound builders constructed the mound by using an adjacent Swift Creek midden as a source of material for the new construction. This reuse of older material in a declining period to build ceremonial structures is common to many cultures. For example, although the Arch of Constantine was built in Rome in AD 315, it contained material from buildings as old the late first century AD (Claridge 1998: 24, 272-273). During this time period, the Roman Empire was in decline, and by AD 324 the capitol had moved from Rome to Constantinople. The construction of the Fort Walton Snow Beach mound largely from easily accessibly Swift Creek material might reflect the same type of desire to maintain the old traditions in the face of social, political, and economic decline.

The size of mounds certainly had much to do with status, and was likely not entirely the need to contain large numbers of deceased individuals. For example, Palmer Mound, a Weeden Island/ Manasota site yielded, 429 individuals, but was only 1.2 m high and 406 m² in base area. Likewise, while Thomas Mound has a Safety Harbor component contained within it, the majority of artifacts and size make it clear that it was a Weeden Island site. Thomas Mound contained 419 individuals, but was only 2 m high and 314.16 m² in base area.

4. Layout

The association of these different mounds with other features indicated that the large, high status mounds were usually associated with adjacent burial and temple mounds. The only significant exception is in Late Safety Harbor culture as Aqui Esta, Parrish Mound 2, Tatham, and Weeki Wachee Mounds were all isolated mounds (Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>MIDDEN/VILLAGE</th>
<th>BURIAL MOUND</th>
<th>TEMPLE MOUND/CHURCH</th>
<th>EARTHWORKS</th>
<th>ISOLATE</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUNDS</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEEN ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>29 3 7 1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Several sites such as Bird Island, Turtle Shores, and Weeki Wachee Mound with adjacent features that may have been destroyed or not reported are not shown in this table.
3.2). However, the isolation of these mounds from inhabited sites might be evidence of greater status or a change in mortuary behavior, as people would have to travel to see the burials of their elite.

5. Layers

Before the actual burials are studied, the stratigraphy of these sites should be examined, as they will provide insights into the arguments about hierarchy and determining the cultural identity of the different sites. The most common features included the use of red powder (ochre or hematite), clean sand or shell layers, and midden layers (Table 3.3). Other common features were fires (hearth or sacred fires burned before construction or the end of mound’s use), “killed” pottery and/or shell cups on top of a mound, pottery caches, grave pits, log tombs, shell lining of grave pits, and the use of charnel houses (either near the mound or on top of it). The presence of pottery caches on the east side of the mound has been one of chief ways of determining whether a site was of the Weeden Island culture (Brown 1994: 152). In this study, pottery caches on the east side were found at four out of the eight sites identified as Weeden Island culture sites. My study also showed the varying influence of Weeden Island culture (Table 3.4). For example, both Benton Mound and Mackenzie Mound, possible St. Johns culture sites dating to the period of the Weeden Island’s apogee in north Florida, contained a pottery cache located on the east side of the mound. At the same time, sites on the Gulf Coast Peninsula were labeled as an area full of Weeden Island sites into the late 1970s. Many of these sites had no east side pottery caches. In fact, the site of Weeden Island is located in this area, but it did not have such a pottery cache (Willey 1949: 106-108). Currently, many of these Gulf Coast sites are now labeled as Manasota sites with Weeden Island influence. Thus, by looking at the stratigraphy and cultural inclusions of mounds, the true cultural identity of many sites, especially those from the Gulf Coast Peninsula, has helped to prove the inaccuracy of cultural identifications made before the 1970s and early 1980s (Luer and Almy 1982).

Two traditions that appear to have been constantly used throughout much of Florida’s prehistory are the use of “killed” pottery and the presence of shell cups. Killed pottery is detected by the presence of distinctive holes or breaks that were deliberately made (Brown 1994: 50; Sears 1959: 24-26). Killed pottery was found at almost every site
### Table 3.3 Layers (Stratigraphy) of Sites*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>CLEAN SAND</th>
<th>CLEAN SHELL</th>
<th>RED POWDER</th>
<th>MIDDEN</th>
<th>KILLED POTTERY</th>
<th>SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRE- POTTERY</td>
<td></td>
<td>6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POTTERY BURIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BURIAL COMPONENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>4570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR PRES</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUNDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR PRES. AND DOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR PRES</td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUA ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR PRES</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Certain mound sites such as Jones, Mayport, Sarasota Bay, and Sowell Mounds were so damaged or poorly documented that the clean layers, red powder, shell cups, or “killed” pottery could have originally existed on the site. Abbreviations: POOR PRES = Poor Preservation and POOR DOC. = Poor Documentation.*
Table 3.4 Weeden Island Period (AD 200-1000) or Cultural Sites: Pottery Caches Locations (Weeden Island Culture or Influence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>NO CONCENTRATION OR IN MOUND CENTER</th>
<th>EAST SIDE</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the sample that dated between the Late Archaic (when pottery use began) to the Mission Period (Table 3.3). Nevertheless, it is sometimes difficult to detect killed pottery, because broken pottery must be reconstructed to determine the reason for breakage. Shell cups are even more important to study as they were used in the Native American “Black Drink Ritual” (Milanich 1994: 137, 140, 149-150). Shell cups are found as early as the Middle Archaic at Tick Island and as late as Post-Contact Safety Harbor at the Weeki Wachee Mound (Table 3.3). At most of the sites, it is likely that the cups were used for the Black Drink Ritual. The shell cups were found only at mound sites, and usually on the top the mound, where the ritual would have taken place. Interestingly, the sites in which shell cups were frequently absent were sites located in north Florida, McKeithen Mounds, Snow Beach, and Woodward Mound, which contained Georgian immigrants. The Black Drink Ceremony, however, still is believed to have taken place at McKeithen, and the drink was prepared in pottery vessels (Milanich 1994: 179). Of the few other sites without shell cups, their absence can be explained by the placement of the cups in the center of the top part of the mound. This is the part of the mound that is frequently looted or destroyed. For example, Bayshore, Mayport, Sarasota Bay, and Yellow Bluffs Mounds all suffered damage to this part of the mound and none of these mounds possessed shell cups.

Besides the use of shell cups and pottery, layers of clean shell and clean sand were often incorporated into mounds and other burial sites (Table 3.3). Depending on the site, these features may have had ritual or hierarchical meaning. Clean sand or clean shell (nonmidden) layers are associated with various sites, and are significant because they indicate that people chose to use clean material instead of midden or untreated soil to cover burials or build a site. This is a much greater investment in time and care of the dead than simply dumping food debris (midden material) to form a mound. Sites with clean sand include Archaic sites (e.g., Tick Island and Republic Groves), Weeden Island sites (e.g., McKeithen Mound C and Sowell Mound), St. Johns sites (e.g., Benton and Goodman Mounds), Safety Harbor sites (e.g., Yellow Bluffs and Tatham Mounds), and Fort Walton sites (e.g., Snow Beach). In the case of clean shell, sites include: the Archaic (e.g., Tick Island), Swift Creek (e.g., Pierce Mound A), Weeden Island/Manasota (e.g., Bayshore Mound B), and St. Johns (e.g., Mackenzie and Goodman Mounds). Many of
these sites were already mentioned as having evidence of status through their size: Pierce, Bayshore, Yellow Bluffs, and Snow Beach. Thus, the presence of these layers is further evidence of the high status of these sites. At the same time the use of an entire clean layer to cover all the burials could be a communal way of honoring the dead, and this would agree with the Weeden Island sites of Sowell and McKeithen in which lineages, not individuals, were usually honored.

The St. Johns sites of Mackenzie, Benton, and Goodman Mounds do not appear to fit with these patterns, but they are explainable through another means. Although it has not been discussed yet, infant and children sacrifice were historically documented for the peoples of the St. Johns’ area. Goodman Mound certainly contained such sacrifices and Mackenzie Mound had only two burials that contained grave goods, but one of them was an infant. Three of the seven burials at Benton Mound were subadults and the deposit did contain grave goods. The use of clean sand and shell layers certainly appears to imply some sort of ritual importance. Nevertheless, detecting these clean layers is difficult and they may have existed at many of the other sites, but were not reported. In fact, many sites, including the most prestigious sites such as Lake Jackson, were built on top of or used midden layers to increase their size. Determining whether a site used clean shell layers can be quite a daunting task (Jones 1994: 122).

One type of material that is found in burials throughout the world and that is associated with ritual or hierarchical meaning is the use of red powder, often ochre (Milanich 1994: 174, 260). In this study sample, a layer of red ochre or hematite throughout the entire site (individual burials will be discussed later) was present in sites from the Weeden Island culture (e.g., McKeithen Mound B), Weeden Island/ Manasota (e.g., Palmer Mound), St. Johns (e.g., Gauthier, Browne, Walker, and Goodman), and Safety Harbor (e.g., Aqui Esta, Englewood, and Parrish Mound 2) (Table 3.3). Like those sites, which contained clean sand or shell layers, many of the sites with ochre/hematite were also highlighted for their size and status. Although the presence of red ochre at Gauthier seems anomalous, this site also contained an individual with 52 grave goods, including a headdress (Jones and Carr 1981: 86). Browne Mound was likely another site in which child sacrifice took place, as three children were recovered, and grave goods were possibly associated with a few of the burials (Sears 1959: 4-6). The use of shell,
sand, and red powder indicated that people had many different ways of instilling meaning into a site.

Fire was another common element to prehistoric Florida burials, but determining how it was used at the burial site can be difficult (Table 3.5). Evidence of fire could imply several things: 1) hearths used for food consumption, 2) sacred fires used to burn a site before the construction of mound, 3) sacred fires used to burn structures on a mound signaling the end of its use, 4) the presence of burnt food offerings, 5) the presence of charnel houses, or 6) evidence of naturally occurring fire. Hearths used for food consumption were relatively rare, and were primarily associated Archaic and Transitional sites (See Appendix B: Site Summaries). Sacred fires, meanwhile, were quite common and appeared in the Swift Creek, Weeden Island, Manasota, St. Johns, Alachua, Safety Harbor, and Fort Walton cultures. In the cases of McKeithen Mound C and Lake Jackson Mound 3 it was certainly used to destroy structures on the mounds. Its presence at Pierce, Bayshore, Aqui Esta, and Lake Jackson gives even more evidence of their special status. Finally, charnel houses were a means of letting burials decompose before they were permanently interred, and most of the sites with which they are associated contained individuals buried as secondary bundle burials (Brown 1994: 148; Milanich 1994: 140, 149; Table 3.10). While Palmer Mound was reported to contain flexed burials, the presence of a charnel house and its ratio of individuals to base area (Figure 3.3) suggest that it is likely that the site really contained bundle burials. Distinguishing bundle burials from flexed burials can be difficult, and much of the analysis of Palmer Mound has been done without photographic evidence of the actual burial in situ (Bullen and Bullen 1976: 46-47; Hutchinson 2004: 51-54). In the end, the presence and use of fire and charnel houses has even given clues to whether our knowledge about or descriptions of burials at different sites is flawed.

Finally, the last subject for discussion is the presence of grave pits, log tombs, and shell lining of grave pits (Table 3.5). Shell lining of grave pits appears to have been a Swift Creek phenomenon, and is associated with all three sites with a Swift Creek context: Pierce A, Mayport, and Dent Mounds. It is also found at Perico Island, Weeden Island, and Turtle Shores. However, the very early excavation dates of Perico Island and Weeden Island in the 1920s and 1930s and the common use of shell as fill makes
Table 3.5 Fire and Charnel Houses vs. Primary and Secondary Burials and Grave Pits and Shell Lining*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>HEARTH</th>
<th>FIRE</th>
<th>CHARNEL HOUSE</th>
<th>PRIMARY BURIALS</th>
<th>SECONDARY BURIALS</th>
<th>GRAVE PITS</th>
<th>SHELL LINING</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POND 7400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POND 4595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POND 1730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEM MOUND B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEM MOUND C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUA ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POND 450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due poor preservation or documentation, several sites may have originally had hearths, fires, or charnel houses, but were not reported. The site of Bird Island was so eroded that there is no clear knowledge about the original state of the site.*
understanding the specific use of shells at these two sites problematic. Meanwhile, Turtle Shores might have been a mound or a shell midden used to cover the remains of several individuals. If the context of a shell lining at Swift Creek sites is completely accurate, then we may have another method of determining whether or not a site is of the Swift Creek culture.

The issue of grave pits is even more important, as it shows that bodies were not simply stuffed into mounds or laid in the ground, but that efforts were made to carefully place them. Grave pits were present in almost every site that used some type of flexed or extended burial and was absent in sites where bundle burial (in which bodies are wrapped up) was used. At some of the sites, elaborate pits were used, and Lake Jackson even contained log-encased levels for different burials. Log-encased tombs were used by many Florida cultures such as St. Johns, but these sites were often excavated very early in Florida’s archaeological history by Moore and others (Jones 1994: 122-127; Milanich 1994: 269-270). It is due to these early excavation dates and lack of exact detail of these sites that actual sites with real tombs are very few in this study sample. The presence of log tombs at Lake Jackson Mound 3 is, yet again, another sign of the high status of individuals buried at the site.

6. Conclusion

By studying the layout of the different sites throughout Florida’s history, I have demonstrated that Florida’s Native Americans practiced very similar burial traditions throughout much of Florida’s history, and that it was likely changes or differences in hierarchy and status, not peoples and locations, that really affected site layout. The study of layout has shown that size did matter in the meaning of a site, and that, frequently, the largest mounds (in regards to their proportion) might contain small numbers of individuals. People also imbued their burial sites with meaning by using features such as red powder, clean shell and sand layers, and fire. Moreover, some burial features such as shell cups and killed pottery expressed traditions that continued throughout most of Florida’s history. Other traditions, such as pottery caches (a Weeden Island trait) and shell lining (a possible Swift Creek trait), can be used to determine the cultural identity of a site. Even the use of charnel houses, though common throughout much of Florida’s history, might help archaeologists determine the culture or types of burial likely to be
identified in a site. Small mound size and presence of a charnel house are possible
evidence that the people at Palmer Mound were buried as secondary bundle burials and
not primary flexed burials. With these elements studied, the actual burials, themselves,
should be examined to see if they too reflect changes over time, among societies, societal
demographics, and developments in hierarchical status.
CHAPTER 4:

Types of Burials

1. Primary vs. Secondary Burial

Burial type may be divided into two major subheadings: Primary vs. Secondary Burials, and Exact Burial Types: extended supine or prone, flexed, bundle, skull, or cremation. Like burial layout, many of Florida’s societies went through a similar development in the use of primary and secondary burials (Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1). Almost all burials in the sample from the Archaic and Transitional Periods were primary burials, and the only two sites in which primary burials did not compose 99-100 percent of the burials were Santa Maria and Bay Cadillac. At Santa Maria, however, there were only six identifiable burials and two of which were in so poor condition that there was no way to determine their original burial type. Meanwhile at Bay Cadillac, primary burials comprised only 18 percent of the all the burials at the site. However, this might be deceptive, as only 48 percent of the burials were secondary burials, and another 34 percent were too poorly preserved for burial type determination. Nevertheless, Bay Cadillac does help illustrate a transition in burial type because, after the Archaic Period, secondary burial became common in many of Florida’s societies. During the Swift Creek Period, while burials were more often primary burials, secondary burials were not uncommon (Milanich 1994: 148-149; Willey 1949: 369-370). The sample’s three sites, Pierce Mound A, Mayport Mound, and Dent Mound, support this idea, as Mayport’s burials were 83 percent primary and 17 percent secondary, and Dent Mound, the latest of the three sites, consisted of 27 percent primary burials and 69 percent secondary burials. Meanwhile, Pierce’s burials are unclear, as C.B. Moore provided a count of all the primary burials, but in the case of secondary burials, merely noted that many existed (Moore 1999c: 217-224; Willey 1949: 281-282).

After the Swift Creek Period, burial traditions divide somewhat between the Weeden Island cultures of the Panhandle, North Florida, and Gulf Coast Peninsula and the St. Johns culture of the St. Johns River area. The Weeden Island peoples of North Florida and the Gulf Coast largely practiced secondary burials, and the peoples of the St.
### Table 4.1 Percentages of Primary vs. Secondary Burial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>PRIMARY (%)</th>
<th>SECONDARY (%)</th>
<th>UNKNOWN (%)</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTR)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRE)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Several sites are not included in this table such as Bird Island and Pierce Mound A because either preservation or documentation was poor.
FIGURE 4.1 PRIMARY VS. SECONDARY BURIALS
Johns area practiced both primary and secondary burials. My study’s sample correlated with these with cultural differences. For the Panhandle and North Florida, McKeithen Mound C was composed completely of secondary burials. Although McKeithen Mound B’s sole burial was a primary burial, this was because of the individual’s high status, and from this study it will become clear that high status burials in Florida were often primary burials. Meanwhile, Sowell Mound was excavated several times, and the exact stratigraphy and layout of the mound is unclear (Robbins 1994: 45-48).

Many of the sites from the Gulf Coast Peninsula that were described as Weeden Island were largely composed of secondary burials (e.g., Thomas Mound - 86 percent, Bayshore Mound B - 100 percent, and possibly Palmer Mound, if the flexed burials were in reality secondary bundle burials). Ironically, the actual site of Weeden Island cannot be included in this study, because of poor documentation (Willey 1949: 107-108). Furthermore, all of the Weeden Island Gulf Coast Peninsula sites studied were part of the Manasota culture, which practiced primary burials until about AD 300 before switching to secondary burials (Luer and Almy 1982: 42, 46, 47). The long use of primary burials in Manasota culture is first seen at Perico Island and Manasota Key, which were composed completely of primary burials. The next earliest Manasota site is Palmer Mound, which dates to about AD 500, when secondary burials were common. Therefore, both cultures, Weeden Island and Manasota, that were associated with Palmer Mound, practiced secondary burials at the time of Palmer Mound’s construction. Only one other Weeden Island/Manasota site, Jones Mound, was composed largely of primary burials (76 percent), but this site might have several components, some of which date to Post-Contact Safety Harbor. Jones Mound might also have contained high status burials as many the burials were furnished with grave goods (Bullen 1952: 47-53).

Whereas the Weeden Island Panhandle, North Florida, and Gulf Coast Peninsula cultures largely practiced secondary burials, the St. Johns culture had much more variation in its mortuary practices. Even though secondary burials were the most common types, primary burials never ceased and were frequently used throughout the entire St. Johns Period/culture (500 BC- AD 1565). For the St. Johns’ sample, this variation is quite clear from Dent Mound (27 percent - primary vs. 69 percent - secondary), Mackenzie Mound (13 percent - primary vs. 71 percent- secondary), and Browne Mound.
(10 percent primary vs. 56 percent secondary). While Turtle Shores and Walker Point
were composed completely of primary burials, both of these sites are likely missing many
of their burials, and therefore, the surviving burials may not reflect the true ratios of
primary vs. secondary burials. Lastly Goodman Mound’s burials were all primary burials,
but it was a sacrificial mound. Like high status burials, sacrifices were almost always
primary burials in Florida.

When the Weeden Island Period ended in the Gulf Coast Peninsula, Panhandle,
and North Florida, the common use of secondary burial among these different areas also
ended. On the Gulf Coast Peninsula, the succeeding Safety Harbor culture largely
continued secondary burial. In all but two of the sites, secondary burial comprised about
90 percent or more of the burials. The two exceptions were Yellow Bluffs Mound in
which 90 percent of the burials were primary burials, and Tatham Mound in which 39
percent of the Pre-Contact burials and 28 percent of the Post-Contact burials were
primary burials. The high percentage of primary burials at Yellow Bluffs is further proof
of its high status, and the high status of Tatham’s burials is hinted at by its grave goods.
Unfortunately, for this study, there was no description or counts of the burial types at
Aquí Esta to argue whether or not it has further evidence of high status. The fact that 28
percent of Post-Contact Tatham’s burials were primary burials might again be due to
Spanish contact, as European epidemic diseases would have resulted in the rapid deaths
of large numbers of people. There simply would have been no time for elaborate
secondary burials, and, in fact, 77 primary burials were found to have been interred in a
very short period at the site (Mitchem 1989: 329-330).

While secondary burials were the standard burial type for Safety Harbor peoples,
primary burials again became the standard burial type for the later cultures of North
Florida. Woodward Mound, which belongs to Alachua culture, was composed of 89
percent primary burials and 11 percent secondary burials. This mound, however, cannot
be compared in detail with other Florida sites, as only two other Alachua burial sites have
been investigated in any detail, and archaeologists believe that the Alachua people had
been recent immigrants to Florida from Georgia (Milanich 1994: 335-336, 343, 346,
347). Lastly, the Fort Walton peoples in the Panhandle used primary burials in both their
cemeteries for commoners and their elite burials in mounds such as the sample’s Lake
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After Contact, burial type changed, and primary burials were the standard type during both the Mission and Seminole Periods. In all three sites from the sample (Fig Springs, Patale, and Quad Block), primary burials were used for the entire cemetery populations. However, there are two major problems with the idea that primary burials were predominant throughout these two periods. First, the two sites that have been studied from the Mission Period are in areas, the Panhandle and North Central Florida, in where primary burials were common before Contact. Secondly, in the case of the Seminole period, archaeologists have very few Seminole burials to study, and the Seminoles themselves were recent arrivals from Alabama and Georgia (Covington 1993: 3-11).

2. Exact Burial Type

Primary burials were normally flexed or occasionally extended; secondary burials were bundle and occasionally skull burials (Table 4.2 and Figure 4.2). Flexed burial was the most common type of primary burial, and excluding the Mission and Seminole Periods, it is found in all but one of the sites in which primary burial was used. In fact, flexed burial was often the only type of primary burial used at these sites, and this is true of both our general knowledge of prehistoric Florida societies and the sample of 39 Pre-Mission Period sites. In the Archaic Period, flexed burial was the main burial type used in wet cemeteries, mounds, and plain cemeteries. In the sample, flexed burials frequently represented between 80-100 percent of all the burials at a site. Even where primary burials were not the most common burial type (e.g., Bay Cadillac - 18 percent - flexed); flexed burials were often the only type of primary burial present.

During the Swift Creek Period, like the Archaic Period, the most common type of burial was flexed. For example, flexed burials represented 83 percent of burials from the sample recovered at Pierce Mound A (Milanich 1994: 149). The fact that extended burials outnumbered flexed burials at Mayport (43 percent - extended supine vs. 9 percent- flexed) and at Dent Mound (22 percent - extended supine vs. 4 percent - flexed) is somewhat unusual. This finding is not likely the result of hierarchy and status differences as my study shows that extended burial was often associated with high status...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>EXTENDED SUPINE (%)</th>
<th>PRONE (%)</th>
<th>FLEXED (%)</th>
<th>BUNDLE (%)</th>
<th>SKULL (%)</th>
<th>CREMATION (%)</th>
<th>UNKNOWN (%)</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTR)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIIERA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRE)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For several sites, the percentages of primary and secondary burial types will not agree with Table 4.1 Primary vs. Secondary Burial. This is because sometimes the archaeologist reported the overall burial type for all the burials at a site, but only provided the individual burial type for a sample of the burials at a site. Several sites such as Safety Harbor and Weeden Island could not be included in this table because there was no available documentation on exact burial types.
FIGURE 4.2 EXACT BURIAL TYPES

Sites Chronologically Listed:
- Windover Pond
- Tick Island
- Santa Marilla
- Bay Cadillac
- Perico Island
- Mayport Mound
- Manasota Key
- Dent Mound (Intr)
- Keith Mound
- Turtle Shores
- Palmer Shores
- Thomas Mound
- Jones Mound
- Mackenzie Mound
- Brown Mound
- Englewood Mound
- Walker Point Mound
- Lake Jackson Mound (Pre)
- Parrish Bluffs Mound
- Goodwin Mound
- Weeki Wachee Mound
- Snow Beach
- Big Springs
- Patale Quad Block

Burial Types:
- Cremation
- Skull
- Bundle
- Flexed
- Prone
- Extended Supine
in Florida. In fact, extended burials only accounted for 12 percent of the burials at Pierce, which is possibly the highest status mound of the three sites. If anything, the preference for extended over flexed burial at Mayport and Dent Mound might be due to their locations in the St. Johns’ area, as extended burial was the common form of primary burial used in the succeeding St. Johns culture.

In St. Johns culture, extended burial was a minor burial tradition that continued, along with the more common secondary burials of bundle and skull types (Milanich 1994: 260-262; Thunen and Ashley 1995: 5). In the sample, however, extended burials were frequently outnumbered by flexed burials. At Turtle Shores and Mackenzie Mounds, the only primary burials found were flexed. Meanwhile, at Gauthier, flexed burials represented 99 percent of burials vs. 1 percent - extended, and at Goodman Mound, 54 percent of the burials were flexed vs. only 8 percent - extended. The only St. Johns’ site in which extended burials outnumbered flexed burials was at Browne Mound, where extended burials composed 10 percent of all the primary burials (Sears 1959: 4-6). The fact that flexed burials appear to be much more common than extended burials in this study, though, is likely the result of sample problems. This study did not incorporate many of the sites excavated by Moore in the late 19th and early 20th century, and this sample should not be taken to mean that flexed, not extended burial, was the usual primary burial type of St. Johns’ peoples.

Although most burials of the Weeden Island, Manasota, and Safety Harbor cultures were secondary burials, if primary burial was used, they were normally flexed. Before secondary burials were common, primary flexed burials were the usual burial type in Manasota culture, and at Manasota Key, 100 percent of all burials were flexed. Even after the introduction of Weeden Island culture to the Gulf Coast Peninsula, flexed burials continued, and flexed burials were the only type of primary burial used until very late Safety Harbor (e.g., 75 percent - Jones, 55 percent - Bayshore, 55 percent - Tierra Verde, 50 percent - Yellow Bluffs, 46 percent - Pre-Contact Tatham, and 51 percent - Post-Contact Tatham). Only two Gulf Coast Peninsula sites in the sample contained primary burials, which were not flexed: Yellow Bluffs - 20 percent prone and Tatham Pre-Contact- 18% percent - extended). The presence of prone burials at Yellow Bluffs might be the result of mound containing sacrificial victims. Meanwhile, the high numbers of
flexed and extended at Tatham can partly be explained by the small sample sizes used for individual burial type, 11 burials for Pre-Contact and 66 burials for Post-Contact, and may also indicate the effect of epidemic European diseases.

The Fort Walton and Alachua cultures of the Panhandle and North Florida were much more like the St. Johns culture in their use of primary burial. For the Alachua culture, extended or flexed burials were the common burial types. At Woodward Mound only primary burials were extended burials (61 percent) (Bullen 1949: 54-57). In Fort Walton culture, both commoners and elite were largely buried as primary burials, which could be extended or flexed (Brown 1994: 154; Milanich 1994: 370; Willey 1949: 456). At Lake Jackson Mound 3, 42 percent of the burials were extended and 38 percent of burials were flexed; only 4 percent of the burials (cremations) were possibly secondary burials. Likewise, at Snow Beach, 86 percent of the burials were extended and 14 percent were flexed. Lastly, like all other burial traditions so far, the arrival of Europeans changed burial type and all the burials recovered from European or heavily Euro-American influenced sites, including the sample’s three sites (Fig Springs, Patale, Quad Block) were all extended burials.

While flexed burial was the main form of primary burial, bundle burial was the usual type of secondary burial and occurs as early as Bay Cadillac, in which 48 percent of the burials were secondary bundle burials. Secondary burials in Swift Creek culture were either bundle or skull burials. Bundle burials represent 17 percent of Mayport and 19 percent of Dent Mound’s burials (Milanich 1994: 148-149). No bundle burials were directly documented at Pierce Mound, but as Moore suggested that many more of the burials were secondary burials, it is likely some bundle burials existed (Moore 1999c: 217-224; Willey 1949: 281-282). Corresponding to what we know of Swift Creek tradition, skull burials comprised 9 percent of Mayport and 34 percent of Dent Mound’s burials. Bundle burial also was the main burial type in middle and late Manasota, Weeden Island, and Safety Harbor cultures. In North Florida, at the Weeden Island culture site of McKeithen, Mound C’s burials were all bundle burials. The absence of Sowell Mound data in this study has already been explained. On the Gulf Coast Peninsula, bundle burial frequently comprised 60-90 percent of all burials, and with the exceptions of Englewood Mound and Parrish Mound 2, was the main type of secondary burial employed by people.
At Englewood Mound 63 percent of the burials were skulls. Parrish Mound 2 is especially unusual as 95 percent of the burials were cremations. Cremations were never the main type of burial used by any Florida society, and cremation was particularly uncommon on the Gulf Coast Period in the Safety Harbor Period (Brown 1994: 153).

Bundle burials were also the chief burial type used in St. Johns culture and in the sample, they comprised 19 percent of Dent, 74 percent of Mackenzie, 57 percent of Browne, and 20 percent of Walker Point Mound’s burials. Only Gauthier and Goodman Mound were without bundle burials. Gauthier is confusing because of its South Florida location and the fact that it may not be part of St. Johns culture. The lack of bundle burials at Goodman Mound is most likely explained by the sacrificial nature of the mound. Skull burials were also known in St. Johns culture and actually comprised 34 percent of Dent, 13 percent of Mackenzie, and 5 percent of Browne Mounds’ burials. Turtle Shores may have contained some secondary burials, but with only eight burials and a very damaged site, any data about the presence of secondary burials is now lost. Secondary burials, in the form of bundle and skull, are even associated with the Alachua culture. At Woodward Mound, 11 percent of burials were bundle and 4 percent were skulls.

Only one culture, besides the Archaic peoples, in this study rarely practiced secondary burials, the Fort Walton culture. Secondary burials are unknown at commoners’ cemeteries, and in the case of elite mounds, only 4 percent of Lake Jackson Mound 3 burials were cremations. Cremations, though, may be primary or secondary burials as they destroy the body and prevent archaeologists from knowing if there was flesh on the bodies before they were burned. Finally, as mentioned earlier secondary burials completely disappear in the Mission and Seminole periods.

3. Status

Throughout this chapter, the issue of hierarchy and status and its effect on burial was hinted at, and there were several burial sites that make it apparent that high status burials in Florida were almost always primary burials. Unlike secondary burials, primary burials are often found with individually associated grave goods. While the issue of status and burial type might not be arguable for Archaic and possibly Swift Creek time periods, to a certain extent, in later cultures, the use of primary burial and associated goods does
become clear evidence of status. This is especially apparent in societies where secondary burials were the normal burial type. At the McKeithen site, Mound B’s single individual was laid out as a primary extended burial, whereas all the burials in Mound C were secondary bundle burials (Milanich et al. 1997: xvi, 109-110, 116-117). The Mound B individual was certainly a high status burial as it was the only burial in the mound, and unlike the burials from Mound C, this individual received individual grave goods. Moreover, other studies have shown that the Mound B individual may have not been a native of site, and overall aspects of the burial hint at beginnings of the transition from Weeden Island to Fort Walton culture in North Florida. Likewise, in Safety Harbor culture secondary bundle burial was the standard burial type, and yet, at Yellow Bluffs only one burial was a secondary bundle burial. All other burials at Yellow Bluffs were primary burials, and all the flexed burials had associated grave goods (Milanich 1972: 34-35, 37, 39). This use of primary burials and grave goods, instead of the normal secondary burial without grave goods, definitely seems to be evidence of the high status of the deceased. The late Weeden Island/early Safety Harbor site of Jones Mound might also have had status-related burials, as 75 percent of burials were flexed, and many did possess grave goods (Bullen 1952: 47-53).

St. Johns and Fort Walton culture sites too reflect status in their use of primary burial. For St. Johns, Goodman Mound was largely comprised of child sacrifices with grave goods, and all the burials at the site were primary burials. Walker Point’s burials might also reflect status as one of the extended burials did contain numerous grave goods. However, with only six of thirty possible burials studied, it is impossible to say for sure (Hemmings and Deagan 1973: 39-41). Fort Walton society was the most hierarchical society in prehistoric Florida, and almost all burials in the sample were primary burials. Furthermore, like McKeithen Mound B, Lake Jackson Mound 3 was an elaborate mound with tombs to contain several high status people laid out in either flexed or extended positions (Jones 1994: 125-144).

Hierarchy and status certainly do appear to have affected burial type, and two final questions that can be asked are whether the need to contain a large population in a mound affected burial type, and whether prehistoric Florida societies differed in the directions in which they oriented the bodies of their dead. Many of the mounds with the
largest interred populations were composed of bundle burials, and these types of burials do take up far less space than primary burials. However, several mounds, including Perico Island with 185 individuals, contained a large number of primary burials (Willey 1949: 175-182). Furthermore, cremation reduces burials to much smaller sizes than bundle burials, and yet cremation is only found to be associated to a large extent with a single burial mound, Parrish Mound 2.

4. Orientation

Finally, in many societies, the orientation of the deceased is quite important, and this issue has been used to determine the ethnicity of burials in many areas (Lucy 2000: 132; Rahtz et al. 2000: 419; Ucko 1969: 272; Welch 1995: 74). In Florida, though, as bundle and skull burials were frequently used, archaeologists often do not have perceivable burial orientations to study. In this study, an attempt was made to plot and compare orientation when archaeologists noted it, but in many cases, the published material did not discuss burial orientation at even those sites in which primary burials were recovered. Only fifteen sites from the sample could be used in this study, and orientation was based on the direction of the entire body, or in some cases in which there were problems with the study of the entire body, the direction of the head was used to understand orientation (Table 4.3 and Table 4.4). It appears that a westward facing orientation was common throughout Florida’s prehistory. Out of the eleven Pre-Mission sites in which orientation could be studied, seven had west or westward orientation. Of these sites, two dated to the Archaic Period: Windover (58 percent) and Tick Island (54 percent). One site belonged to the Manasota culture: Manasota Key (85 percent), and two belonged to the Fort Walton culture: Lake Jackson (74 percent) and Snow Beach (83 percent). The main orientation for the Mission Period appears to have been an eastward orientation as 100 percent of all burials at Patale and Fig Springs were orientated east, and in Seminole westward orientation was again common as 86 percent of Quad Block burials were oriented to the west. This sample of 14 sites, though, is simply too small a sample to make any broad generalizations of orientation, and this issue is also complicated by the fact that people frequently oriented burials to features that may or may not exist today.
these buttons were so common that they were interpreted as merely clothing remains and were not counted as grave goods (Piper et al. 1982a: 132-197, 321-327). Only at Quad Block were metal buttons part of the normal clothing of the deceased Native Americans, and unlike most materials that were part of Native American clothing, metal buttons do preserve well. If these burials with just buttons were classified as furnished burials, it would make Quad Block incapable of being properly compared with the earlier sites.

4. Individual Furnished Burial: Sex and Age

Where it was possible, furnished burials were studied by sex and age to determine if people of certain sex or age more often received grave goods than other individuals. At most sites where furnished burial took place, men more often received graves goods than women. This pattern was observed as early as the Archaic, and continued as late as Late Safety Harbor (Table 5.5 and Figure 5.4). Even at Windover, with its numerous furnished burials, 57 percent of the men received goods and only 40 percent of the women received goods. Three of the sites in which women did more often receive grave goods than the men are easy to explain: Lake Jackson (88 percent of men and 100 percent of women), Snow Beach (0 percent of men and 50 percent of women), and Fig Springs (11 percent of men and 40 percent of women). In the case of Lake Jackson, most of the burials were men, and if any woman was included in this high status burial mound, they had to be very important to receive such an honor. In fact at many high status Mississippian culture sites in the Southeast, women are frequently absent from mounds and were instead buried in the village area (Rodning 2001 94-98; Sullivan 2001: 106-122). Although the Snow Beach site was a Fort Walton site, it is slightly problematic as only eight burials were found. The sample size is somewhat small for reaching a clear conclusion. Lastly, at Fig Springs, few of the burials were women, and besides the inherent sample bias, if this sample of the burials is a true representation of Fig Spring population of 900 individuals, then the fact that there were few women at the site may have meant the women who lived there were treated with higher esteem than the numerous men at Fig Springs.

When the age of those individuals with furnished burial was examined, it became clear that in most cases adults were more often buried with grave goods than children or infants (Table 5.5 and Figure 5.5). At the same time, in most of the few cases in which
### Tables 4.3 and 4.4 Percentages of Orientation and Orientation: West vs. East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BODY ORIENTATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEST (%)</td>
<td>EAST (%)</td>
<td>NORTH (%)</td>
<td>SOUTH (%)</td>
<td>SE (%)</td>
<td>SW (%)</td>
<td>NW (%)</td>
<td>NE (%)</td>
<td>UNK (%)</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SITE                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |
|-------------------------| | | | | | | | | | |
| WINDOVER POND           | 58 | 31 | 6 | 5 |
| TICK ISLAND             | 54 | 5  | 28 | 13 |
| BAY CADILLAC            | 0  | 100| |
| MANASOTA KEY            | 85 | 0  | |
| PIERCE MOUND A          | 59 | 12 | 10 |
| TURTLE SHORES           | 100| 0  | |
| WALKER POINT MOUND      | 25 | 75 | |
| LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3    | 74 | 26 | |
| YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND     | 0  | 90 | |
| GOODMAN MOUND           | 0  | 13 | 38 |
| SNOW BEACH              | 83 | 17 | |
| FIG SPRINGS             | 0  | 100| |
| PATALE                  | 0  | 100| |
| QUAD BLOCK              | 0  | 95 | |
| AVERAGE:                | 38 | 47 | 5  | 2 |
5. Conclusion

The study of burial types can be summarized into eight major points. 1) Certain cultures, periods, and areas of Florida used different burials types. 2) Many sites matched our general knowledge of the cultures in which they were affiliated, and could be identified culturally by their burial type. For example, the use of bundle burial was a clear mark of Weeden Island and Safety Harbor influence in certain areas such as Weeden Island McKeithen Mound C (100 percent - bundle burials) and Late Weeden Island/ Early Safety Harbor’s Thomas Mound (86 percent - bundle burials). 3) Almost every culture had at least one site, for which burial type did not completely correspond with the cultural norm, such as Safety Harbor’s Parrish Mound 2 with 95 percent of its burials having been cremations. 4) Certain burial types, such as flexed burial, were never completely abandoned, and flexed burials are found as early as Windover and as late Snow Beach in almost all of Florida’s native cultures. 5) Almost every site, especially those of the St. Johns culture, contained at least a few burials that did not match the standard burial type at the site. For example, St. Johns Browne Mound consisted of 10 percent - extended supine, 57 percent - bundle, 5 percent - skull, and 2 percent - cremation. 6) The Europeans possibly did have a major effect on burial type, as all the Mission and Seminole sites in the study consisted of primary extended burials. 7) Hierarchy and status did affect burial type. Sites such as McKeithen Mound B (one burial - an extended supine burial) and Yellow Bluffs (70 percent - primary burials) consisted of primary burials when their cultures normally used secondary bundle or skull burials. Likewise, sites with sacrificial victims such as Goodman Mound (100 percent of known burials were primary) used primary burials when secondary burials were the common burial type. 8) Finally, sampling and documentation issues again make further analysis in many areas quite difficult. For example, only 14 out of the 43 site contexts could be studied for orientation, and many sites such as Pierce Mound A and Weeden Island are missing precise documentation about the burial types of their many interred individuals.
CHAPTER 5:

Grave Goods

1. Pottery

The topic of grave goods is one of the most discussed, analyzed, and debated issues in mortuary studies. For this paper, grave goods were analyzed by: types recovered; the preference for certain artifacts over time, space, and culture; their association with individual burials or as general fill or deposits; and how these different types of artifacts could be used to understand hierarchy in their societies.

Throughout Florida’s prehistory, pottery was one of the most common grave goods. Pottery was found in 30 of 43 site contexts, and more importantly, was recovered in direct association with individual burials at 12 of the sites. In fact, pottery was the most common grave good in all three studied contexts: individual burials (12 sites), unknown/fill context (29 sites), and overall in 30 sites (Table 5.1). Counting and plotting the quantity of potsherds were key methods of identifying the cultures and dates of sites when the published material was either unclear or written before certain advances in Florida archaeology had occurred. The most common pottery types were St. Johns varieties (found at 17 sites), sand tempered (at 12 sites), Pinellas varieties (at 9 sites), and Weeden Island varieties at (6 sites) (Table 5.2).

While some of the results might be slightly skewed, because potsherds could have simply originated in older deposits used as fill to build much later mounds, most collections of pottery corresponded with other evidence used to identify a site culturally and temporally. Likewise, the order of the most common pottery types agrees with the nature of the sites in the study sample. For example, the St. Johns culture did not dominate all of Florida, but it had a great influence over much of Florida. Many of the pottery samples from the Gulf Coast Peninsula were not exactly St. Johns, but a local derivative called Biscayne (Sears 1967: 31). At the same time, unlike the other cultures and pottery styles in the study, St. Johns covered a time span of over 2,000 years. This longevity helps explain its abundance in the archaeological record. Sand tempered pottery, meanwhile, is a very simple type of pottery and might have ties to Florida’s very
Table 5.1 Most Common Grave Goods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL MOST COMMON GOODS</th>
<th># SITES</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL FURNISHED GRAVES</th>
<th># SITES</th>
<th>UNKNOWN/FILL</th>
<th># SITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECTILE POINTS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SHELL BEADS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>PROJECTILE POINTS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONE TOOLS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>STONE TOOLS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>STONE TOOLS</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>PROJECTILE POINTS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CHERT FLAKES / CORES</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELL CUPS/DIPPERS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>RED POWDER/OCHRE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SHELL CUPS/DIPPERS</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERT FLAKES/CORES</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CELT (STONE OR SHELL)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SHELL</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELL BEADS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>COPPER JEWELRY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SHELL TOOLS</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELL TOOLS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>GLASS BEAD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MAMMAL BONE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMMAL BONE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SHELL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>BONE TOOLS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED POWDER/OCHRE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ANTLER TOOLS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SHELL BEADS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONE TOOLS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>STONE JEWELRY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STONE JEWELRY</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELT (STONE OR SHELL)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SHARK TEETH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SHARK TEETH</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONE JEWELRY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MAMMAL BONE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PEBBLES OR GRAVEL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARK TEETH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SHELL TOOLS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SHELL JEWELRY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2 Most Common Pottery Types Present at a Site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>ST. JOHNS VARIETIES</th>
<th>SAND TEMPERED</th>
<th>PINELLAS VARIETIES</th>
<th>WEEDEN ISLAND VARIETIES</th>
<th>NO POTTERY</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pierce Mound A is not included as Moore excavated it decades before modern pottery typologies, and Willey’s later documentation of the pottery was quite poor as there were few samples from the site he could study in the 1940s (Willey 1949: 281-282).
sandy environment. The prevalence of certain locations and cultures in this study was clearly evident as Pinellas varieties (an Early Safety Harbor type) were the third most common type. At least a third of the sites in this study dated to the Late Weeden and Safety Harbor periods/cultures of the Gulf Coast Peninsula. Likewise, Weeden Island types were the next most common, and their presence was useful in identifying the spread of Weeden Island culture. Weeden Island types were most common at the McKeithen site, and their presence only at late Weeden Island sites on the Gulf Coast Peninsula indicates that Weeden Island culture likely did not originate in the Gulf Coast Peninsula region. For example, Palmer Mound, arguably one of the earliest Weeden Island cultural sites on the Gulf Coast Peninsula in this study, did not yield any Weeden Island types. Meanwhile, Weeden Island types were found in the St. Johns’ culture area, and their presence at Mackenzie Mound agrees with the site’s geographic location. Mackenzie Mound is the westernmost St. Johns site in this study and might really be a Weeden Island site. On the other hand, the lack of Weeden Island or St. Johns’ types at Woodward Mound in north-central Florida supports the idea that its people were recent immigrants to the area.

Besides the use of Weeden Island and St. Johns’ types to track cultures and their influence, Belle Glade, Glades and Fort Walton types were also useful in understanding the cultural dynamics of Florida. Belle Glade and Glades pottery styles were found at some of the southernmost Gulf Coast Peninsula sites that were clearly part of the Manasota or Safety Harbor cultures (e.g., Perico Island, Tierra Verde, Englewood, Sarasota Bay, and Parrish 2 Mounds). The presence of these pottery types as far north as the Sarasota Bay area supports what archaeologists know about these cultures, as both Belle Glade and Glade influence existed as far north as the nearby Charlotte Harbor area (McGoun 1993: 97; Milanich 1994: 298-302). These pottery types also demonstrate the cultural interaction between south central Florida and the Gulf Coast. Finally, Fort Walton pottery styles were not only found on the Panhandle, but occasionally, on the Gulf Coast Peninsula. For example, Lake Jackson Plain was one of the most common pottery types at the Sarasota Bay Mound, illustrating the spread of Mississippian culture in late prehistoric Florida. (Cordell 2005: 80-84).
2. Most Common Artifacts

After pottery, the most common artifacts found at sites were projectile points (24 sites), stone tools (22 sites), shell (19 sites), shell cups (18 sites), and chert flakes and cores (17 sites) (Table 5.1). The frequent presence of these artifacts, except for the shell cups, is likely because of preservation. Projectile points, stone tools, and chert flake and cores are all made of stone and rarely decay. These are artifacts that maybe incorporated into sites as unintentional fill, and archaeologists occasionally find Archaic points in very late mounds for this very reason. Likewise, shellfish was a main source of food for prehistoric Florida groups, and used as building material. It is no wonder, therefore, that shell is often found in burial sites, and like stone tools or debitage, was often simply part of the fill.

Nevertheless, the presence of stone objects and shell can sometimes be tied to ritual activities. For example, it is known from historical documents that sometimes groups shot arrows into the side of a mound, and Tatham Mound did have concentrations of projectile points at one side of the mound (Mitchem 1989: 330). As discussed earlier, shell, often in the form of shell cups, was used for ceremonial purposes, and besides entire shell layers, burial sites often included offerings of food. Therefore, in some contexts, the presence of small concentrations of shell is evidence of ritual activities.

Finally, the issue of preservation may also obscure the common use of other organic artifacts in burial. For example, many of the burials at the different sites may have originally contained clothing and wooden objects, but Florida’s acidic soil has destroyed them. At several sites, such as Windover with its unique oxygen-depleted environment (essentially bog burials), and Lake Jackson Mound 3 with its well-built tombs, archaeologists have found such organic material (Dickel 2002: 79-96; Jones 1994: 125-144). Therefore, even with the best analysis, some of our conclusions about grave goods depositions may be flawed.

This study also concentrated its analysis on artifacts found associated with individual burials. The most common grave goods found with individual burials were: pottery (12 sites), shell beads (11 sites), stone tools (8 sites), projectile points (8 sites), and red ochre (8 sites) (Table 5.1). In many ways, the presence of these grave goods mirrors those found to be the most common in the overall burial context, or in the case of
ochre, as an entire layer. The stone tools and projectile points might be interpreted as everyday items included for life after death. The presence of shell beads and red ochre might imply status and special treatment of the dead. For example, the association of individual burials with red ochre was frequently found at possible high status sites such as McKeithen Mound B, Jones Mound, Gauthier (with an individual who possessed 52 grave goods), Aqui Esta Mound, Lake Jackson Mound 3, and Tatham Mound. Lake Jackson even contained two different colors of ochre, red and yellow, and this is arguably the most hierarchical site in the study. Like red ochre, shell beads were also frequently found with possible high status sites such as Pierce Mound A, Jones, Lake Jackson, Yellow Bluffs, and Tatham. Moreover, shell has often been used as a status symbol or currency by Native American societies. The famous shell “wampum” is one example, and whole trade networks were organized to collect and exchange precious shells across much of North America (Fagan 2000: 395, 398, 485). Interestingly, shell beads are found at the Mission Period site of Patale, but are absent at Fig Springs. In the health study of the sample, it will be demonstrated that the people at Patale were likely far more prosperous and healthier than those at Fig Springs. At the same time, Patale was established later, and in an area where Spanish presence had been as not extensive as in the Fig Springs area (Jones et al. 1991: 1, 3; Weisman 1993: 171-172). Therefore, the presence and lack of shell beads would correspond with their varying status and prosperity, but also demonstrates the effect of the Spaniards on Native American burial practices.

The popularity of different grave goods with individual burials between societies and periods was also tracked, but this was more difficult, since furnished individual burials were not always the standard burial treatment. For the Archaic Period, all 5 sites were used, but the samples for later periods are fewer. For Swift Creek, only 2 sites could be used, Weeden Island (3 sites), St. Johns (5 sites), Safety Harbor (3 sites), and for Fort Walton and the Mission Period two sites each (Table 5.3). With such a small sample size, the most common grave goods were often only found at 3 sites for a period or culture. For several of the cultures and periods, it was the usual pottery, ochre, stone tools, shell beads, and projectile points that were the most common grave goods (See Appendix B: Site Summaries). A significant change in grave goods, however, takes place with Fort
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period/Culture</th>
<th>STONE TOOLS</th>
<th>ANTLER TOOLS</th>
<th>BONE TOOLS</th>
<th>PRJ. PT.</th>
<th>SHELL</th>
<th>SHARK TEETH</th>
<th>BN. BDS.</th>
<th>CHERT FL/CR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCHAIC PERIOD:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWIFT CREEK CULTURE:</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>SH. BDS.</td>
<td>PRJ. PT.</td>
<td>CELT (ST. OR SH.)</td>
<td>COP. JEWL.</td>
<td>ST. JEWL.</td>
<td>SHARK TEETH</td>
<td>BN. BDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEEN ISLAND CULTURE:</td>
<td>RED POW/OCHR.</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>SH. BDS.</td>
<td>STONE TOOLS</td>
<td>CELT (ST OR SH)</td>
<td>ST. JEWL.</td>
<td>SHARK TEETH</td>
<td>SH CUPS/DIPPERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. JOHNS CULTURE:</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>SH. BDS.</td>
<td>RED POW/OCHR.</td>
<td>PRJ. PT.</td>
<td>CELT (ST. OR SH)</td>
<td>COP. JEWL.</td>
<td>SHELL</td>
<td>SHELL TOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR CULTURE:</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>SH. BD.</td>
<td>GL. BDS.</td>
<td>MAM. BON.</td>
<td>SILV. BDS.</td>
<td>STONE TOOLS</td>
<td>PRJ. PT.</td>
<td>RED POW/OCHR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT WALTON CULTURE:</td>
<td>STONE TOOLS</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>SH. BDS.</td>
<td>PRJ. PT.</td>
<td>RED POW/OCHR.</td>
<td>CELT (ST. OR SH)</td>
<td>COP JEWL.</td>
<td>GL. BD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION PERIOD:</td>
<td>GL. BDS.</td>
<td>POTTERY</td>
<td>SH. BDS.</td>
<td>PRJ. PT.</td>
<td>ST. JEWL.</td>
<td>SH. JEWL.</td>
<td>UN. LIS BDS.</td>
<td>COP. BDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Seminole Period is not included in this table as there was only one site in the sample and its artifact collection was quite different from the previous sets.

Abbreviations:

- BDS.=Beads
- RED POW/OCHR= Red Powder/ Ochre
- CHERT FL/CR. = Chert Flakes/Cores
- SH.= Shell
- COP. = Copper
- SILV. = Silver
- GL. = Glass
- ST. = Stone
- JEWL.= Jewelry
- TLS= Tools
- PRJ. PT.= Projectile Points
- UN. LIS= Unlisted
Walton, Safety Harbor, and the subsequent Mission Period. In these cultures, different types of jewelry and sacred objects become much more prominent, such as native copper jewelry and objects at Fort Walton sites, and European items such as glass, silver, and copper beads at the Safety Harbor and Mission sites. This change in grave goods likely reflects the strict and more complex hierarchies found in Fort Walton and Safety Harbor societies and the introduction of European goods into Late Safety Harbor. The Mission Period sites were in areas in which Fort Walton cultures had formerly dominated, and societies often increase furnishing of burial and demonstrations of native traditions when they are faced with an outside threat or are trying to maintain power in unstable times (James 2001: 113; Mann 2005: 3-7). In the Mission Period, native lifestyles were being replaced by European lifestyles, but the sample still contains common native jewelry such as shell and stone types, and shell beads were frequent grave goods. This idea of the threat of Europeans to native culture, and the tradition of furnished burial is especially seen at the Seminole site of Quad Block, in which most the burials were furnished. Nevertheless, the great abundance of European jewelry and items at these sites could simply be due to a much greater availability of European goods.

Finally, the sites were plotted for the variety of grave goods found in individual burials at a site (Figure 5.1 and Table 5.4). This study showed that the use of a variety of grave goods for individual burial was affected by several factors: the availability of goods, preservation, and the status of the sites (Binford 1971: 22; Tainter 1978: 119-121). The variety of grave goods was actually quite high in the Early and Middle Archaic, with as many 10-11 types of goods found at Windover and Tick Island, and my study did not even include the floral objects found, because of the rarity of their preservation at most other sites. The variety of grave goods then drops, only to increase again with the Swift Creek culture in which 10 different types of artifacts were recovered from individual burials at Mayport Mound and Pierce Mound A. In Weeden Island culture, the use of individual grave goods was quite rare, and the only Weeden Island site with numerous types of goods was Jones Mound, with nine types of grave goods associated with individual burials. In fact, the wide variety of grave goods, their types, and the number of furnished burials makes it apparent that Jones Mound may date more to the Safety Harbor
FIGURE 5.1 VARIETY OF TYPES OF ARTIFACTS WITH INDIVIDUAL BURIALS*

FIGURE 5.2 PERCENTAGES OF BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS*

*At Tatham Mound the exact details on the context of many of the furnished burials was unclear and so the overall distribution of furnished burials at Tatham was plotted.
Table 5.4 Presence of Individuals with Grave Goods, Variety of Grave Goods with Individual Burials, and the Issue of Bundle Burial*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS PRESENT</th>
<th># TYPES OF ARTIFACTS</th>
<th>% OF BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS (%)</th>
<th>BUNDLE (%)</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR PRES.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR PRES.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR PRES. &amp; DOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR PRES. &amp; DOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (BOTH PRE &amp; POSTCONTACT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL/AVERAGE: 31 SITES 7 AVERAGE (NOT INCLUDING QUAD BLOCK) 29 AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF FURNISHED BURIALS 21 AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF BUNDLE BURIAL

*Several sites such as Bird Island and Manasota Key were either so damaged or poorly documented that determining if individual furnished burial existed was impossible.
Culture than Weeden Island. In the case of St. Johns, only one site had a wide variety of grave goods, fittingly, Goodman Mound with its child sacrifices.

For Safety Harbor, only three sites could be studied. Contact with Spanish explorers is most likely the reason that Tatham and Weeki Wachee Mounds had as much 8-13 types of grave goods (Figure 5.1 and Table 5.4). Many of the grave goods at these sites were made from Spanish metals, which were unavailable at the older sites, and thus, should not be taken as a sign of increased status. These Spanish goods could have simply taken the place of native goods, such as gold beads being used instead of shell beads. Yellow Bluffs Mound, however, has no evidence of Spanish contact, and yet seven different types of artifacts were found with individual burials. This might be further proof of the high status nature of this mound. Of all the sites, Lake Jackson had the most variety of grave goods: 25 types, 14 more types than any of the other sites. The variety of grave goods and their inclusion with individual burials is one of the clearest signs of the high status of the burials at Lake Jackson. Finally, for the Mission Period, Patale had two more types of grave goods than Fig Springs. While this might be due to status issues, it might also be explained by demographics, as the Patale sample contained many more women, children, and old adults. In many cultures, people of different ages and sex received different kinds of grave goods, and therefore, it may be demographics and not status that is responsible for a greater variety of individual grave goods at Patale than at Fig Springs. Meanwhile, Seminole Period Quad Block could not even be used for most studies of grave goods because, by the 1830s, the Seminoles were very dependent on inexpensive Euro-American goods. Their artifact collections are significantly different from even the Mission Period burial sites.

3. Individual Burials with Grave Goods

Much of this paper has attempted to find, plot, and understand status. One of the best ways to understand status has always been to determine if individual burials contain grave goods, which people were buried with grave goods, and what types of artifacts were used as grave goods. The actual practice of furnished individual burial was quite common throughout Florida in time and space (Table 5.4). Although many sites could not be analyzed with regard to the number of artifacts and their inclusions with certain individuals, most documentation for sites did mention whether or not individual furnished
burials were present. In this study of about 40 sites, only one fourth of the sites (10 sites) did not have individual furnished burials. Most the sites lacking individual grave goods were of Weeden Island/Manasota cultures or Early Safety Harbor (e.g., Palmer Mound, Weeden Island, Thomas Mound, Englewood Mound, and Tierra Verde Mound) attribution. Unfurnished burial does appear to be a Weeden Island trait, and this is very evident from McKeithen Mounds B and C. McKeithen Mound B was a furnished burial mound for one person. However, McKeithen Mound C, which contained many individuals, lacked any individual grave goods. In Weeden Island culture, furnished burial was reserved for the very elite, and this tradition continued on the Gulf Coast Peninsula into the Early Safety Harbor culture. During Weeden Island, most of the ritual emphasis was on family lineages, not individuals, and so appropriate burial goods in most cases were associated with the overall site and not individual people. The fact that Jones Mound contained furnished burials suggests that these burials were high status or that most of the burials were really from the later Safety Harbor culture (Bullen 1952: 47-53).

The percentage of burials with grave goods at sites was also studied, and this showed that furnished burial was, at times, the most common when the given society was the least structured (Figure 5.2). Until the Fort Walton and Late Safety Harbor cultures, the site with the most furnished burials was Early-Middle Archaic Windover Pond, with 62 percent of the burials having been furnished. In fact, between the Archaic and Fort Walton/Late Safety Harbor, only two sites in the study had a high percentage of furnished burials: Swift Creek Mayport Mound (57 percent) and Weeden Island McKeithen Mound B at (100 percent). McKeithen B, though, only contained a single burial. The high percentage of furnished burials at Mayport Mound is somewhat of a mystery, and could either reflect a continuation of Archaic ideas, or the very beginnings of status and hierarchy in burial. Nevertheless, as mentioned before, many of the sites also may have included artifacts of organic material that had long since decomposed, skewing the results.

The St. Johns’ culture and area was highly variable. In some cases, a single major burial deposit was furnished such as at Benton and Browne Mounds, and in other cases, such as Mackenzie and Walker Point Mounds, several individual burials contained grave goods. Mackenzie Mound’s identification as a St. Johns’ site is also debatable, and many
of its features, discussed earlier, suggest it may have really been a Weeden Island culture site. The St. Johns’ site with the most furnished burials was the late St. Johns IIC Goodman Mound, with its sacrificial children. Sixty-two percent of the burials at this site were furnished. However, it is likely that the study sample does not accurately represent St. Johns’ ritual life as none of its major high status mounds was used in this sample. This uncertainty is due to their excavation and inadequate documentation by Wyman, Moore, and others in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the Fort Walton and late Safety Harbor cultures, furnished burials become common on the Panhandle and Gulf Coast Peninsula. At high status Lake Jackson, 77 percent of the burials were furnished, and at the late Fort Walton site of Snow Beach, 43 percent of the burials were furnished. However, this study does not include any Fort Walton sites, which were used for the burial of commoners. Thus my discussion of Fort Walton culture and furnished burial is problematic at best.

On the Gulf Coast Peninsula, as much as 60 percent of the burials at the Yellow Bluffs Mound were furnished, and even where bundle burials were present at Tatham and Weeki Wachee, 10 percent of Tatham and 13 percent of Weeki Wachee Mound’s burials were furnished. Throughout the sample, it was clear that the sites with the greatest use of bundle burial were also those with the least use of individual furnished burials (Table 5.4 and Figure 5.3). These traditions may be integrated or occur because bundle burials are secondary burials in which are bodies stored together before interment. This practice by definition precludes individual-associated burials with grave goods being present. As the bodies were defleshed and stored together, there might have been no way of determining which skeleton was which, and therefore, which was to receive specific grave goods upon internment.

During the Mission and Seminole Periods, furnished burial was also quite common. What is clear again is how Fig Springs and Patale differed as only 13 percent of Fig Springs’ burials were furnished in comparison to 21 percent of Patale. The meaning of this and the possible high standards of life and prosperity at Patale have been discussed here and will be further discussed in the chapter on health. For the single Seminole site of Quad Block, furnished burial was so common that 40 percent of burials with grave goods is actually on the low side. At Quad Block, many of the burials included buttons, but
FIGURE 5.3 BUNDLE BURIAL VS. INDIVIDUAL FURNISHED BURIAL
Table 5.5 Percentages of Male, Female, Adult, and Subadult/Children Burials with Grave Goods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>MALE (%)</th>
<th>FEMALE (%)</th>
<th>SUBADULT (%)</th>
<th>ADULT (%)</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tables 6.1 and 6.2 provide information for sample size, sex, and age information for each site. McKeithen Mound B is not included as there was only one individual in the mound.
FIGURE 5.4 INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS: MALE VS. FEMALE INDIVIDUALS

FIGURE 5.5 INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS: SUBADULT VS. ADULT INDIVIDUALS
more children received furnished burials than the adults, the percentage of furnished child burials was dramatically higher than the adults (e.g., Mayport Mound - 100 percent of children vs. 55 percent of adults and Goodman Mound - 73 percent of children vs. 0 percent of adults). Both of these sites are in the St. Johns’ area, and Goodman Mound contained sacrificial children. Although Mayport Mound was of the Swift Creek culture, it too could have contained sacrificial children. Another possible St. Johns culture site, Mackenzie Mound, only contained two burials with grave goods, but again, one of them was an infant and the other was completely unknown (Sears 1959: 22).

Beside the St. Johns’ sites, the only other sites with such a high percentage of children receiving furnished burial were sites in which high status for the entire burial population was evident: Lake Jackson Mound 3, Snow Beach, and Yellow Bluffs. The fact that child burials at these sites were also well-furnished corresponds with the fact that in both Fort Walton and Safety Harbor society, rank and status were no longer achieved, but were ascribed from birth (Rothschild 1979: 661). The only other site in which the number of furnished child burials compared to furnished adult burials was excessively high was Quad Block (Piper et al. 1982a: 132-197, 321-327). However, this site is difficult to understand as very few Seminole burials have been excavated and the Seminoles themselves were recent immigrants to Florida.

5. Conclusion

The analysis of grave goods has demonstrated that certain artifacts (such as pottery) can be used to identify the period and culture of a site and the scale of a culture’s influence. For example, Weeden Island pottery types were found associated with Weeden Island sites such as McKeithen, Weeden Island, and Thomas Mound. At the same time, the absence of such pottery at Palmer Mound suggests that Weeden Island culture was not native to the Gulf Coast Peninsula and its presence at Mackenzie Mound shows its eastward expansion. The popularity of certain artifacts in burials or burial sites may be due to preservation and environmental issues, or status. Stone objects are especially common in many burials sites, partially because they rarely decompose. Some sites even contain stone artifacts that were part of the fill and hundreds of years older than the site. Shell is another common grave good due to its use as building material, tool, receptacle (shell cups), and as food offering.
Certain artifacts such as ochre and jewelry were clearly popular because of status. Ochre was found with many of the high status burials at sites such as McKeithen Mound B, Jones Mound, and Lake Jackson Mound 3. Jewelry, especially metal jewelry, was frequently associated with high status sites, and Lake Jackson had a large number of copper objects including breastplates, badges, and hair ornaments (Jones 1994: 143-144). In regard to the variety of artifacts included with burials, it was initially quite high in the Archaic, 11 types, (e.g., Windover and Tick Island), but was considerably lower afterward. It was not until late Safety Harbor and Fort Walton cultures/periods that the use of a wide of variety of artifacts rose to Archaic levels. As many as 25 types of artifacts were included with the burials at Lake Jackson.

My study also has tried to understand status by examining whether individual burials were furnished and who exactly was buried with grave goods. Although furnished burial was quite common in Florida’s prehistory, it does appear tied to status and burial type. In most sites with secondary burials, individual furnished burial was uncommon, and only those individuals buried as primary burials contained grave goods. The fact that McKeithen Mound B’s single individual was buried as a primary burial with grave goods contrasts starkly with what was reserved for the common people of the society as McKeithen Mound C’s numerous secondary burials lacked grave goods. Likewise, on the Gulf Coast Peninsula, most Safety Harbor sites, which used secondary burials, did not have many individual furnished burials. Sites with primary burials and likely high status sites such as Yellow Bluffs, however, did contain high numbers of furnished burials.

The use of furnished burials, to a certain extent, was also affected by age and sex. Men frequently were more often buried with grave goods than women, and adult burials more regularly had grave goods when compared to children. On the other hand, sites with large numbers of women and children with grave goods is a possible sign of status or ritual. For example, all the women at high-status Lake Jackson were buried with goods, and Goodman Mound with its child sacrifices contained grave goods for the deceased children. Overall, the analysis of grave goods tells us many things about the burial of Florida’s native peoples, and when it is combined with the analyses on burial layout and type and the health of individuals, a true picture of status and hierarchy in Florida’s native societies can be seen.
CHAPTER 6:

The Biological Analysis of Burials

1. Sex and Age

Beside studying layout, burial type, and associated artifacts, the physical characteristics of human remains, including sex, age, and health, were analyzed and plotted. The proportion of male to female burials was roughly equal in most sites from all periods and cultures (Table 6.1 and Figure 6.1). In no period or culture was there generally a clear differentiation in the burials of males and females, and the only major differences were found at high status sites or those with small sample size. Plotting sex distribution demonstrated that certain sites, such as Windover Pond, McKeithen Mound C, Bayshore Mound B, and Tatham Mound likely contained burials representative of the entire community, as the ratio of males to females was basically even. Most of the sites with high differences between recovered males and females were likely due to sampling and preservation issues (e.g., Santa Maria, Browne Mound, and Snow Beach). Additionally, some sites could not be included in Table 6.1 and Figure 6.1, because few burials could be sexed (See Appendix B: Site Summaries).

The issue of hierarchy and status clearly affected the burials of males and females at certain sites. In many societies, males have been treated with higher status than females, and three of the sites with high proportions of males vs. females were also sites in which status elements have already been seen (Binford 1971: 20-22; Saxe 1971: 42-48; Sullivan 2001: 106-112; Tainter 1978: 125-126). At Jones Mound, for every female burial recovered, three male burials were recovered, and many of the burials at this site were furnished (Bullen 1952: 47). Although Walker Point Mound’s ratio of males to females might be explained as a sampling issue, it might also be due to status. At Walker 67 percent of the burials were males and 33 percent were females (Bullen 1973: 72-76). The possible high status of the mound and its burials has been suggested by the height of this mound, and the presence of individual grave goods. In fact, the only burial with grave goods was an adult male with a food offering (Hemmings and Deagan 1973: 39-41). Further support for the high status of male burials is suggested by Lake Jackson
Table 6.1 Percentages of Male, Female, and Unknown Burials*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>MALE (%)</th>
<th>FEMALE (%)</th>
<th>UNKNOWN (%)</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEEN ISLAND</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRE)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Unknown burial percentage includes unsexed and in some cases unaged burials in which there was no data on sex or age. For several sites the percentages of males to females only reflect the proportion the archaeologist or osteologist reported. For Manasota Key it is by proportion of adult females to males. At Jones Mound, adult males outnumbered adult females 3 to 1.
FIGURE 6.1 MALE VS. FEMALE BURIALS
Mound 3. At Lake Jackson, 85 percent of the burials were males and only 10 percent were females. Nevertheless, at high status McKeithen Mound B and Snow Beach, women more often received high status burials, and the fact that women were even included in Lake Jackson illustrates the possible rise of ascribed, instead earned status, in later Florida societies. At Snow Beach, while only seven burials could be studied, 29 percent of the burials were females and only 14 percent were male (Magoon et al. 2001: 19-20). The high status of women or at least one woman at McKeithen is exceptionally prominent, as the single burial from Mound B was a female who may not have been even from the local population (Milanich et al. 1997: xvi). Furthermore, McKeithen Mound B may date to late Weeden Island, when society was moving to increased social complexity, which reached its height in the Fort Walton culture that Lake Jackson and Snow beach belonged. Overall, hierarchy and status may have certainly affected the deposition of bodies according to sex.

The use of males for hard labor and war could have also affected the burial of males and females, and this possibly occurred in the Mission and Seminole Periods. At Fig Springs, the ratio of deceased males to females is about 2 to 1 (39 percent to 22 percent), and the number of adult burials is about 80 percent (Hoshower and Milanich 1991: 218; Hoshower and Milanich 1993: 222). In comparison, Patale’s cemetery consisted of 13 percent males and 19 percent females. The cemetery also contained a more extensive distribution of people all ages: 1 percent infants, 28 percent subadults, 42 percent adults, and 12 percent 50+ years old individuals (Jones et al. 1991: 118) (Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2). Both Fig Springs and Patale practiced the same burial traditions enforced by the Spaniard, and skeletal preservation was similar at both sites. Patale seems to represent a whole community but Fig Springs’ sample consists largely of adults. Nevertheless, unlike Patale, the Fig Springs’ sample represents only 23 of an estimated 900 individuals (Weisman 1993: 171-172, 192). A look at the physical health of the individuals at both sites, however, will reveal how these two communities differed greatly in lifestyle. At Patale, all of people, including the elderly, were healthy, while a great number of Fig Springs’ older population suffered pathology related to hard labor (Storey and Widmer 1991: 173-201; Hoshower and Milanich 1993: 228-231). Therefore, the difference in males to females at Fig Springs versus that at Patale is likely because the
Fig Springs’ sample were largely adult males conscripted for labor by the Spanish, whereas Patale contained the burials of a whole Native American community. Secondly, it must be remembered Patale dated later than Fig Springs, and their difference in sex demographics may suggest that labor conscription was not major factor in later times. Finally, the Seminole site of Quad Block also had a large number of males to females, and this is probably because the people at Quad Block were prisoners from the Second Seminole War (Wienker 1982: 9, 16, 17, 24).

Like sex, the study of age showed similar distributions between sites of all the different periods and cultures (Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2). At most sites, adults (defined as 20-49 years old where possible) were the most common age group, and often exceeded the population of subadults/children (defined as 2-19 years old where possible), by about 40 percent. Infant remains were even scarcer, and were found at only 12 sites, usually in small numbers. In some cases, adults were the only age group reported, and this was likely due to several factors. Although infant mortality has been quite high throughout history, infants and children have delicate bones and are susceptible to loss through decomposition (Evison 1994: 59; Timby 1996: 17). In Florida, the preservation of human remains is often poor at best as the acidic soil frequently decomposes skeletal remains thoroughly. The fact that many sites were mounds causes further preservation problems as burials could have been crushed from the weight of different layers of the mound. Furthermore, the use of secondary bundle burials and cremations often results in the destruction of bone. Sites with primary burials did frequently contain more child burials than those with secondary burials (Table 6.2 and Figure 6.3). With such problems as acidic soil, weight crushing mounds, and destructive burial rituals, osteologists certainly have had difficulties analyzing even adult remains. Detecting child burials in some cases can be almost impossible. Many archaeologists and osteologists also focus on the sexing of individuals, and as children can rarely be sexed, they may be excluded from some studies. Additionally, in many societies young children and infant remains are not buried with rest of the community (Timby 1996: 17). Thus, the presence of children remains is still important since their presence can demonstrate whether all the people from a community were interred together.
### Table 6.2 Percentages of Age Demographics of Burials and the Issue of Burial Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>INFANT (%)</th>
<th>SUBADULT/CHILD (%)</th>
<th>ADULT (%)</th>
<th>SENILE/50+ YRS (%)</th>
<th>UNKNOWN (%)</th>
<th>PRIMAR Y (%)</th>
<th>SECON DARY (%)</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR PRES.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR PRES. OR DOC.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR PRES. &amp; DOC.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>POOR PRES. &amp; DOC.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRE &amp; POST CONTACT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Unknown burial percentage includes all the individuals in which age could not be assigned. Furthermore, for Sowell, the percentages only represent the proportion of children to adults and may not reflect the entire 169 individuals listed. For Tatham, there is no age break down for Pre and Post Contact. Furthermore, many of the sites reported in Willey (1949) only had an age classification of child or adult, and there may be 50+ years individuals reported within the adult category.
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FIGURE 6.3 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY BURIALS VS. INFANT AND SUBADULT BURIALS
The presence of children can also illustrate hierarchy and status. Furnished burials of children at a site may show that status was ascribed, instead of achieved in the society (Binford 1971: 20-22). This is especially clear when only a few burials at a site had any grave goods. Furnished child burials should not be interpreted as status burials if almost all the burials at the site contained grave goods (e.g., Windover). One of the best sites for evidence of inherited status for children is the Fort Walton culture site of Lake Jackson. At Lake Jackson Mound 3, only two burials were child burials, and both of them contained numerous grave goods (Jones 1994: 125-144; Storey 1993: Burial Catalog; Storey 2002: 68-75). Likewise, the presence of children with grave goods at Snow Beach further supports the idea of inherited status in socially complex Fort Walton society (Magoon et al. 2001: 20). In many of the earlier and less hierarchical societies, the people only used grave goods for adults who had achieved their status. Child burials, moreover, may indicate human sacrifice as in the case of Goodman Mound, which consisted of 11 children and only 2 adults, and is in an area historically known for child sacrifice (Bullen 1963: 61-65; Jordan 1963: 28-34). Goodman Mound’s children did possess grave goods, and the fact that several other St. Johns’ sites contained furnished infant and child burials may be further archaeological evidence of child sacrifice by the St. Johns people.

At some sites, osteologists were able to estimate age within several years for individuals, or at single years for children. At a number of sites, osteologists defined older individuals as old, old or late middle age, or senile, and this allowed the adult category to divided between adult (20-49 years) and senile/50+ years for this study (Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2). While few sites had 50+ years populations, enough existed to come to certain conclusions concerning them. Senile age people were identified at sites such as Windover, McKeithen Mound C, Jones Mound, and Woodward Mound. Almost all of these sites also included individuals of all ages and sexes, and therefore, demonstrated that these sites were representative of their entire communities. Meanwhile, the large numbers of people over 50 years old at Lake Jackson might be interpreted as evidence of better health or increased longevity of this site’s elite population. Senile age people were also found at Patale but not Fig Springs, hinting at possibly evidence of a better health and lifestyle or treatment for Patale inhabitants. The fact that Seminole Quad Block did not have 50+ years people is likely due to epidemic diseases, which plagued
not only the Seminoles, but also the American garrison (Wienker 1982: 9, 16, 17, 24, 29-37). Many of the non-Native American burials at Quad Block are of seemingly healthy young American soldiers, and few of the Seminole burials show evidence of poor health. Epidemic diseases, such as yellow fever, prevented many from living to old age. If epidemic diseases were truly responsible for the lack of old people at many sites, this might also explain that fact that 50+ years people were rarely found in any of the Post-Contact purely Native American sites (Tatham - 5 percent, Weeki Wachee - 0 percent, and Snow Beach - 0 percent).

Finally, at certain sites, osteologists were able to provide tight age ranges of several years for individuals. In a few cases, osteologists even calculated the overall average ages of people in the society. In this study, where exact age or age ranges of several years for individuals were given, an average age for the entire population, and if possible, the average age of males and females was calculated. Most osteologists calculate average age using only the adults of the population, and it is this type of average age that is used in this study (Hutchinson 2004: 55-56). The study of average age shows that men and women had similar lifespans and that the average age at death for Native Americans through Florida’s history was about 34-35 years (Table 6.3 and Figure 6.4). Average age of death of adults did vary between societies and periods, but in most cases, the average age peaks at the sites with the best overall demographic representations of their societies. For example, the overall average age was 36 years at Windover, 45 years at McKeithen Mound C, 40 years at Palmer Mound, and 46 years at Safety Harbor. While 34-35 years does seem rather low it is consistent with many societies throughout the world, and shows that Native Americans in Florida were living as healthy lives as other groups around the world (Harke 1997: 135; McCaa 2002: 106, 111, 116-120). The study of average age of death of adults might also be related to hierarchy since two of the sites with the oldest average individuals were the very hierarchal Fort Walton culture site, Lake Jackson Mound 3 and the Safety Harbor culture site of Safety Harbor. With higher status, comes better access to a wider variety and greater amount of food, and thus, the ability to live longer than most people (Griffin and Bullen 1950: 28; Storey 2002: 68-75). Surprisingly, even with the arrival of the Europeans, who brought new diseases and societal changes and pressures, and caused poorer health for Native American
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>OVERALL AVERAGE</th>
<th># OF ADULTS AGED</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 6.4 AVERAGE AGE OF ADULTS AT DEATH
populations, average age of adults only dropped about two years for Postcontact populations (Worth 2001: 8-20).

2. Dental Health

The study of health in Florida is particularly difficult because of Florida’s poor conditions for skeletal preservation, and the burial traditions of its inhabitants. Combined with the fact that skeletal analysis often involves much more technical and painstaking study than other archaeological examinations, the available sample of sites that has received detailed pathological study is somewhat small. Unlike many of the previous studies in this paper, many of the pathological discussions will be restricted to one area, the Gulf Coast Peninsula. Furthermore, because of preservation issues, dental analysis, which deals with decomposition-resistant teeth, has been one of the few areas in pathological analysis to receive extensive study.

The most productive dental conditions for which data exist were 1) caries, 2) dental chipping and wear, and 3) enamel hypoplasia and pathological striae. Dental caries are defined as a multifactorial, multibacterial disease of calcified teeth tissues, characterized by the demineralization of the inorganic portion and destruction of the organic component (Langsjoen 1998: 402-404; Larsen 1997: 65-72). Caries are caused by bacteria and solutes of oral fluids. They are recognizable as pits and fissures in teeth. Agricultural populations are the groups most often afflicted with caries because of the higher quantities of carbohydrates in their diets. In Florida, caries were not a major health problem until the Fort Walton culture, and the later arrival of Europeans. In fact, the average percentage of people affected with caries for 16 sites, not including Fort Walton or Mission and later sites, was only 6 percent, and even this number was largely inflated by the rise in number of people afflicted by caries in the Late Safety Harbor culture (Table 6.4 and Figure 6.5). For the excluded Fort Walton sites of Lake Jackson and Snow Beach, 85 percent and 80 percent, respectively, of the individuals were afflicted with caries. For both Mission sites, about 25 percent of the population suffered caries. The overall low number of people afflicted with caries makes perfect sense, since agriculture was not the main source of subsistence in most Floridian societies, especially not the Gulf Coast Peninsula. As mentioned before, only one area in Florida had an environment well-
Table 6.4 Percentages of Caries, Dental Chipping, and Premortem Tooth Loss and the Presence of Heavy Dental Wear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>CARIES (OV, M, F) (%)</th>
<th>DENTAL CHIPPING (%)</th>
<th>PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS (%)</th>
<th>HEAVY DENTAL WEAR (PRESENT)</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>5% OF TEETH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>12.7% OF PROV. TEETH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>4570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>5, 10, 7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>9, 4, 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>0, 0, 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>3, 4, 2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRE)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>85, 91, 50</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST)</td>
<td>19, 18, 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>80, 100, 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>24, 44, 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td><em>5, 10, 11</em></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lake Jackson and Snow Beach are not included in the average for caries as they have incredibly high incidences of caries that would inflate the average and not reflect the real dental health of the overall samples. The Mission and Seminole Periods sites are also not included in average for caries as the main interest is how Native Floridians lived, and during these periods in many areas the Europeans dramatically changed Native Florida society with the institution of widespread agriculture. Abbreviations: OV.= Overall, PROV.= Provenienced
FIGURE 6.5 PERCENTAGE OF A POPULATION WITH CARIES

FIGURE 6.6 PERCENTAGE OF A POPULATION WITH POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS
suited for agriculture, the northern edges of Florida (including the Panhandle where Fort Walton culture developed).

Evidence of agriculture is also indicated by the analysis of the Alachua culture site of Woodward Mound (Bullen 1949: 54-57). Although documentation and analysis of pathology was cursory, individuals with caries were noted. When the percentage of individuals with caries was calculated, it was 8 percent, but this might be conservative for the site as many individuals had suffered from tooth loss and heavy dental wear. Eight percent does not seem high, but most of the other sites in the dental study had received much more extensive study. Before the Late Safety Harbor period, Woodward’s 8 percent was actually on the high side for the study. From other archaeological evidence, we know that Woodward’s Alachua people were agriculturalists who had settled on good farming land and replaced the hunter-gather society that had preceded it (Dolan 1959: 25; Milanich 1994: 333). Therefore, the available data supports the expected relationship between caries incidence and agricultural societies. Furthermore, even though the Europeans expanded the use of agriculture in some areas, such as the St. Johns’ region, it must be remembered that both Mission Period sites, Fig Springs and Patale, were located in the Panhandle and North Central Florida, where Native Americans had already been practicing agriculture (Dobyns 1983: 135-143). Thus, the distribution of caries may be more consistent with indigenous practices than European influence.

Caries were also studied according to sex to determine if men and women were possibly consuming slightly different diets. However, the sample of populations studied for caries and identified by sex was quite small. Additionally, the results of plotting those few sites did not agree with commonplace findings in other Native Americans groups and societies. In this study, men were shown to have suffered caries much more frequently than women (Hutchinson 2004: 152). In most societies, women haven been found to have higher number of caries because they focused on farming and the men on hunting (Larsen 1997: 72-75; Larsen et al. 2002: 421).

There were also some unusual findings in the rate of caries at sites such as Archaic Period Bird Island, where 13 percent of the teeth had caries, and the Early Manasota culture site of Manasota Key where 9 percent of its population suffered from caries (Table 6.4 and Figure 6.5). In Late Safety Harbor culture, the rate of caries rose to
19 percent at Post-Contact Tatham, but was only 4 percent at Weeki Wachee. Unlike the Fort Walton culture, there is no evidence that Safety Harbor peoples ever extensively practiced agriculture, and therefore there must be another explanation for these discrepancies. Even after the end of Safety Harbor, the Seminole Quad Block site, located in the same Gulf Coast Peninsula area, had a population in which only 4 percent of people were afflicted with caries. In the case of this Seminole population, we do not know much about their lives, as they were a transitional population who were only occupying the site for a short time. They had previously be constantly moving to escape the US army and were being shipped them out of Florida from Fort Brooke (Quad Block) (Piper et al. 1982b: 122-125). Finally, the study of caries is made more difficult by dental wear, dental chipping, and premortem tooth loss. These conditions remove from the individuals the teeth or parts of the teeth that would show evidence of caries.

Dental wear, chipping, and premortem tooth loss were noted to a varying degree in the study’s sample (Table 6.4). Heavy dental wear and dental chipping were especially common, and extreme dental wear was noted in about 25 percent of the sites. The rarity of dental caries and the abundance of tooth chipping and general dental wear are likely due to one thing: diet. Most of the populations in this study depended on marine resources, such as shellfish, for their diet. These foods would have been tough on their teeth and the coastal environments meant that coarse sand would frequently find its way into peoples’ mouths. Therefore, the daily lives of Native Americans would have constantly exposed their teeth to excessive wear and breakage. Dental wear may also be evidence of old age of individuals, but there were few sites in which old individuals were excavated.

A few of the sites even illustrated a possible correlation between a low frequency of caries and excessive dental wear, chipping, and premortem tooth loss. At Perico Island, only 5 percent of the population was afflicted with caries, but 62 percent of the population suffered dental chipping. At Republic Groves, only 3 percent of the population suffered caries, but heavy dental wear was quite common. Lastly, the six bodies at Walker Point seemingly did not suffer from caries, but 50 percent of this group suffered premortem tooth loss (Bullen 1973: 62-66). The studies of dental chipping, dental wear, and premortem tooth loss does seem to illustrate the diets of Florida’s native
peoples, and how our knowledge of caries may be quite skewed by a lack of teeth to study.

While caries, dental chipping, dental wear, and premortem tooth loss tell us about diet, enamel hypoplasia and pathological striae are useful in understanding the health of individuals. Enamel hypoplasia and pathological striae, a type of enamel hypoplasia, are conditions in which there are defects in the structure of tooth enamel resulting from a body-wide, metabolic problem sufficient to disrupt ameloblastic physiology (Langsjoen 1998: 405-407; Larsen 1997: 44-47; Simpson 2001: 147-149). These specific enamel lesions consist of sharply defined linear, horizontal grooves of reduced enamel thickness, extending circumferentially around the tooth crown. Because of the way teeth develop, this condition most commonly manifests in the first two years of life. Enamel hypoplasia is frequently caused by hemolytic disease of newborns, premature birth, major febrile infections, dietary deficiencies of vitamins A, C, D, and newborn hypoxia. These are basically conditions of malnutrition or major acute bacterial infections sufficient to require the body to divert energy away from nonvital processes, and redirect all its resources into essential processes for survival. Unlike caries, enamel hypoplasia was quite common in Florida populations from all areas and cultures (Table 6.5). It often affected at least 40 percent of a population, and was high as 88 percent in one group, Sarasota Bay Mound. Although this condition develops in early childhood, Goodman Mound, with one of the largest collections of child burials in the study, did not have a single individual who suffered this condition (Simpson 2001: 150). This lack of a normally common health condition might give further credence to the idea that these children were sacrificial victims, as these individuals did not suffer poor health, which would have led to death. At the same time, the study of enamel hypoplasia also demonstrated that status and health are sometimes not related. At high status Lake Jackson Mound 3, all tested individuals (100 percent) suffered enamel hypoplasia, and at least 33 percent of Snow Beach’s population suffered this condition. The high frequency of hypoplasia at even high status sites shows that no one was able to live completely healthy lives in prehistoric Florida. Finally, enamel hypoplasia does appear to become higher in the later Safety Harbor sites and this would correspond with development of the larger populations of the period, which would have competed fiercely over resources.
The study of enamel hypoplasia also suggests that in the Mission Period, the people at Patale were possibly healthier than those at Fig Springs. For enamel hypoplasia, 75 percent of those studied at Fig Spring suffered this condition, in comparison to 2 percent or less of those at Patale. Patale even contains far more children than Fig Springs, and so it is not a sampling issue. The disparity between the two populations is likely due to differences in basic health, and illustrates the argument that the Fig Springs sample is largely Native American men who were used for hard labor while the people at Patale represented a complete Native American community that lived relatively well. While numerous other dental conditions (such as periodontal diseases and dental abscesses) were examined, the numbers of sites that were consistently analyzed for them was quite small, and the sample size inadequate for making any proper conclusions.

3. Other Health Indicators

Besides dental health, various other health issues were examined including porotic hyperostosis and cribra orbitalia, periostitis (and all its forms), fractures and trauma, and osteoarthritis. Porotic hyperostosis (PH) and cribra orbitalia (CO) are caused by conditions similar to those that result in enamel hypoplasia (Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998: 348-351; Larsen 1997: 29-33). Porotic hyperostosis is characterized by symmetrically distributed cranial lesions, involving the outer table only of the frontal and parietal bones, and occasionally the occipital bone. Meanwhile, cribra orbitalia is a similar condition, but involves smaller lesions located in the orbital roof of the frontal bone. Both of these conditions appear as spongy, porous bone on the human skull, and it is only where they are located on the skull and their respective sizes that differ. Like enamel hypoplasia, porotic hyperostosis and cribra orbitalia predominantly affect infants and younger children. Both cribra orbitalia and porotic hyperostosis are caused by an iron deficiency or internal parasites (Hutchinson 2004: 68, 69, 110-112).

On average, porotic hyperostosis and cribra orbitalia were quite common and affected about 26 percent of the studied populations (Table 6.5 and Figure 6.6). The presence of porotic hyperostosis is usually high in agricultural populations, and the argument has often been made that this is because of the lack of iron in the foods that agriculturalists consume (Hutchinson 2004: 68-69). However, the high prevalence of porotic hyperostosis in the Florida sites, most of which were on the Gulf Coast Peninsula,
Table 6.5 Percentages of a Population with Porotic Hyperostosis, Cribra Orbitalia, Enamel Hypoplasia, and Pathological Striae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS (%)</th>
<th>CRIБRA ORBITALIA (%)</th>
<th>ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA (OV, M, F) (%)</th>
<th>PATHOLOGICAL STRIAE (%)</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>52, 65, 51</td>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8, 17, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>62 (POR. &amp; CRIB.) 91 (EN. HYP.)</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>78, 80, 71</td>
<td></td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2, 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>115 (POR. &amp; CRIB.) 419 (EN. HYP.)</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (POR.) 48 (CRIB. &amp; EN. HYP.)</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRE)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>35, 33, 36</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>57, 56, 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>39 (POR.) 46 (CRIB.) 16 (EN. HYP.)</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23 (POR. &amp; CRIB.) 19 (EN. HYP.)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44, 42, 37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the sample size column, the number before POR., CRIB, or EN. HYP. represents the number of individuals studied for each condition. For specific conditions only a certain number of population could be studied. Abbreviations: POR. = Porotic Hyperostosis, CRIB. = Cribra Orbitalia, EN. HYP. = Enamel Hypoplasia
cannot be due to agriculture, as most of these peoples did not practice it. The study sample, therefore, validates the idea that porotic hyperostosis can be largely attributed to internal parasites, which cause infection and intestinal bleeding. The heavy fish and shellfish diet that many Florida populations consumed or contaminated water may have been sources of such parasites (Hutchinson 2004: 132; Walker 1986: 349-352; Walker and Thorton 2002: 518-519). Some studies have now also tied porotic hyperostosis to the increase in populations and close quarters, poor sanitation (including contaminated water), and greater access or susceptibility to various infectious diseases. In this case, my study suggests that the relationship between population size and porotic hyperostosis is still unclear for Florida. For example, although 39 percent of the 309 bodies from Palmer Mound suffered porotic hyperostosis, this high percentage was not matched at sites such as Tatham Mound. At Post-Contact Tatham, only 1 percent of 166 individuals suffered from this condition. If anything, porotic hyperostosis should have been higher at Tatham, because Tatham’s Safety Harbor society had far larger and socially complex populations than Palmer Mound’s Weeden Island/Manasota society.

Interestingly, however, the three sites with the lowest percentage of people affected with porotic hyperostosis have all been suggested to be high status sites from other studies in this paper. Thus, high status may have affected health. Porotic hyperostosis was found in only 1 percent of Bayshore, 1 percent of Tatham Post-Contact, and 4 percent of Weeki Wachee’s samples. The site with the highest incidence of porotic hyperostosis (67 percent) was the Fort Walton culture site of Snow Beach. The high prevalence at Snow Beach might be due to several factors: it is one of the few sites, in which the people were dependent on agriculture, shellfish was also part of their diet, and/or the fact that only eight bodies were studied (Magoon et al. 2001: 21-22). Although 0 percent of Lake Jackson’s sample suffered porotic hyperostosis, 25 percent of the sample had cribra orbitalia (Storey 2002: 68-75). Lake Jackson’s results are somewhat strange, as the site should either be high for all conditions of malnutrition (enamel hypoplasia, porotic hyperostosis, and cribra orbitalia) or low because of the high status of the individuals. This issue should be further examined and might be related to preservation or sample size problems. Nevertheless, while the role population density played in the prevalence of porotic hyperostosis in Florida societies remains unclear, it
seems that a shellfish diet, internal parasites, and associated contaminated water may have played major roles in how common porotic hyperostosis was in a population.

The next major health condition studied was periostitis (proliferative skeletal lesions) and its subconditions of osteomyelitis and osteitis (Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998: 172; Hutchinson 2004: 70-71, 114-115). Periostitis is any inflammation of bone, and conditions such as osteomyelitis is an inflammation of bone (osteitis) and bone marrow (myelitis), caused by pus producing bacteria. Periostitis can be the result of various types of bacterial infections and diseases or induced by damage done to one’s bones such as fractures or trauma. In Florida, these conditions have often been tied to treponemal diseases, which are caused by microorganisms called spirochetes of the genus Treponema, and divided into four types of infection: pinta, yaws, bejel (edemic syphilis), and venereal syphilis (Bullen 1972; Hutchinson 2004: 115-119). In this study, periostitis was found in an average of 20 percent of the populations, and its distribution over time and cultures was quite varied (Table 6.6). For example, for the Safety Harbor culture, periostitis was reported in as much as 69 percent of the population at Sarasota Bay Mound, while only in 6 percent at the site of Safety Harbor. At many of the sites where it does appear high, it was due to the small sample size such as Santa Maria and Snow Beach. This small sample size might also explain the high percentages found at the Safety Harbor sites, as both Sarasota Bay Mound and Pre-Contact Tatham Mound held less than 20 bodies each. If these sites are removed, we do see a possible gradual increase in periostitis from Late Weeden Island and Early Safety Harbor to Fort Walton and Late Safety Harbor. This increase would agree with both the growth in population experienced in Fort Walton and Safety Harbor and the arrival of the Spaniard with new diseases. At Tatham, archaeologists know many of the burials had to be the result of disease, and the fact that over one-fifth (23 percent) suffered periostitis would support it (Hutchinson 1991: 96, 102; Mitchem 1989: 329). For Lake Jackson, about 41 percent suffered periostitis and this supports the population argument, but again, shows that improved status did not necessarily mean improved health (Storey 2002: 68-75). At the same time, like many of the previous conditions, Fig Springs and Patale differed dramatically with 52 percent at Fig Springs and 3 percent at Patale. Finally, the lack of periostitis at Quad Block helps to eliminate some diseases from the possible list of killers of its deceased,
Table 6.6 Percentages of a Population with Periostitis, Skeletal Lesions, Osteomyelitis, Osteitis, Treponemal Infection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>PERIOSTITIS (%)</th>
<th>SKELETAL LESIONS (%)</th>
<th>OSTEOMYELITIS (%)</th>
<th>OSTEITIS (%)</th>
<th>TREPONEMAL INFECTION (%)</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>7% OF TIBIAE</td>
<td>0.36% OF TIBIAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>31% OF TIBIAE</td>
<td>2.9% OF TIBIAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>59% OF TIBIAE</td>
<td>0.9% OF TIBIAE</td>
<td>22% OF TIBIAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11% OF TIBIAE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRE)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5% OF TIBIAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.4% OF BONES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.78% OF BONES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For many of the sites, only the percentage of the population affected with each condition was reported.
and gives more credence to the idea that yellow fever and other such diseases were the cause of so many of the deaths at the site (Wienker 1982: 29-37).

Fractures and trauma, referring to any evidence of broken bones, lacerations, cuts, etc., were relatively uncommon in the studied populations, affecting an average of 8 percent of the study samples (Table 6.7). For the most part, the sites with the highest frequency of fractures were those with the smallest populations or those sites in which primary burial was the standard burial type (e.g., Windover - 22 percent, Gauthier - 18 percent, Walker Point - 20 percent, and Yellow Bluffs - 11 percent). The high appearance of fractures and trauma in different populations is likely an issue of sample size and preservation. In bundle burial, skeletal remains are frequently broken after death, and osteologists often cannot identify whether breaks occurred before or after death. The lack of trauma and fractures, though, does hint that violence was not very common in prehistoric Floridian society. However, some societies collected the heads of their enemies, and skull burials were found at some sites. In fact, at several of the sites, the burials of human skulls were interpreted to be that of fallen enemy warriors being included in the burials of their victors (e.g., Yellow Bluffs and Santa Maria) (Carr et al. 1984: 187; Milanich 1972: 37, 39). Furthermore, people who were severely injured or killed in battle may not have been sent back for proper burial, as Storey has suggested for Lake Jackson (Storey 2002: 68-75). At Lake Jackson, 0 percent of the individuals suffered from trauma, and though this may be tied to status and lack of preservation, Storey believes that people of Lake Jackson did not transport the remains of warriors killed in battle back to the site for burial.

At the same time, although many burials were performed at the same time at Post Contact Tatham, only 2 percent of the adults excavated suffered trauma. The lack of trauma is important as it suggests that disease, and not Spanish violence, was the cause of their deaths (Hutchinson 1991: 97, 117, 119; 2004: 124). For the Mission Period, at Fig Springs 13 percent of all people and 10 percent of the adults suffered trauma. In comparison, none of the people at Patale suffered trauma, and this significant difference shows again the different quality of life between these supposed similar populations. Lastly, Quad Block is somewhat odd in that none of the individuals studied suffered
### Table 6.7 Percentages of a Population with Trauma and Fractures, Blunt Trauma, and Evidence of Violent Death or Injury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>TRAUMA/FRACTURES (%)</th>
<th>MALE (%)</th>
<th>FEMALE (%)</th>
<th>BLUNT TRAUMA (%)</th>
<th>MALE (%)</th>
<th>FEMALE (%)</th>
<th>VIOLENT DEATH OR ACT (%)</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>18%-OVERALL, 10% OF ADULTS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>4 EXAMPLES OF HEALED FRACTURES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIIER VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>0% OF ADULTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (PRE)</td>
<td>11% BONES, 17% TIBIAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>1% OF ADULTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST)</td>
<td>2% OF ADULTS, 1% TIBIAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>13%-OVERALL, 10% OF ADULTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For many of the sites, only the percentage of the population affected with each condition was reported.*
trauma (Wienker 1982: 29-37). The people at Quad Block were prisoners of war and so it would be expected that at least a few bodies would show violence.

Osteoarthritis (Degenerative Joint Disease) is a noninflammatory, chronic, progressive, pathological condition, characterized by a loss of joint cartilage and subsequent lesions resulting from direct interosseous contact with diarthrodial joints (Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998: 93-94). It can be the result of a combination of different factors, including metabolism, bone density, infection, hereditary, sex, age, and nutrition (Hutchinson 2004: 79-80). Physical activity and mechanical stress are the primary factors in the degeneration of bone tissue. Osteoarthritis was found in an average 20 percent of the sample, and varied considerably over time and cultures (Table 6.8 and Figure 6.7). It is noticeably at its highest levels in those populations with smallest size (e.g., Santa Maria and Snow Beach) and those that likely received the greatest scrutiny (e.g., Windover, Republic Groves, and Manasota Key).

However, three important points do stand out. Only at Windover was there a high number of cases of osteoarthritis and high number of Senile/50+ years adults. Even though osteologists were able to precisely age the individuals at Manasota Key and Republic Groves, neither of these sites held high numbers of Senile/50+ years adults that could correspond with the high percentages of individuals afflicted with osteoarthritis recovered at these sites. At Manasota Key, 44 percent of the sample suffered from osteoarthritis, and osteoarthritis was the most common pathology at Republic Groves (Dickel 1991: 58-60; Hutchinson 2004: 122; Saunders 1972: 29) The absence of the very old shows that the presence of osteoarthritis in most cases was not due to old age, but was likely work-related. Secondly, the high percentage of people with osteoarthritis at Windover (98 percent) does suggest that age is a factor in the likelihood of suffering from this ailment. Of the 64 people with osteoarthritis, 16 were 55 years or older (Smith 2004: 30). The third point is more evidence that the people from the Fig Springs’ sample likely worked much harder than those at Patale. Although no 50+ years adults were found at Fig Springs, over 31 percent suffered osteoarthritis. In comparison, 12 percent of Patale’s population was Senile, but osteoarthritis was found in only 2 percent of the population. The people of Fig Springs and Patale certainly appear to have been different groups and
Table 6.8 Percentage of a Population with Osteoarthritis and Osteoarthritis vs. the Overall Number of Adults and Senile/ 50+ yrs People reported in a Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>OSTEOARTHRITIS (%)</th>
<th>ADULT (%) IN OVERALL SAMPLE</th>
<th>SENILE/ 50+ YRS (%) IN OVERALL SAMPLE</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO SEPARATE AGE ASSIGNMENTS FOR PRE AND POST IN AGE OF POPULATION</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For many of the sites, only the percentage of the population affected with osteoarthritis was reported.*
FIGURE 6.7 OSTEOARTHRITIS VS. ADULT AND SENILE/ 50+ YRS IN A POPULATION
who lived very different lives. Finally, other health conditions were studied, but the available samples for these studies were too small to reach significant conclusions.

4. Conclusion

The study of age and sex has demonstrated many key points. In the case of the sex, there were three major issues. First, Florida societies did not normally differentiate in the burial of men and women, and those few sites with exceptionally high numbers of men or women are likely due to issues of hierarchy and status that did not reflect the general burial practices of the people. Secondly, in Florida it appears that high status burials were more often done for men than women, as illustrated by sites such as Jones Mound and Lake Jackson Mound 3. Third, the role of men in a society is sometimes indicated to archaeologists by the number of men in comparison to the number of women found at a site. For example, the high proportions of men buried at Fig Springs and Quad Block are likely due to the fact that men were used for hard labor and war.

The study of age was even more useful and provided clues to the status of health in Florida societies and can be summarized in eight major statements. 1) Adults were the most commonly-recovered age group at the sites in this study, and this is likely due to preservation issues such as the fragility of children’s bones, Florida’s acidic soil, and damaging burial methods and types used, such as deposition in mounds and bundle burial. 2) The inclusion of child burials in high status sites may illustrate either inherited status in a society (e.g., Lake Jackson Mound 3) or the practice of human sacrifice (e.g., Goodman Mound). 3) The presence of infants, children, adults, and Senile/50+ together at many of the sites is evidence that the whole community of a society was frequently interred together. 4) The presence or absence of the elderly at a site may show that the site included high status burials (e.g. Lake Jackson Mound 3). It would also be very useful and informative if the sample had more aged burials from the Weeden Island Period to see if status was truly earned in Weeden societies. 5) The lack of the elderly at a site is a possible sign of differences in health, lifestyle, and the presence of epidemic diseases (e.g., Tatham, Weeki Wachee, Fig Springs, Patale, and Quad Block). 6) The study of exact age in societies showed that the average age of men and women was roughly equivalent throughout most of Florida’s history, and that average age did not change dramatically over the last 7,000 years. 7) Native Americans in Florida did live
relatively normal lives in that their average age of death, 34-35 years, is quite common in societies throughout the world. 8) Lastly, the results surprisingly did not suggest a dramatic decline in health with the arrival of the Europeans, and this should be examined in greater detail.

Although the study of health was quite difficult, the analysis of dental and other health indicators did result in some clear conclusions. The study of dental health supported other archaeological and historical evidence that most Native American populations in Florida did not practice agriculture, as caries rarely affected a large number of the studied populations. Likewise, caries did significantly increase at the Fort Walton culture sites of Snow Beach and Lake Jackson, and the Mission sites (where agriculture was practiced before and after the arrival of the Spaniard). The study of caries, though, also showed no evidence of women primarily eating plants and men eating meat; if anything, it was the reverse. Dental chipping and heavy dental wear were especially common in Florida’s societies, and this was likely due to the consumption of marine resources and the constant infiltration of sand into a people’s diet; likely the result of Florida’s sandy environments. Meanwhile, the high frequency of enamel hypoplasia in the sample demonstrates that life was somewhat difficult in Florida, and the sharp discrepancy between Fig Spring and Patale is further evidence of the differences in the conditions and peoples who occupied each site.

The study of other health indicators worked very much in conjunction with the analysis of dental health. The high frequency of porotic hyperostosis, often more than 25 percent of the population, was likely not due to an agricultural diet as the caries data demonstrated. Instead, porotic hyperostosis was probably due to internal parasites from contaminated water or the same tough diet of shellfish and other marine resources that was hinted at in the dental wear and chipping study. Likewise, the presence of porotic hyperostosis supports the evidence from enamel hypoplasia, that life in Florida could be quite difficult. The study of periostitis, meanwhile, was much more complicated as periostitis can be the result of numerous types of infections, diseases, and injuries. What is clear is that periostitis did commonly affect 20 percent of a population, and that its increase over time may have been due to population growth, perhaps leading to disease and war. Periostitis seems to have increased in the Safety Harbor Period when larger and
larger populations developed, and chiefdoms warred with each other over resources. Periostitis increased more with the arrival of the Spaniards, and this is evidence of the European infectious diseases that decimated Native American populations. Periostitis again shows heath differences between the populations of Fig Springs and Patale, but the lack of it at Quad Block demonstrates that many killer diseases did not leave evidence of their presence on the skeletal remains. Finally, the studies of periostitis, cribra orbitalia, enamel hypoplasia, and caries are very important as they demonstrated that health was not often affected by status. For example, prestigious Lake Jackson Mound 3 was high for caries (85 percent), enamel hypoplasia (100 percent), cribra orbitalia (25 percent), and periostitis (41 percent).

While high frequency of porotic hyperostosis and periostitis showed that Florida’s Native Americans often suffered many health problems, the study of trauma and fractures demonstrates that Native Americans did not suffer excessive broken bones or violence. Even though, the study of trauma and fractures is somewhat hindered by the practice of bundle burial, the average percent of the population that could be studied for trauma and/or fractures was still only 8 percent. Apparently, internecine warfare was uncommon, or if did happen, did not leave much skeletal evidence. Nevertheless, this might also be due to groups burying only the skulls of those they killed, and abandoning their killed on the battlefield; leaving archaeologists and osteologists with a sample unrepresentative of the violence in prehistoric Florida. Like other conditions, trauma and fractures appear noticeably higher in Fig Springs than Patale, and the study of osteoarthritis in populations showed that people at Fig Springs also worked harder than those at Patale. Osteoarthritis was especially uncommon of the studied health conditions, affecting on average, 16 percent of the total population studied. Furthermore, the lack of elderly people at many sites shows that presence of osteoarthritis was likely due to hard work and not aging. Demographic and health data provides a great deal of information about burial ritual and health. The information these sets of data provide about possible high status burials will be synthesized with the previous studies on burial layout, burial type, and grave goods to give a conclusive picture on what exactly was status in Florida and how it was represented by different cultures and peoples.
CHAPTER 7:

Status and Hierarchy

Throughout this thesis, evidence of status and hierarchy has been examined. The various features considered were mound size, the ratio of mound size to the population placed in it, its layers, the ratio of female to male and young to old burials, and grave goods. The presence of grave goods and the percentage furnished burials at a site together with all the previous factors tell archaeologists about the status of the site, and to some extent the status of its individuals. For example, Windover contained numerous furnished burials and Pierce Mound A was quite large and contained special features such as red ochre. However, neither of these sites was likely created by highly stratified societies. Therefore, other factors must be used to clarify the existence of high status individual burials and other methods developed for determining how much a site shows evidence of a high status (ceremonial or social classes of its people). These additional methods for understanding overall site and individual status include plotting the variety of possibly high status grave goods found at a site or with individual burials, examining the number and type of grave goods found with individuals, and the age and sex of those individuals buried with grave goods. Finally, many of the factors used to understand status were scored and used to calculate how the different sites ranked in their evidence of levels of social complexity and status.

1. High Status Grave Goods: Overall Context

To examine status through highly prestigious grave goods, twenty types of grave goods were identified as possible high status goods, and most of them were varieties of jewelry (Table 7.1). These goods were selected by their “exoticness” (goods difficult to obtain because of distance or cost), a clear ceremonial purpose, and/or their use for personal adornment. Many of these grave goods were employed throughout the Archaic to Seminole Periods, and could be used to track the social status through time. Likewise, certain grave goods were not useful for analysis because of preservation issues. For example, human hair jewelry was found at Lake Jackson Mound 3 and wooden artifacts at Windover Pond, but these materials rarely preserve well. These kinds of artifacts could
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.1 Types of Goods Considered as Status Markers in Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber Beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Teeth Beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone/ Antler Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Object/ Jewelry (Native)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effigies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Beads (Glass, Gold, Silver, Copper, Iron, Brass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Metal Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Teeth Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Jewelry (European)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Various types of artifacts that show status, but occurred in only one site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigment (red or other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark Teeth/ Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Jewelry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have been part of burials at other sites, but have since decomposed. At the same time, several types of high status goods that were relatively unique for their periods were plotted. These include the presence of European metal objects and jewelry. Fittingly, two of the three sites with the greatest variety of status goods on site were Post-Contact sites: Quad Block (14 types) and Tatham Mound (19 types) (Table 7.2 and Figure 7.1).

Nevertheless, the overall study of status goods at sites did reveal cultural and temporal differences that corresponded with several of the earlier analyses in Chapters 3-6. The variety of high status grave goods was quite high in Swift Creek culture sites, and all three sites (Mayport, Pierce A, and Dent Mounds) yielded seven types of high status goods. Like the previous studies in size, layers, and percentage of furnished burial, the Swift Creek people appear to represent a peak in social complexity which was not reached again until Late Weeden Island times (See Tables and Figures in Chapters 3-5).

Late Weeden Island culture Thomas and Jones Mounds had between eight and ten varieties of prestigious grave goods such as effigies, shell beads, and stone jewelry. The high social status of Jones Mound’s individuals and the site’s overall high status has repeatedly been mentioned. Both of these sites may have also been reused in the Safety Harbor Period, and so their long-term use might partly explain their great variety in high status goods.

What is interesting is that many sites that were identified as high status sites (in terms of ceremonial or social class of its individuals) in the studies on size, layers, goods, and demographics did not yield a great variety of high status grave goods. For example, McKeithen Mound B contained only four types of high status goods, and for the St. John’s sites, even Goodman Mound with its child sacrifices, only had five types of prestigious grave goods. These low numbers might be explained if the people at these sites used different grave goods including organic, easy-decomposing goods or they could have marked the status of their important individuals in other ways (Ucko 1969: 266). For example, at McKeithen, there was the construction of a large mound for single individual in extended burial type, McKeithen Mound B. The rest of the community was interred as bundle burials in McKeithen Mound C. McKeithen Mound B might also illustrate another reason why some high status sites did yield a great variety of goods (Milanich et al. 1997: xvi, 107-109). Mound B was possibly built towards the end of the
Table 7.2 Variety of Types of High Status Grave Goods: All Contexts and Individual Burial Context*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>ALL CONTEXTS</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL BURIAL CONTEXT</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POOR PRES.</td>
<td>4570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR PRES.</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>POOR PRES.</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (ALL PERIODS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO IND. W/ GDS.</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO IND. W/ GDS.</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND (1969 SEASON SAMPLE)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR PRES.</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO IND. W/ GDS.</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POOR PRES. &amp; DOC.</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>POOR DOC.</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations: NO IND. W/ GDS= No individuals with grave goods at site
FIGURE 7.1 VARIETY OF TYPES OF HIGH STATUS GOODS: ALL CONTEXTS

FIGURE 7.2 VARIETY OF TYPES OF HIGH STATUS GOODS: INDIVIDUAL BURIAL CONTEXT
McKeithen site’s use. If a burial site was built in a single event and no additional layers and burials were added, it would certainly lack the variety of grave goods found on sites that were used for centuries such as Jones Mound (Bullen 1952: 47-53, 59-61).

The possible height and decline of Fort Walton culture can also be illustrated by the variety of grave goods recovered from Lake Jackson Mound 3 and Snow Beach. After Tatham Mound (19), Lake Jackson yielded the greatest variety of grave goods from a Native American mound site, 14 types, but unlike Tatham, it is a Pre-Contact site. None of Lake Jackson’s 14 types were of European origin, and instead, many artifacts reflect the increased usage of metal by Fort Walton society as copper jewelry and objects were common. Lake Jackson Mound 3’s high status has already been indicated by its large size, layers, burial types, furnished burials, and demographics and so this study reinforces its importance. Snow Beach, the other Fort Walton culture site, is the last purely Native American built site in the study and dates to the end of Fort Walton culture. The analysis of its size, layers, and burials has demonstrated that its people may have been trying to maintain their Fort Walton ideals in this declining period (1500s-1600s and the arrival of the Spaniards). This is illustrated by the use of a nearby Swift Creek midden to build the Fort Walton culture mound. Aptly, unlike Lake Jackson, only four types of high status grave goods were found at the site.

Finally, the study of high status grave goods again shows marked differences between the two Mission sites: Fig Springs and Patale. At Fig Springs only a single high status good was found in the sample group, but six types were found at Patale. This correlates with the health information to further suggest that that people at Patale were more valued and higher status than those buried at Fig Springs. Nevertheless, this analysis may be somewhat flawed for two reasons. The Fig Springs sample may only represent 23 out 900 individuals, whereas Patale’s sample consisted of 58 out of a total 67 individuals. Moreover, the archaeological data for the Spanish missions on the east coast of Florida and Georgia show that many of burials at these sites contained a wide variety and great numbers of grave goods (Marrinan 2006: Personal Correspondence). Thus, the status differences between Patale and Fig Springs’ samples cannot be used to make a full assessment of the levels of status and prosperity of the entire community of each of these two sites. The reason for the great variety of high status goods and grave
goods at Quad Block has already been explained, and the types of grave goods recovered included six types of nonbead jewelry (such as perforated coins), three types of beads, the use of coins as money, and two types of metal military decorations (Piper et al. 1982a: 132-197, 310-327).


When the variety of high status grave goods by individual burials was plotted, it largely paralleled the presence of high status goods at the site. The only the major difference was in the number of varieties of high status goods in the individual context (Table 7.2 and Figure 7.2). There were only a few minor discrepancies, such as at Thomas Mound, which had great variety of prestigious grave goods in the overall context, but none in the individual burial context. This was understandable as the site was part of the Weeden Island culture in which individual furnished burials were rare. Moreover, the site was excavated in the 1920s and 1930s before modern field methods were developed (Willey 1949: 114-116).

As the issue of high status grave goods with individual burials dealt with individual furnished burials, it closely corresponded with the issue of simple presence of any grave goods with individual burials. This study of the relationship of high status grave goods to individual burials further emphasizes the higher status of some sites, and the possible lower status of other sites. In the individual furnishing of high status goods, Goodman Mound had five types of high status grave goods, and it ties with Patale as the site with fifth greatest variety of high status grave goods in an individual burial context. Likewise, Weeki Wachee Mound, another mound believed to be a high status site due to its Safety Harbor culture and goods, had four types of grave goods. Finally, a few sites, such as McKeithen Mound B and Yellow Bluffs Mound, which appear to have had high status burials as suggested by their size, strata (layers), burial type, and demographics, did not rank high in the varieties of high status goods found with individual burials. Both of these sites yielded only two types of high status goods, and in their case the question again is whether the lack of high status goods can be attributed to preservation problems or that their builders felt no need to lavish individual burials with grave goods.
3. Individual High Status Burials: Based on Grave Goods, Sex, Ages, and Layers

The study of grave goods, the different types of goods, their association with certain strata or layers, and their association with people of different sexes and ages was used to detect individual high status burials (Binford 1971: 21-26; Hatch 1987: 9-12; Rothschild 1979: 668-670; Tainter 1978: 122-127; Table 7.3). Of the 24 sites with clear individual furnished burials, only six did not have clear evidence of high status burials (Table 7.4). This statement, though, is problematic as all but two of these sites date to the Archaic Period, when archaeologists believe status and social rank were not very defined. Turtle Shores is one of the non-Archaic sites with goods, but without a high status burial. However, it was previously argued that the site may have been partly destroyed and that many site features and possible burials are missing. The second non-Archaic site without high status burials is Browne Mound, and most of its grave goods are associated with one main burial of several individuals. Although Browne Mound was identified as a St. John’s site, many aspects of it, including its strata and grave goods, have already been discussed as being Weeden Island in nature. The fact that the site’s high status goods are not associated with a single individual, but several individuals would support the Weeden Island attribution. Thus, a look at high status and grave goods in general is further evidence of how Weeden Island culture was able to infiltrate even the heartland of St. Johns culture. Browne Mound is near the very mouth of the St. Johns River.

An analysis of the percentages of high status burials at these sites was even more informative (Table 7.4 and Figure 7.3). Many of the sites with the greatest number of high status burials are those that were identified as high status sites with great ceremonial value and social divisions in earlier studies (e.g., Mayport, McKeithen B, Woodward, Walker Point, Lake Jackson, and Yellow Bluffs, Snow Beach). At the same time, certain sites, which appear as high status sites in the studies of layers, burial type, and grave goods, do not appear so in this study of high status burials based on grave goods, layers, and population demographics (e.g., Pierce, Weeki Wachee, and Tatham). Thus, by examining individual high status burials as identified by grave goods, layers, and demographics, a better understanding of the scale and ranking of the different sites is possible. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that sample size may have a major impact on this study. For example, Walker Point, Yellow Bluffs, Goodman, and Snow Beach all
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>IND W/ GR. GDS</th>
<th>#IND BURIALS W/ GR. GDS.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>GOODS:</th>
<th>LAYER OVER BURIALS AND OTHER FEATURES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62% 46AD, 22 SUB</td>
<td>27M, 19F, 22 UNK</td>
<td>VAR: BN. &amp; ANTLER ART. &amp; TOOLS, FABRIC WRAPPINGS, SEEDS, TEETH, MOD &amp; UNMOD BONE, FEW SHELL BDS, LITHICS, GOURDS, ATLATLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14% NO DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>BN JEW, PRJ PTS, BDS, ST. TLS, OCHRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>37?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHILD BURIALS MORE RICHLY SUPPLIED W/ GRAVE GOOD THAN ADULTS- ST. BDS EXAMPLE OF OBJ. W/CHILD</td>
<td>MOST BURIALS TOO DISTURBED TO ASSESS GRAVE GOOD DEPOSITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>4570</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>LITTLE DETAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>LITTLE DETAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33% 2AD</td>
<td>2F</td>
<td>2 BN. BD., 1 SHARK TOOTH, LIMESTONE PENDANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22% 16 AD</td>
<td>4M, 1F, 11UK</td>
<td>MAINLY SHELL OR CHERT, SEV. POT SHERD: SAND TEMP, ST. JOHNS PL, FIBER TEMP PL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEW OF OBJECTS EVEN IN MOUND-MOSTLY LIKELY PART OF FILL</td>
<td>BODIES IN PLAIN CEMETARY AREA PLACED IN SMALL SHELL LINED PITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57% 21AD, 3 CH, 1SN</td>
<td>6M, 1F, 19UNK</td>
<td>FOOD OFFERING, POTTERY, ST. TLS, MICA SHEETS, PRJ. PTS, COP. JEW</td>
<td>SOME POT. MAY HAVE HELD FOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8% 1 INF, 7UNK</td>
<td>8UNK</td>
<td>SH. BDS, PROJ. PTS, ST. JEW, POT, COP. JEW, MICA SHEET, CELT, GLOWWORM EFFIGY</td>
<td>SEV. BURS. DEPOSIT IN SH. LAYERS, POT. CACHES SOMETIMES NEAR BURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>VERY FEW ARTIFACTS ON ENTIRE SITE, SOME BURIALS W/ CONCH SHELLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>IND W/ GR, GDS</td>
<td>#IND</td>
<td>BURIALS W/ GR, GDS.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>GOODS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DENT MOUND</strong></td>
<td>1610?</td>
<td>113?</td>
<td>SEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXAMPLE: BURIAL-STATUS-DRILLED BEAR TEETH, CUT WHELK SH, 2 FISH EFFIGY PENDANTS, 3 PROJ. PTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAUTHIER</strong></td>
<td>1600?</td>
<td>26 SEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 IND. W/ 52 GRAVE GOODS INCLUDING HEADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</strong></td>
<td>1596?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100% 1ADULT</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>RED OCHRE, HEADRESS, TURKEY VULTURE EFFIGY HEAD</td>
<td>POT., EFFIGY POTTERY, FEAST EVIDENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</strong></td>
<td>1480?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1M, 1F, 1UK</td>
<td>2 ST. JOHN PL. SHERDS, 2 QUAHOG SHELLS</td>
<td>SHELL LINING FOR BURIAL DEPOSIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TURTLE SHORES</strong></td>
<td>1450?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38% 2AD, 1SUB</td>
<td>1M, 1F, 1UK</td>
<td>2 ST. JOHN PL. SHERDS, 2 QUAHOG SHELLS</td>
<td>SHELL LINING FOR BURIAL DEPOSIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PALMER MOUND</strong></td>
<td>1450?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1M, 1F, 1UK</td>
<td>2 ST. JOHN PL. SHERDS, 2 QUAHOG SHELLS</td>
<td>SHELL LINING FOR BURIAL DEPOSIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOWELL MOUND</strong></td>
<td>1340?</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LITTLE DETAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEDEN ISLAND</strong></td>
<td>1300?</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LITTLE DETAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENTON MOUND</strong></td>
<td>1270?</td>
<td>8 SEV</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOODS W/ MAIN BUR DEPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ST JOHN PL. POT, 2 QUARTZ CRYSTALS, SEVERAL SHELL FRAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THOMAS MOUND</strong></td>
<td>1150?</td>
<td>419?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POSSIBLE ASSOC OF POTTERY &amp; CHARCOAL WITH A FEW BURIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JONES MOUND</strong></td>
<td>1000?</td>
<td>188+</td>
<td></td>
<td>MANY OF BURIALS MIN. 12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BEADS, PENDANTS, CELTS, AWLS, SHK TTH, RED OCHRE, SH. CUPS, ETC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>IND W/ GR. GDS</td>
<td>#IND BURIALS W/ GR. GDS.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>GOODS:</td>
<td>LAYER OVER BURIALS AND OTHER FEATURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>950 X</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18 AD, 2 CH, 2 IN</td>
<td>11 M, 6 F, 5 UNK</td>
<td>POT, 9 LARGE FLATTEN CONCH SHELLS W/ 1 F &amp; HER 2 INF, AND CLEAN SHELL AROUND &amp; OVER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>950 X</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1 INF, 1 UNK</td>
<td>2 UNK</td>
<td>40 SH. BDS., 1 VESSEL, CHERT FLAKE, 1 SH. DIPPER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>950 X</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>?-1 OR 2 LIKELY</td>
<td>5%?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1 COP JEW, 1 CELT-FOUND W/ MAIN MASS BURIAL, 1 RED OCHRE DEP.</td>
<td>1 BURIAL W/ RED OCHRE &amp; OT. BUR LATER PLACED BY RD OCHRE/ ALL POT JUST FILL/ LARGE SHELL RING AROUND MANY OF BURIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>850 X</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3 AD, 2 CH</td>
<td>2 M, 1 F, 2 UNK</td>
<td>RED POWDER, 3 SHELL BDS, 1 SHERD, 1 SHELL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>850 X</td>
<td>100 SEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCHRE ON FEW BUNDS, STACKS OF POTTERY BY 1 BUR, SHELL ASSOCIATED W. A FEW BUR</td>
<td>POTTERY COVERING FOR ANOTHER BURIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>850 ?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RED OCHER, COVERING, POTTERY OFFERING LATER L Yale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>825 ?</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOME POTTERY ASSEMBLAGES COULD HAVE BEEN W. INDS</td>
<td>POTTERY OVER BODIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>800 X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1 ADULT</td>
<td>1 M</td>
<td>FOOD OFFERING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>700 X</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>IND W/ GR. GDS</td>
<td>#IND BURIALS W/ GR. GDS</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>GOODS:</td>
<td>LAYER OVER BURIALS AND OTHER FEATURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>550 X</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2JV, 10AD, 5SEN</td>
<td>15M, 2F, 7UNK</td>
<td>1 BURIAL-25 DIFFERENT TYPES OF GOODS, 3 BURIALS -14-15 DIFFERENT TYPES OF GOODS</td>
<td>LARGE MASS OF CHARRED CORN COVERING OF B6 WOODEN TOMB-L11/ OFTEN SERIES OF BODY ENCASEMENTS: OUTERMOST LAYER WOODEN TOMB COVERING/NEXT LAYER LEATHER WRAPPING OR COVERINGS OVER CANE MATTING/WOVEN CLOTH COVERINGS, WRAPPINGS OR CLOTHING OVER BODY/ BODY USED LAY ON LEATHER/IF COPPER-CLOTH BETWEEN COPPER &amp; BODY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>500 X</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6AD, 1CHD</td>
<td>3 M, 1 F, 2UNK</td>
<td>FOOD OFFERING, SNAKE VERTEBRAE SHARK TEETH, STONE TOOLS</td>
<td>MANY INDIVIDUALS BURIED W/ GR. GDS. INCLUDING EUROPEAN MAT. POTTERY KILLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>450 X</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>FOOD OFFERING-MAINLY FISH-MOST OF OTHER MATERIAL POSSIBLE RESULT MIDDEN FILL</td>
<td>MAINLY (417+ IND. GR. GDS INCLUDING BDS.) POTTERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>450 X</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8CHD</td>
<td>8UK</td>
<td>SH. BDS, DISC BDS, PERFORATED CARNIVORE TEETH, BN. PINS W/ RING OF FERRULE., PRJ. PTS.</td>
<td>19 BURIALS-EUROPEAN GOODS, 17 BURIALS-NATIVE GOODS (NO EXACT COUNT OF ARTIFACTS PER BODY)/ POTTERY &amp; SH. CUPS- TOP OF MOUND/ ARROWS SHOT OR THRUST INTO E. SIDE OF MOUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>415 X</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4AD, 3SUB, 4UNK</td>
<td>2M, 9UNK</td>
<td>GL., SIL, &amp; SH. BEADS, SHELLS, MAINLY (417+ IND. GR. GDS INCLUDING BDS.)</td>
<td>OFFERING DEP-4 COPPER PENDANTS, ST. PROF PTS, RED OCHRE, 1 FT. WALTON CERAMIC BOWL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST &amp; PRE)- AUTHOR DOES NOT STATE DIF.</td>
<td>415 X</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>34 (PRE &amp;POST)- OFTEN W. PRIMARY BURIALS</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31AD, 3JUV</td>
<td>10M, 17F, 7UK</td>
<td>OFTEN BDS- EUR. GLASS, METAL, OR SH./ OT. EUR. MET, NATIV COP JEW, ONLY 1 BURIAL WITH A PIECE OF POT; SHELLS W/ AT LST 6, INFANT BURIAL W/ NUMEROUS GOODS</td>
<td>5-OFFERING DEP-4 COPPER PENDANTS, ST. PROF PTS, RED OCHRE, 1 FT. WALTON CERAMIC BOWL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>348 X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2AD, 1SUB</td>
<td>1F, 2UNK</td>
<td>1 BN. BD., 1 SANDSTONE ABRADER, 212 GL. BDS &amp; 61 GL BD. FRAGMENTS</td>
<td>19 BURIALS-EUROPEAN GOODS, 17 BURIALS-NATIVE GOODS (NO EXACT COUNT OF ARTIFACTS PER BODY)/ POTTERY &amp; SH. CUPS- TOP OF MOUND/ ARROWS SHOT OR THRUST INTO E. SIDE OF MOUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>IND W/ GR. GDS</td>
<td>#IND BURIALS W/ GR. GDS.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>GOODS:</td>
<td>LAYER OVER BURIALS AND OTHER FEATURES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>320X</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3AD</td>
<td>1M, 2F</td>
<td>CHERT KNIFE, GLASS BEADS, IRON NAIL, TURTLE CARPACE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>290X</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8AD, 4JUV, 2UNK</td>
<td>2M, 12UNK</td>
<td>GLASS, COPPER, &amp; OT. BEADS, CLOTH POUCHES, SHELL FASTENERS OR PENDANTS, COPPER RINGS, QUARTZ PEBBLES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>110X</td>
<td>38 (NAT)</td>
<td>24 &amp; (13 BUTTONS ONLY)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17SUB, 7 AD, (11AD BUTTONS ONLY)</td>
<td>4M, 4F, 19UNK, (6M, 4F, 1 UNK BUTTONS ONLY)</td>
<td>BUTTONS, PERF. COINS, NUMEROUS MET. OBJECTS, NECKLACE &amp; SEED BEADS, ETC.</td>
<td>ALL BURIALS IN WOODEN COFFINS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations: AD= Adult, CH= Child, INF= Infant, JV= Juvenile, SN= Senile, UNK= Unknown*
Table 7.4 High Status Burials Based on Grave Goods and Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>HIGH STATUS (%)</th>
<th>HIGH STATUS BURIALS PRESENT</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NONE?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CHILD BURIAL OFTEN RICH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NONE?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7AD, 5UK (ONLY BUR W/ GOODS)</td>
<td>5M, 1F, 6UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 JV, 6 AD, 1 SN, 1 UNK</td>
<td>4 M, 1F, 6 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 UNK, 1 INF</td>
<td>5 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 INDIVIDUAL 52 GRAVE GOODS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ADULT</td>
<td>1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 INF</td>
<td>1 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE HOMES MOUND B</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 AD F W/2INF?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 JV, 3 AD</td>
<td>2 M, 1 F, 2 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-ADM (FOOD OFFERING ONLY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 JV, 8 AD, 4 SN</td>
<td>4 M, 2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 AD, 1 JV</td>
<td>1 M, 2 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8CH</td>
<td>8 CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 AD, 1 JV, 1 UNK</td>
<td>2 M, 3 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 AD, 1 SN 1 INF, 7 UNK (SPANISH ARTIFACTS)</td>
<td>10 F, 2 M, 9 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 AD, 1 JUV</td>
<td>2 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 AD (ONLY BURS W/GDS)</td>
<td>1 M, 2 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 AD, 1 SN, 2 JV</td>
<td>2 M, 8 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 INF, 15 JV, 6 AD</td>
<td>3 M, 2 F, 16 UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE AND TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 7.3 HIGH STATUS BURIALS % (BASED ON GRAVE GOODS AND DEMOGRAPHICS)
contained fewer than 15 individuals. Meanwhile Tatham Mound, with (5 percent) high status burials, contained over 300 individuals, and Browne, which also had (5 percent) high status burials, almost 50 people.

High status burials were also examined by analyzing the age and sex of individuals buried with high status goods (Table 7.5, Figure 7.4, and Figure 7.5). In many ways, this study helped to verify conclusions on the nature of burials discussed in the chapters on grave goods and population demographics. For example, based on the grave goods, all the female burials at Lake Jackson Mound 3 were high status burials. The argument that a lack of women at Fig Springs made them important is supported by the fact that 40 percent of females vs. 10 percent of male burials were high status burials. In this specific case, these high status burials were judged to be high status since they were the only burials that contained any individual grave goods. The study of high status burials also showed that sites such as Mayport and Quad Block may not have been as high status, ceremonial or socially ranked, as previously argued, as men and women received about the same level of treatment. For example, 57 percent of Mayport and 63 percent of Quad Block’s burials were furnished with grave goods. Quad Block’s burials were especially standardized, since all the burials were extended supine inhumations in coffins and 95 percent of the bodies were oriented westward (Piper 1982a: 132-197, 310-327). At some sites, it also appears men were more important than women and these include Bay Cadillac (83 percent - Male vs. 33 percent - Female), Walker Point (25 percent - Male vs. 0 percent - Female), Yellow Bluffs (33 percent - Male vs. 0 percent - Female), and Weeki Wachee (18 percent - Male vs. 0 percent - Female). The percentages are of the number of high status male or female burials vs. the total number of male or females burials at the site. Nevertheless, many of these sites had particularly poor preservation and/or few bodies. Furthermore, Tatham Mound was of the same period and culture as Weeki Wachee, but had completely reverse proportions of high status burials. At Tatham (5 percent) of the males and (20 percent) of the female received high status burials, and at Weeki Wachee it was the males (18 percent) and females (0 percent) with high status burials. This analysis of sex in relation to high status goods does seem support the previous argument that frequently men were treated with more prestige or higher
Table 7.5 High Status Burials: Sexes and Ages (Based on Grave Goods and Demographics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>MALE (%)</th>
<th>FEMALE (%)</th>
<th>UNKNOWN (%)</th>
<th>SUBADULT/CHILD (%)</th>
<th>ADULT (%)</th>
<th>SENILE/50+ YRS (%)</th>
<th>UNKNOWN (%)</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 7.4 HIGH STATUS BURIALS: M VS. F. (BASED ON GRAVE GOODS AND DEMOGRAPHICS)

FIGURE 7.5 HIGH STATUS BURIALS: AGE (BASED ON GRAVE GOODS AND DEMOGRAPHICS)
status than women, but improved sampling is still necessary before more conclusive statements can be made.

The study of status of burials and age was also very productive, and the issue of child sacrifices and special treatment of child burials has already been mentioned, most frequently when Goodman Mound was discussed. While many sites did not have many child burials, those that did frequently contained children with prestigious burial goods. This tradition appears as early as Middle Archaic and as late as the Seminole Period. The sites with most common use of high status burials for children were of the St. John culture or region (e.g., Mayport - 100 percent, Mackenzie (possible St. Johns) - 100 percent, and Goodman - 73 percent), and this might actually reflect the practice of child sacrifice, which is supported by historical and archaeological evidence. Many of the sites from other cultures with high percentage of high status children burials are also easy to explain. In comparison to other age and sex groups, children received the smallest percent of the high status furnished burials at the Fort Walton culture site of Lake Jackson. Nevertheless, 50 percent of child burials at Lake Jackson were treated with high status, and this gives further support to argument for the site’s overall high status with an elite social class. Likewise, the Safety Harbor site of Yellow Bluff Mound has repeatedly come up as having evidence of high status and 50 percent of the children burials were treated with high status grave goods. This is significantly higher than the number of adult or senile burials in which only 13 percent of the adult burials and 0 percent of the very old burials were high status burials. Cultural influences may have also ensured high status burials for children. Both Snow Beach and Lake Jackson were Fort Walton cultural sites, and 100 percent of Snow Beach’s children received high status burials. Meanwhile, the Seminoles from Quad Block were descendents of a Mississippian cultural heritage similar to that of the people from Lake Jackson and Snow Beach; interestingly, 84 percent of Quad Block’s children received high status, well furnished burials. Therefore, this may be evidence that Mississippian traditions continued into the Historic period. Finally, in at least two sites, there is evidence of the very old receiving high status burial treatment, Mayport and Lake Jackson. At Mayport, one of the two senile burials had four pottery vessels associated with it (Wilson 1965: 11-13). At Lake Jackson, all three of the 50+ years burials were considered “rank 1 burials” and were furnished with a number of
copper objects. Two of the three burials even contained copper hawk dancer plates (Jones 1994: 125-144; Storey 1993: Burial Catalog). Although Swift Creek society is not believed to have been as socially stratified as Fort Walton society, the frequent parallels between Swift Creek and Fort Walton sites such as Mayport and Lake Jackson, make this issue more contentious and in need of further research. The study of high status burials of sex and age based on grave goods did correlate with much of the previous work, but also hinted at possible status differences and culture ties between sites; including the closer association of Browne Mound with Weeden Island culture than the St. Johns culture it is currently identified.

4. Calculating Status and Ranking Sites

In order to calculate how the different sites ranked overall by their evidence of great ceremonial value or clear social divisions, 15 factors were used, and they were 1) individuals with or without goods; 2) the percentage of burials with goods; 3) the presence of high status burials (based on goods and demographics); 4) the percentages of high status burials at a site; 5) the variety of high status goods (explained earlier in this chapter) throughout a site; 6) the variety of high status goods in individual burial contexts; 7) the base area of a mound vs. the number bodies placed it; 8) the height of a mound; 9) the use of clean layers of shell or sand; 10) the use of a powder layer (red or another color); 11) the use of grave pits, 12) shell lining, or 13) fire; 14) the distribution of people of different sexes; and 15) the distribution of people of different ages (Table 7.6 and Table 7.7). The value of each factor was kept quite simple, and a scale of 0 to 5 was used. Zero was used if the presence of the feature was nonexistent, could not be studied, or the lack or frequency of the feature was such that it was ranked much lower than other features. Most categories based on percentages were based a scale of intervals of the first two lower tiers, 1-9.9 percent = 1 and 10-19 percent = 2, in 10 percent intervals; the middle two tiers 20-49.9 = 3 and 50-79.9= 4 in 30 percent intervals; and the high tier of social complexity, 80-100 percent= 5 in a 20 percent interval. This arrangement allowed a greater focus or absence of high status burial features at site.

Grave goods were especially emphasized, as they are often a good indicator of status. The system of scoring is explicitly detailed in Table 7.7 and Table 7.8. Grave goods were divided into four topics: the presence of grave goods, the percentage of
Table 7.6 Status Calculation Rules
(See Table 7.7 for exact calculation points used for scoring sites)

I. Grave Goods:
   1. Individual Burials with Grave Goods is often Evidence of Status Differences.
   2. The Greater the Number of Burials with Grave Goods, the Greater the Chance, Status and Hierarchy Differences are being defined in Burial.

II. High Status Burials:
   3. High Status Burials are often suggested by the number of burials with goods and the relationship of sex and age of furnished burials with the grave goods associated with them and lack of grave goods associated with other individuals.
      a. On sites which had few burials that contained a large number of grave goods - these burials were often considered to be high status burials.
      b. If only people of certain age or sex received grave goods - these burials were often consider high status burials.
      c. If only a few burials even contained possessed grave goods and the rest had none - these burials were often considered to be high status burials.
   4. The Greater the Percentage of High Status Burials at the Site, the Higher the Status of the Site.
   5. The Greater the Variety of High Status Goods in the Overall Context of a Site, the Higher the Status of the Site.
   6. The Greater the Variety of High Status Goods in Individual Furnished Burials, the Higher the Status of the Site.
      1. High Status Grave Goods are those goods that were:
         a. Difficult to acquire
         b. Had clear symbolic meaning
         c. No utilitarian function
         d. And/ or were used for personal adornment
Table 7.6 (Continued)

III. Size:

7. The Greater the Base Area of a Mound versus the Number of Individuals, the Higher the Status of a Site.

8. The Taller the Mound, the Higher the Status of a Site.

IV. Layers:

9. The Use of Clean Shell or Sand Layers to build Mounds, shows Greater Care in Burial, instead of Standard Soil, Sand, or Midden Debris.

10. The Use of Powder, often Red Hematite or Ochre, as a Layer is Evidence of Greater Meaning associated with a Site.

11. The Use of Grave Pits shows Greater Care in Burial than simply covering Burials with layers of soil, sand, or midden debris.

12. The Use of a Deliberate Shell Lining for Burials shows Greater Care in Burial than if no special lining was used for burials.

13. The Use of Fire at Site often means Ritual Activities were conducted on the Site.

V. Sex and Age Distribution:

14. The Greater the Disproportion of Burials of a Certain Sex, the Higher the Status of the Site.

15. The Greater the Percentage of Children or 50+ Years Individuals versus the Number of Adults (20-49 years), the Higher the Status of the Site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOODS</th>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>TYPES OF HIGH STATUS GOODS: (SEE PREV. PGS.)</th>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>AREA: STATUS- GRADED ON SIZE VS. POP.</th>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>SEX: MORE MALE OR FEMALE</th>
<th>SCORING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAVE GOODS (SEE CHAPTER 5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GOODS OVERALL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%-100%+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHOUT GOODS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO PRESENCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%-79%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.1-20%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3GDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30%-49%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.1-30%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF BURIALS WITH GOODS %</td>
<td>4-6GDS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%-29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.1-40%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0.009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7-9GDS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%-9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.1-50%+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10-15GDS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16GDS+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HEIGHT OF MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>AGE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-0.99M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADULTS (20-49YRS) MOST COMMON</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-79.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GOODS INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>1-1.99M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MORE CHILD THAN ADULT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO PRESENCE</td>
<td>2-2.99M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50+ (20%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3GDS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-3.99M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE OF HIGH STATUS BURIAL (SEE PREV. PGS.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-6GDS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-4.99M+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO PRESENCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7-9GDS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15GDS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LAYERS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF HIGH STATUS BURIALS</td>
<td>16GDS+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLEAN LAYERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO PRESENCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POWDER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GRAVE PITS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SHELL LINING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-79.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.8 Scoring for High Status of Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>(IND)</th>
<th>% OF BUR W/ GDS SC</th>
<th>HIGH STAT BUR PRE SC</th>
<th>HIGH STAT BUR (OV) SC</th>
<th>HIGH STAT BUR (IND) SC</th>
<th>AREA SC</th>
<th>HT SC</th>
<th>CL. SAND</th>
<th>CL. SH</th>
<th>POW</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>PITS</th>
<th>SH. LINING</th>
<th>FIRE</th>
<th>M. VS F. SC</th>
<th>CHILD VS. AD SC</th>
<th>50 YR+ (18%+) SC</th>
<th>OVERALL HIGH STAT SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>4570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTR)</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowell MOUND</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>(IND)</td>
<td>GD</td>
<td>% OF BUR W/ GOO</td>
<td>HG STAT BUR</td>
<td>HG STAT GDS (OV)</td>
<td>HG STAT GDS (IND)</td>
<td>AREA SC</td>
<td>HT SC</td>
<td>CL. SAND</td>
<td>CL. SH</td>
<td>POW</td>
<td>GR PITS</td>
<td>SH. LINI</td>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>M. VS. F. SC</td>
<td>CHILD VS. AD SC</td>
<td>50YR+ (18%+)</td>
<td>OVERALL HIGH STAT SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST &amp; PRE)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
burials with grave goods, the variety of high status goods found at a site, and the variety of goods found with individual burials. The actual presence of grave goods on a site was scored with a (2) and a lack of grave goods received a (0), as many sites either did not individual furnished burials or the excavator did not record the exact number of burials with goods. When the variety of high status grave goods was scored, the first tier was merely the presence of no high status goods and so received a (0). The next three tiers were divided into intervals of 3 GDs: 1-3GDs, 4-6GDs, and 7-9GDS. The principle behind these intervals is the same used for the percentage, that is, the greater the evidence of elevated social status, the higher the score. Intervals of 3 were used because they were small intervals to show subtle changes in society. Finally the second to last tiers, covered an interval 6, 10-15GDs and the last tier was 16+GDs. This sharp rise in intervals is because when society is using as much 10 to 15 types of grave goods, social hierarchy must be greatly defined and 16 or more types of grave goods was found at the peak of the socially complex sites in Florida, Lake Jackson Mound 3. The presence of high status burials based on grave goods, layers, and populations demographics was given its two categories: the actual presence of high status burials (at some sites high status burials were noted but not the number of them) and the percentage of high status burials at site with a scoring range of 0-5. The importance of the existence of any high status burials at a site is why this category of mere presence or absence was graded either 3 or 0.

The importance of the size of mound and the use of special layers has already been discussed in detail in Chapter 3 (Binford 1971: 20-22; Tainter 1978: 125-126). The larger the mound and the fewer the people placed in it, suggests a greater social investment than if a community were only trying to adequately fit the entire community into a mound. Making size vs. population evaluations are more complex than using grave goods as a status marker, and throughout the thesis it was noted some high status sites were not massive structures. Likewise, because of possible site erosion or an inability to successfully calculate the number of originally interred bodies on some sites, the scoring for size vs. population and mound height were given only ranges of 0-4. Furthermore, some relatively small mounds may have been sites of great ceremonial importance or the burial of high status, social ranked individuals, but various factors prevented them from becoming quite large. For example, in Chapter 3, the relatively small size of high status
Tatham Mound was suggested to be the result of contact with the Spaniards who may have brought diseases that could have decimated the builders of the mound.

The use of clean layers of sand and shell, instead of simply using midden and soil fill to build a mound, also shows greater social investment in burial. For example, some mounds, such as Snow Beach, were built the easy way by taking a much older midden and using it to form the base of mound. The presence of clean layers is sometimes hard to detect, however, and its common use by many groups of diverse levels of social organizations is why the presence of clean sand or shell layers received a score of only a (2). Red powder especially has been seen as a status marker in many societies, and was also found as part of individual burials at such prestigious sites as Lake Jackson Mound (3). This is why the presence of a powder layer received a higher score than the presence of clean sand or shell layer, 3. The issue of grave pits can be confusing, because at most sites, they were simple pits dug into a mound. Determining whether or not a fully formed pit was used can be difficult. At the same time, certain sites, such as Lake Jackson had actual tombs, and the issue of grave pits could not be ignored. Shell lining, like grave pits, can be difficult to interpret as shell midden material was often used to form mounds, and so, at some sites, the use of a shell lining for burial may not have been deliberate. This might explain the shell lining at the rather unexceptional site of Manasota Key. The site may merely have been a midden with human burials placed in it. Because of these problems, the presence of grave pits or shell lining received only a score of (1). The last stratum issue involved fire, and groups frequently burned a site or structure to prepare for construction or to signal the end of its use. For this reason, fire must be considered a symbol of status. Nevertheless, fire can also be a natural occurrence or the result of eating and habitation of the site long after its use for burial. Therefore, fire receives the lowest score, (0.5), of any of the factors used to calculate status.

A significant difference in the proportions of certain sexes or ages at site might also reflect status and hierarchy issues (Binford 1971: 20-22; Saxe 1971: 42-48; Sullivan 2001: 106-112; Tainter 1978: 125-126). For example, if an equal proportion of men and women are found at a site, it might be concluded that the site contains the entire community. Thus, sites were ranked by the greater the proportional differences between male and female burials recovered from a site. This category was divided into only four
intervals because either sites had relatively even proportions of people of both sexes or contained individuals of largely only one sex. The issue of age works the same way, and one reason that Goodman Mound appears to be a sacrificial mound is the almost complete lack of adults in comparison to children at the site. A disproportion of senile/50+ years in a burial site was also considered symbolic of higher status as status was frequently acquired over time such as in “big men societies” (Kottak 1999: 138-139). It might also suggest that certain people in society were able to have better health than most, and thus received better care and access and more supplies of different foods than other people in the society. For these reasons both the presence of more children vs. adults or a high number of very old (20 percent +) were both given scores of 2. At most sites, partly due to preservation, adults were the most common age group and so those sites in which adults between 20-49 years were common received a score of 0.

Although, health was studied in detail in this study, health may often not be a good indicator of status in a society (Robb et al. 2001: 218-219). Storey’s study of Lake Jackson’s high status individuals vs. their Spanish conquered descendents at Patale actually showed that the people at Patale were far healthier (Jones et al. 1991: 114-116; Storey 2002: 68-75; Storey and Widmer 1991: 173-201). Furthermore, any examination of industrial and modern society will show that many of the groups with the highest standards of living often do not consume healthy diets. It is only the difference in the treatments of their problems that shows their higher status or wealth over other individuals (Saunders et al. 2002: 149-151). The classic example is the greater consumption of highly processed sugar-rich foods, and the subsequently higher caries rates in modern society. Between this issue and the absence of detailed bioarchaeological study at many sites, health was not used in scoring for high status burials and sites.

Furthermore, while burial type was studied and extended burials did frequently correlate with high status burials, certain burial types could not be used as consistent marks of high status. For example, bundle, flexed, even cremations could be just as socially significant as extended inhumation and this has been discernable in many societies (Tainter 1978: 126). Some of the highest status burials at sites such as Yellow Bluffs were actually flexed burials (Milanich 1972: 32-39). Therefore, burial type could only be used to suggest if a site had burials of great ceremonial significance or high social
rank. Finally, the reuse of a site is also a possible sign of high status. For example, at Pierce, during the Swift Creek period, only Mound A and a few small middens existed, but by the Fort Walton Period, a temple mound, a burial mound, and several more middens had been added to the site (Penton 1972: 1-6; Willey 1949: 282). At Tatham, we have clear Pre- and Post-Contact components on top of each other, and at Thomas and Jones we also have evidence of the reuse of mounds (Bullen 1952: 12, 43-53; Mitchem 1989: 328-330; Mitchem and Hutchinson 1987: 13-14; Willey 1949: 114-115). The reuse and addition of new layers to mounds by cultures of different periods was quite common in Florida. Nevertheless, the reuse of site was not scored because many sites were not excavated in great detail. Except for the presence and absence of European goods, it is often difficult to date specific layers and so it was not practical to analyze sites for reuse as evidence of high status.

The issue of sample size, the quality of documentation, and the issues examined also constrained this study, and some sites ranked lower or higher because of these factors. For example, Walker Point Mound appears quite high in status, but the site only yielded six of a likely 30 bodies. Meanwhile, Gauthier appears quite low in the study even though it contained an individual with 52 associated grave goods. The documentation for Gauthier, however, was not very extensive and as some of the scoring was based on mound size, this further lowered its score. Sites, which were not mounds such as Gauthier, would receive zeros in the scoring for area and height when these issues were not applicable.

When the scores of the sites were plotted, many of them conformed to expectations about societal complexity found in the various cultures, areas, and burial sites (Table 7.9 and Figure 7.6). During the Archaic and Transitional Periods the scores were relatively low and the possibly unusually high score for Tick Island (15) may be related to its long use, since St. Johns pottery has been recovered in the upper levels of the mound (Aten 1999: 152-161). Surprisingly, status differentiation and display seems to have risen sharply in the Swift Creek Period/culture. Mayport Mound’s score of (24) ranked it as the 4th to 6th highest site in the study. Meanwhile, Pierce Mound A received a score of (15), giving it a rank of 14th to 17th, as four sites received a status score of (15). However, Pierce Mound A may actually deserve at much higher score because Moore
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>OVERALL HIGH STATUS SCORE:</th>
<th>BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN MOUND</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYPORT MOUND</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER POINT MOUND</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW BEACH</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAD BLOCK</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BLUFFS MOUND</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATHAM MOUND (POST &amp; PRE)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE MOUND B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES MOUND</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD MOUND</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRISH MOUND 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICK ISLAND</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE MOUND</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATALE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE MOUND A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE MOUND</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY HARBOR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKI WACHEE MOUND</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG SPRINGS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT MOUND</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI ESTA MOUND</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY CADILLAC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEITHEN MOUND C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD MOUND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINDOVER POND</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOUND</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURTLE SHORES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC GROVES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER MOUND</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON MOUND</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIERRA VERDE MOUND</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA BAY MOUND</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWELL MOUND</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANASOTA KEY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD ISLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAUTHIER (ARCHAIC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.9 Overall High Status Score: Highest to Lowest
FIGURE 7.6 OVERALL HIGH STATUS SCORE
was its chief excavator, and we do not have extensive documentation about the mound. Individual social status then appears to decline in Weeden Island/Manasota Period/culture sites and is replaced by a greater emphasis on the community. The highest ranking purely Weeden Island site was McKeithen Mound C with a score of (11) and ranked only 24th or 25th.

Several sites with Weeden Island components did receive high scores and ranks, such as Jones Mound, Bayshore Mound B, and McKeithen Mound B, and this was partly due to some of the very factors that suggest that these sites were not completely of Weeden Island origin. For example, both Bayshore Mound B and Jones Mound contained individual furnished burials with high status goods. Together with the presence of Safety Harbor pottery, both sites are to likely be Late Weeden Island- Early Safety Harbor sites. Likewise, McKeithen Mound B with a score of (30) and ranked 2nd, contained a single individual with grave goods, who was a woman not even native to the local area (Milanich et al. 1997: xvi, 105-111). Between these data and radiocarbon dates, Mound B is now believed to be from period of transition from Weeden Island to Fort Walton culture.

Towards the end of Weeden Island culture, individual social status distinctions appear to have gradually risen as illustrated by the previous sites (e.g., Jones, Bayshore, and McKeithen B). At the same time, individual social status was rising in St. Johns culture, and Mackenzie and Browne Mound, which had both Weeden Island and St. Johns components were ranked in the top twenty of sites: Mackenzie (15)- ranked 14th to 17th and Browne (14) ranked 18th or 19th. This rise in possibly clear social classes and individuals of differential status continues in the Safety Harbor, Fort Walton, and Late St. Johns sites with their complex societies. The relatively low scores for the site of Safety Harbor (14) - ranked 18th or 19th, Weeki Wachee (13) - ranked 20th or 21st, and especially Sarasota Bay Mound (7) - ranked 31st to 37th were likely due to preservation and documentation problems. Safety Harbor was largely excavated in the 1920s and 1930s, and both Sarasota Bay and Weeki Wachee Mounds were severely damaged by construction before their excavation (Luer 2005: 9, 26-30; Hutchinson and Mitchem 1996: 47-51).
The results of this scoring system support the idea that Native Florida societies were reaching their peak in social complexity at the end of Prehistoric times. Like many of the previous studies, which emphasized their high status features, Fort Walton Lake Jackson Mound 3 received the highest score (38) - ranking 1st; the late St. Johns Goodman Mound and its child sacrifices scored (26)- ranking 3rd; and Late Safety Harbor Yellow Bluffs Mound scored (22) - ranking 7th or 8th. Status scores drop again in the Mission period, and this makes sense as native power and ritual was replaced by Spanish power and ritual. Nevertheless, Patale (15) - ranking 14th to 17th, still scored two points higher than Fig Springs (13), which ranked 20th or 21st. This supports the previous differences between the two sites, including better health among the Patale dead. Finally, the status score for Seminole Quad Block (22), which ranked 7th or 8th, was almost as high as the Fort Walton site of Snow Beach (24), which ranked 4th - 6th. While this may seem strange, unlike previous sites, the people at Quad Block had access to a wide variety of cheap Euro-American merchandise, and its score is somewhat inflated because of this availability. Finally, the methodology for scoring the high status nature of sites reflected much of what we know about the different societies and areas, and also the problems inherent in any large-scale study of society and burial in Florida. Furthermore, the methodology did help to illustrate how society developed in Florida and that the importance of individual status underwent several changes over time.

5. Conclusions: Status, Burial Ritual, and Biological Analysis

In conclusion, the overall study of status and scoring sites for levels of social complexity and individual rank synthesized much of the previous work in the thesis. This thesis set out to track and understand burial ritual and health throughout Florida’s Native American occupation by examining a total of 43 burial contexts from over a time span of about 8,000-9,000 years, the Archaic to Seminole Periods (7,500 BC-AD 1850), and three major areas of Florida: the Panhandle and North Central Florida, the St. Johns region, and the Gulf Coast Peninsula. The thesis examined issues including layout, size, and layers of a site; individual burial type and orientation; types of ceramics, grave goods, and their amounts and associations; sex and age; dental health; and other health indicators.
By understanding status, many of the differences between the various sites were explainable, and Chapters 3-6 each contained a component that explored the issue of status and hierarchy. This chapter’s goal was to synthesize this information by creating a system of numeric scores and ranking to compare these sites based on identified status markers. Overall, the study illustrated how Precolombian Florida society rose in complexity from the Archaic Period to the time of European Contact. Meanwhile, it clarified that at times societies may have not formulaically progressed from less to more socially complex societies. For example, it appears that status and hierarchy divisions emerged in the Swift Creek Period, but then decreased in the Weeden Island Period.

Overall, understanding status and social hierarchy distinctions is a very complicated issue, and our perceptions may change over time. Even when possible evidence of status (ceremonial or hierarchy) is clearly visible, it may not be recognized. For example, for many years archaeologists did not believe that large mounds, such as Tick Island were built during the Archaic Period (Russo 1994: 93-109). Status may also have been manifested in ways, which are not visible to modern archaeologists such as through the use of organic artifacts or practiced rituals. Furthermore, burial ritual may have been manipulated so that some individuals appear to be more prestigious or equal in death than they were in life (Brown 1995: 15-21; Pearson 2001: 31-35, 99, 195-196). For example, a society attempting to show equality among its people may bury its entire population, including its very rich or social elite, with as few goods as the poorest people in the society could receive. Meanwhile, some of the more complex sites may have been built by people with less defined social hierarchies than their sites suggest. Many large sites including the Hopewell mound complexes of the Ohio River Valley and Neolithic and Bronze Age Stonehenge of England are now believed to have been built by far simpler societies than initially was thought (Bogucki 1999: 278, 281-284; Fagan 2000: 422-424). A look at modern burial ritual illustrates this problem, as most people of rich and poor classes are buried in cemeteries without additional artifacts and marked only by simple headstones. Thus, burial structure can be very deceptive. Furthermore, while this thesis focused largely on material evidence, the expression of social meaning, which did not perfectly match the material evidence, was sometimes considered. For example, one of the reasons speculated for the high number of furnished burials at Quad Block was that
it was an attempt by the Seminole population to emphasize old traditions in the face of
greater and greater Euro-American intrusions into their lives.

Nevertheless, an archaeologist can only work with the data available, and the
overall archaeological evidence does show evidence of hierarchy and status differences
among sites and across time. These differences were clarified by a review of many
different types of burial data, and while not discussed in this thesis, other issues such as
settlements patterns are frequently used to understand status in a society (Anderson 1996:
157-173; Milanich et al. 1997: 35-44). This thesis relied on comparing burial data with
other knowledge archaeologists have on the various societies, including settlement
patterns. Burial data did support the idea of increasing social complexity and change in
Fort Walton, Safety Harbor, and Late St Johns’ societies. All of these societies were
characterized by large or at least tall mounds, clean layers, high status grave goods, a
large number and/or a wide variety of goods, and the inclusion of high status children or
females, which would have been rare in earlier societies. While some of the health
studies, such as the caries analysis, may be deceptive for status evaluations, as these
conditions may actually worsen with improved status, other studies at least support the
argument that in the overall context societies were changing over time. The decline in
health in the later periods and cultures, as reflected by increases in enamel hypoplasia,
and periostitis, supported the argument of larger populations in the Fort Walton and
Safety Harbor societies. These problems often become more common in larger
populations, because increases in populations frequently lead to poor sanitation and the
spread of infectious diseases. The issue of status also helped to explain mound size
differences in Chapter 3, the use of primary and secondary burial in Chapter 4, and
differences in grave goods in Chapter 5. In this chapter, the methodology did work and
no archaeologist disputes the high status nature of Lake Jackson Mound 3, which scored
the highest in status of any site in the study.

Status and hierarchy are often very evident in the burial setting and are crucial to
our understanding of societies. The analysis of status is one of the main themes in
archaeological analysis, and this chapter’s methodology explored and tested new ways to
understand and rank sites according to the status elements demonstrated. This
methodology synthesized almost all aspects of burial ritual and health covered in the
previous chapters and created a new way to understand burial sites of various time periods, cultures, and locations from throughout Florida. Finally, although, status is truly a complex issue, hopefully this methodology can be used to help synthesize the study of burial ritual and health and be applicable to the analysis of a variety of societies especially, those similar to Precolumbian Florida.
CHAPTER 8:

Conclusions and Final Remarks

The goal of this thesis was to collect, organize, and analyze a large body of data on Florida’s Native American burials to understand how burial ritual, health, and social status and stratification changed from the Archaic Period (7,500 BC) to the establishment of the state of Florida in 1845. Many important and minor points were either verified or discovered by this data analysis. Moreover, the study also illustrated many of the problems in the archaeology of prehistoric Florida, and how even with the most recent work, archaeologists are left many mysteries to resolve about its peoples.

Ritual and biological data for 43 site contexts, and from almost all of Florida’s geographic regions, time periods, and cultures was compiled. This provides a starting point for any archaeological analysis of Florida and includes a comprehensive bibliography of Florida archaeology. With all the site summary data examined and compared, the cultural affiliations and dates of the sites were either verified or sometimes changed (Tables 1.1 and 1.3; Appendix B: Site Summaries). Throughout this study, burial data on layout, burial type, grave goods, and even health were used to show that the cultural and temporal identifications for some sites were in certain cases wrong or not as absolute as once thought. The data also demonstrated the spread of certain cultures and gave an idea when specific cultural influences reached an area.

One of the best examples of the application of all these data sets is how Weeden Island Culture/Period (AD 200-1000) was identified culturally and temporally at various sites. Its presence is often identified by its decorated pottery, and its burial ritual which included the use of east side pottery caches, charnel houses, unfurnished bundle burial, and the presence of artifacts only on the very top of the mound. With these aspects in mind, the study showed that Weeden Island culture likely did not originate in the Gulf Coast Peninsula, but instead came from the north. While the actual site of Weeden Island is located in this area and has provided us with the pottery types we label “Weeden Island,” the site, itself, only dates to about AD 650 and did not contain an east side pottery cache. Meanwhile, Palmer Mound located in this region and dated to AD 500, did not even possess Weeden Island types of pottery. This information allows us to set a date
for Weeden Island expansion into this region of about AD 550-600. Moreover, the layout study suggests that the site of Weeden Island is more likely a Manasota culture (AD 300-700) site with a growing Weeden Island influence. The study of burial ritual also provided information about Weeden Island influence in eastern and northern Florida. For example, the data now suggest that Mackenzie Mound, located in north central Florida was a fully Weeden Island cultural site, with St. Johns influence, and that Browne Mound located on mouth of the St. Johns River (the heart of St. Johns culture), may have been deeply influenced by Weeden Island culture or was even an outpost of Weeden Island peoples. At the same time, the fact that Weeden Island culture rarely practiced individual furnished burial also helps us reassign the dates of certain sites. For example, Jones Mound was likely not a Weeden Island site, but an early Safety Harbor mound with a Weeden Island component, as 12 percent of its burials were individually furnished. Even the McKeithen Mounds site has undergone some new interpretations. Partly due to its layout and grave goods, Mound B, with its single individual burial with grave goods, may be interpreted as dating toward the end of Weeden Island Period/culture and at the beginning of the highly stratified Fort Walton culture.

Chapter 3 demonstrated the use of certain burial traditions, cultural differences, and how certain factors may affect burial deposition. Burial layout seems to have gone through several stages: wet/pond cemeteries (South Florida only) in the Archaic Period, plain cemeteries (Late Archaic and Transitional Period), and then mound burials until Spanish colonization, when burial layout returned to plain cemeteries. The use of burial mounds dates as far back as Archaic Tick Island (4134 BC) and as late as Fort Walton Snow Beach (AD 1602). The size of mounds was frequently determined by either of two factors, the status of the deceased individuals or the length of time of the site’s occupation. Frequently the largest mounds actually contained the fewest people and had other evidence to suggest the high status of their individuals (e.g., Lake Jackson, Yellow Bluffs, Goodman). In other cases, large mounds were the result of long occupation, not only as burial sites but also as habitation sites (e.g., Tick Island).

The strata of many burial sites often consisted of similar ritualistic features. The use of red powder (often ochre), shell cups on the top center of a mound, clean sand or shell layers, charnel houses, or fire (to prepare or end the site’s use) are evident
throughout Florida’s history. In some cases, these features were found at sites, which were not even mound sites, such as Gauthier, which contained a red powder layer. Furthermore, while east side pottery caches were a Weeden Island trait, shell lining of the burial pit may be a Swift Creek trait and was found with all three of the Swift Creek identified sites. This possible Swift Creek feature is only tentative and should receive further research, since Swift Creek burial tradition, in general, is not well understood.

The study of burial type in Chapter 4 also shows cultural distinctions and the continuation of certain types over thousands of years. Primary burials were common from the Archaic to the Swift Creek Period throughout Florida, and flexed burial was often the specific burial type used. Secondary bundle burial then became the standard type for Weeden Island culture throughout Florida and the later Safety Harbor culture of the Gulf Coast Peninsula. While burial type can be used to affiliate a site with a culture, it may be problematic since burial types such as bundle and flexed burial may appear very similar without close examination (e.g., Palmer Mound). Burial type can also help us detect high status burials or evidence of disease. For example, several of the Safety Harbor sites actually contained primary burials, which were well furnished with grave goods (e.g., Weeki Wachee and Yellow Bluffs Mounds). Meanwhile, Tatham Mound, another Safety Harbor site which dates to Spanish contact, contained numerous primary burials that appear to have been deposited at the same time. As few of these bodies show evidence of violence, these may well have likely died of epidemic diseases brought to Florida by the Spaniards. Finally, burial type also helped us distinguish St. Johns’ sites since these sites often contained people buried in a wide variety of forms including extended, flexed, bundle, or even skull or cremation burial (e.g., Dent, Browne, and Walker Point Mounds).

In Chapter 5, the role of grave goods types for cultural identification has already been discussed, and the analysis of grave goods and their associations with people of different sexes or ages also proved especially successful. Once again the study detected clear evidence of high status individuals, but it also showed clear difference in those who were given prestigious burials and possible developments of status. In the Archaic Period, furnished burial for people of both sexes and all ages was common, but with the gradual increase in status and social differentiation in the later periods, this treatment changed.
For the most part, though, even until the rise of highly socially stratified societies, burial treatment with grave goods could be summarized as adult males receiving better burial treatment and grave goods than women, and adults better than children. The one major exception was the practice of child sacrifice, historically reported for the St. Johns people, and evidenced archaeologically at Goodman and possibly Mackenzie and Mayport Mounds. With the rise of the socially stratified societies in late prehistoric times, women and children begin to appear in significant numbers in the most high status sites and were accompanied by large numbers of grave goods (e.g., Snow Beach and Lake Jackson). Thus, the study of grave goods, not only distinguished cultures, but also status and social levels.

The analysis of health from Chapter 6 was somewhat different from other examined issues in that it rarely pointed to status differences among people, but it yielded some surprising results. While the sample included sites from all over an 8,000-year period, the average age at death did not dramatically change over time or even differ much between men and women. The average age for men and women was between 34-35 years, and is consistent with prehistoric cultures throughout the world until the modern era. The analysis of enamel hypoplasia, caries, porotic hyperostosis/cribra orbitalia, periostitis, and trauma/fractures, in particular, produced some unexpected results. The examination of the presence of porotic hyperostosis/cribra orbitalia proved especially important. The prevailing belief has been that these conditions are usually high in agricultural populations, because of the lack of iron. Many of the sites studied were located on the Gulf Coast Peninsula, where agriculture was never significant. Nevertheless, porotic hyperostosis/cribra orbitalia often afflicted 26 percent or more of the studied population. The study indicates that these conditions may not be caused by iron deficiencies, but may often be the result of internal parasites or contaminated water. Meanwhile, the study of trauma and fractures yielded surprising results in that it averaged less than eight percent at most sites. This might be interpreted to mean that Florida’s native people were not warlike, but this study could be flawed, since single skull burials negate against the examination of the postcranial skeleton. It is thought that the taking of the skulls of defeated enemies was a common practice in Precolumbian Florida. Thus, violence might have been significant, but the skeletal remains with evidence of such
violence were rarely buried. The study of trauma and fractures also found one site that
does not correlate with the historical knowledge of its people: Quad Block. These people
were Seminoles captured during the Second Seminole War. One would expect evidence
of trauma or fractures to be present, but it was completely absent. In fact these people
show no evidence of significant physical suffering. This finding was unexpected and
further examination of this skeletal population should be done.

In some cases the heath studies also illustrated cultural, regional, and social
developments. For example, relatively high rates of caries frequently were found in the
agricultural Fort Walton and Alachua peoples, but rarely in nonagricultural Safety Harbor
peoples. On the other hand, enamel hypoplasia and periostitis appear to rise in the Safety
Harbor Period, and this correlates with the rise of larger populations and socially complex
chieftoms, which would have competed more and more with each other for resources. At
the same time, the presumption that there would be a possible correlation between health
and status was discovered to be false. As the higher status people would have had better
and more access to different foods, their health should have been better than most of the
population. However, burials from high status sites, such as Lake Jackson, actually
revealed poor health. At this site, cribra orbitalia was found in 25 percent of the sample,
periostitis - 41 percent, enamel hypoplasia - 100 percent, and caries - 85 percent. The
high percentage of caries, in a prosperous agrarian population makes some sense since
these people likely would have been exposed to high sugar content food. However, the
overall poor health of many high status individuals at different sites in general is
somewhat puzzling and is one of the major reasons that health was not used in the status
and ranking calculations presented in Chapter 7. The study of caries also showed one
major anomaly, and that was a gradual increase in the percentage of a population afflicted
with caries in Late Safety Harbor sites. As these people were not agriculturalists, caries
should have been low, but it was found in almost 20 percent of the populations at some
sites. This increase in caries, coupled with the fact that it could vary dramatically between
Safety Harbor sites of the same period and type (Post-Contact Tatham -19 percent vs.
Weeki Wachee - 2 percent), demonstrates the need for further study of the health and
lifestyle of the Safety Harbor peoples. An examination of the isotopic study for these
sites to rule out maize consumption obtained, perhaps, through trade would be advisable.
Finally, in Chapter 7, the different evidences of high status (ceremonial or social class) were drawn together and a new methodology developed to rank sites using evidence of ceremonial status or social status and class differences. The various features considered were mound size, the ratio of mound size to the population placed in it, its layers, the ratio of sexes and ages, furnished individual burial, high status grave goods; and the amount and variety of goods. Throughout history many societies, such as the native societies of the Southeastern United States, seem to have cycled from lower to higher to lower levels of social complexity. A methodology, such as the one employed in this study, permits examination of such cycling in Florida or other areas where similar burial rituals were practiced. Although, the sample covered a wide variety of cultures and time periods, my methodology did prove successful in examining this facet of prehistoric cultural development. In Florida, it showed that society was quite simple in the Archaic Period, developed significantly in Swift Creek Period, declined in the Weeden Island Period, and then rose to its highest levels in the Fort Walton and Safety Harbor Periods (Table 7.9 and Figure 7.6). With this methodology, an archaeologist can compare sites with different burial features using a variety of factors and time periods to gain a clearer picture of whether or not societies oscillated in social and ceremonial organization and complexity over hundreds or thousands of years. Nevertheless, this methodology cannot be completely successful, and many societies have different ways of expressing status, some of which rarely are preserved in the archaeological record. The methodology is the most useful in that its cross-cultural and temporal setup allows an archaeologist to determine if a site conforms well to its cultural and temporal identification, whether or not a site’s identification is truly correct, and/or that the site suggests social or ritual changes in its identified society.

In the end, my goal to understand many aspects of burial throughout Florida’s occupation by Native Americans succeeded. However, as with any large-scale study, there are problems and new unanswered questions. Throughout this study, I encountered many seeming inconsistencies relative to what we know about Florida’s native peoples. A number became apparent, and even when some of these were explainable, they were not completely resolved. Some of these inconsistencies included small mounds at high status sites, specific individual burial types at a site uncommon to its culture, and poorer
or better health at sites where it should be the reverse. In the end, my thesis is intended as a new baseline for burial studies in Florida, in which people can use the summarized data and burial trends to explore these questions and more systematically analyze the different sites, periods, and cultures. My study assembled a wide variety of different types of data from numerous sources and compared them in a way that should make pursuing broad scale approaches to Florida’s rich archaeological record possible. In the future, it is hoped that archaeologists will finally have all the tools and funding to use this record to completely understand how Florida’s native peoples lived and died. This thesis is just a step in that direction.
## APPENDIX A: SITES NOT USED IN STUDY*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites Not Used</th>
<th>Citations:</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Period/Culture</th>
<th>Reasons Why Not Used</th>
<th>Available Information</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Burials #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo Mound (8DA94)</td>
<td>Beiter 2001: 30-49</td>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>GLADES II-III</td>
<td>Humain remains largely dental and poor preservation</td>
<td>Layout, Artifacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnhill Mound</td>
<td>Bullen 1957: 22-36</td>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>GLADES II</td>
<td>Mound not fully excavated, only real discussion on body position</td>
<td>Mound Form, Burial Type</td>
<td></td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Pines (PI64)</td>
<td>Gallagher and Warren 1975: 96-116; Austin et al. 1992: 167-171</td>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC- EARLY MANASOTA</td>
<td>Not very detailed</td>
<td>Little on Age, Sex, HLTH, GDS, MD Form</td>
<td></td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay West</td>
<td>Beriault et al. 1981: 39-58</td>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>ARCHAIC</td>
<td>No context for bodies, simply dredged out</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEALTH, AGE, SEX, LAYOUT MORE ARTIFACT DETAILS</td>
<td>40+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton Mound</td>
<td>Sears 1960B: 55-60; Wheeler et al. 2000: 132-157</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC</td>
<td>Site excavated by Moore and Wymann- only details on about 3 burials</td>
<td>Some on Burial Type, Layout, Goods, Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITES NOT USED</td>
<td>CITATIONS:</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PERIOD/CULTURE</td>
<td>REASONS WHY NOT USED</td>
<td>AVAILABLE INFORMATION</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>NOTES:</td>
<td>BURIALS #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALICO HILL</td>
<td>SMITH 2002: 59-66</td>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>NO KNOWN DATE</td>
<td>NO PROVINENCE OR DATE</td>
<td>AGE, SEX, HEALTH</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEETUM</td>
<td>NEWMAN 1993: 37-42</td>
<td>DADE</td>
<td>ARCHAIC</td>
<td>POOR STRATIGRAPHY, HARD CONCRETION LEVEL- ARCHAIIC</td>
<td>BURIAL TYPE, SOME ON GOODS</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td>HYPOPLASIA &amp; AGE IN (ELGART BERRY 2003: 253-266)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORAL SPRINGS</td>
<td>WILLIAMS 1970: 135-151</td>
<td>BROWARD</td>
<td>GLADE I-III CONTACT</td>
<td>FEW BURIALS &amp; VERY POOR PRESERVATION</td>
<td>LAYOUT, ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAGAMI SOUTH</td>
<td>ISCAN ET AL. 1995: 54-60; KESSEL 2001: 25</td>
<td>DADE</td>
<td>ARCHAIC</td>
<td>VERY SHORT</td>
<td>SOME HEALTH, AGE AND SEX, SOME IDEA ON BURIAL TYPE</td>
<td>S. ATLANTIC COAST- OFTEN VERY POOR PRESERVATION</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Not Used</td>
<td>Citations:</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Period/Culture</td>
<td>Reasons Why Not Used</td>
<td>Available Information</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>Burials #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Center</td>
<td>Sears 1982; Hutchinson 2004</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Belle Glade (200-800CE)</td>
<td>Very little information on actual burials</td>
<td>Layout, little type, some on artifacts, some on health</td>
<td>Everything else</td>
<td></td>
<td>121+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hichory Ridge (8ES1280)</td>
<td>Philips 1995: 72-96</td>
<td>Escambia</td>
<td>Fort Walton</td>
<td>Incredibly poor preservation</td>
<td>Layout, GDS.</td>
<td>Everything else</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Mound</td>
<td>Smith 1971: 107-134</td>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>Perico Island</td>
<td>Material excavated in 1896, very poor preservation</td>
<td>Layout, artifacts</td>
<td>Everything else</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Mound (8SO98)</td>
<td>Luer and Almy 1987: 301-320</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>Safety Harbor</td>
<td>Only main concern was body position &amp; orientation</td>
<td>Position, orientation</td>
<td>Everything else</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School Mound</td>
<td>Fradkin and Milanich 1977: 166-178</td>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>Very poor preservation, excavated in 1881, no GDS.</td>
<td>Structure, very few artifacts</td>
<td>Everything else</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Salt Springs</td>
<td>Clausen et al. 1979: 609-614</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>Paleoindian-Archaic</td>
<td>Very short discussion, few sites for comparison</td>
<td>Layout, burial type, some artifacts</td>
<td>Everything else</td>
<td>underwater ledge and cemetery in slough</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margate-Blount (8BD41)</td>
<td>Iscan 1983: 154-166</td>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>Post Archaic-Contact</td>
<td>Very short, site severely damaged</td>
<td>Health, age, sex</td>
<td>Everything else</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITES NOT USED</td>
<td>CITATIONS:</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PERIOD/ CULTURE</td>
<td>REASONS WHY NOT USED</td>
<td>AVAILABLE INFORMATION</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>NOTES:</td>
<td>BURIALS #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKHAM PARK MOUND NO. 2</td>
<td>WILLIAMS AND MOWERS 1977: 56-78</td>
<td>BROWARD</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC</td>
<td>VERY POOR PRESERVATION HABITATION MOUND - W/ SKELETAL REMAINS, NO GDS.</td>
<td>ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYAKKAHATCHEE SITE (8SO397)</td>
<td>LWER ET AL. 1987: 137-153</td>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>VARIOUS PERIODS</td>
<td>1 SITE AREA - 2 BURIALS, SAND BURIAL MOUND DESTROYED, MOST ARTIFACTS- UNPROVINCED</td>
<td>LITTLE ON ARTIFACTS, LAYOUT OF SITE</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKLAND MOUND (8JE53)</td>
<td>MORRELL 1960: 101-114</td>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>DEPTFORD</td>
<td>VERY SHORT AND LITTLE DETAIL</td>
<td>POTTERY, SOME GOODS, SEX</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK-19 (DESTIN)</td>
<td>BUNN 1971: 169-172</td>
<td>DESTIN</td>
<td>DEPTFORD</td>
<td>VERY SHORT AND LITTLE DETAIL</td>
<td>LAYERS, GOODS</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTTER CREEK II BURIAL MOUND (8BY39)</td>
<td>LAZARUS 1987: 321-327</td>
<td>BAY</td>
<td>LATE WEEDEN ISLAND</td>
<td>SHORT AND LITTLE DETAIL</td>
<td>LAYOUT, TYPE, SOME GOODS</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITES NOT USED</td>
<td>CITATIONS:</td>
<td>PERIOD/CULTURE</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>NOTES:</td>
<td>AVAILABLE INFORMATION</td>
<td>REASONS WHY NOT USED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICAN SHELL MOUND (PB99)</td>
<td>RITCHIE ET AL. 1981: 21-37; KESSEL 2001: 26</td>
<td>GLADES I-III</td>
<td>PALM BEACH</td>
<td>INCREDIBLY POOR PRESERVATION</td>
<td>POLK LATE SAFETY</td>
<td>ONLY FRAGS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIPS MOUND</td>
<td>BESSEL 1967:118-127</td>
<td>POLK</td>
<td>BROWARD</td>
<td>LATE ARCHAIC POOR</td>
<td>PINELAND LATE SAFETY</td>
<td>INCREDIBLY POOR PRESERVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEEN MOUND</td>
<td>LAFOY AND DUVAL 1995: 3-45</td>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS</td>
<td>POOR PRESERVATION-VERY SHORT</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS LATE SAFETY</td>
<td>INCREDIBLY POOR PRESERVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS HAMMOCK</td>
<td>BULLEN ET AL. 1967</td>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>CITRUS</td>
<td>INCREASINGLY POOR PRESERVATION</td>
<td>RITCHIE AND WEISMANN</td>
<td>INCREDIBLY POOR PRESERVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ON INDIVIDUAL BURIALS AND</td>
<td>1984-100-112; MITCHEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COUNTS</td>
<td>1989: 317-339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTH MOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOOTED &amp; DAMAGED BEFORE SERIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MISSING NOTES: BURIALS #
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITES NOT USED</th>
<th>CITATIONS:</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>PERIOD/ CULTURE</th>
<th>REASONS WHY NOT USED</th>
<th>AVAILABLE INFORMATION</th>
<th>MISSING</th>
<th>NOTES:</th>
<th>BURIALS #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAFFORD MOUND (8Pi3)</td>
<td>BULLEN ET AL. 1970: 81-118</td>
<td>PINELLAS</td>
<td>PERICO ISLAND</td>
<td>MATERIAL EXCAVATED IN 1896- MAINLY ABOUT POTTERY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA COUNTY MOUND (PAULSON POINT)</td>
<td>BULLEN 1971: 1-29; AUSTIN ET AL. 1992: 172</td>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>TRANSITIONAL/ EARLY MANASOTA</td>
<td>NO DETAILS ON BURIAL COUNT AND LITTLE ON ASPECTS OF THEM</td>
<td>LITTLE ON BURIAL TYPES, ARTIFACTS, POTTERY</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHWEST DRIVE (8SO2617)</td>
<td>ALMY 2003: 125-140</td>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>HISTORIC</td>
<td>1 BURIAL- LIKELY A HISPANIC RANCHO WORKER OR EARLY AMERICAN SETTLER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPPA ISLAND (8LL51)</td>
<td>MARQUARDT 1999: 77-98</td>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>VARIOUS PERIODS</td>
<td>VARIOUS PERIODS ONLT 1-3 BODIES IN CERTAIN DEPOSITS, POOR PRESERVATION</td>
<td>SOME LAYOUT, TYPE, HEALTH, ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>EVERYTHING ELSE</td>
<td>SEVERAL DIF. BURIAL DEPOSITS, MASSIVE CEMETERY- ONLY SAMPLED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETROUER SITE (A66)</td>
<td>GOGGIN ET AL. 1949: 10-25</td>
<td>ALACHUA</td>
<td>HISTORIC INDIAN</td>
<td>1 BURIAL ONLY &amp; DIFFICULT TO COMPARE TO OTHER SITES</td>
<td>SEX, AGE, BURIAL TYPE, OR., GDS, STATURE, LAYOUT</td>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITES NOT USED</td>
<td>CITATIONS:</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>PERIOD/CULTURE</td>
<td>REASONS WHY NOT USED</td>
<td>AVAILABLE INFORMATION</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>NOTES:</td>
<td>BURIALS #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL SITES DISCUSSED IN: (Some of these sites did possess good data, but were examined only after the analysis in this thesis was completed.)</td>
<td>BULLEN 1951, 1952</td>
<td>FELMLEY 1991</td>
<td>MILANICH 1999</td>
<td>MOORE 1999A, 1999B, 2000C</td>
<td>PINTO 2004</td>
<td>WILLEY 1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Many of the Sites do not have a site number since the research about these sites was often only cursory.
Abbreviations: ARCH. = Archaeological, FRAGS = Fragments (Bone), GR. GDS. = Grave Goods, and OR. = Orientation*
APPENDIX B: SITE SUMMARIES
AQUI ESTA MOUND (ALLIGATOR CREEK MOUND): (8CH68)- CHARLOTTE COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 850 BP
2. COUNTY: CHARLOTTE
3. PERIOD: LATE WEEDEN-SAFETY HARBOR [ENGLEWOOD (AD 1000-1200), AND PINELLAS (AD 900-1250)], CALOOSAHATCHEE II (AD 700-1200)
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY AND C-14- 4 DATES- 1 AVAILABLE- 800-1100 UNCORRECTED BP
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: OVAL
7. HEIGHT: 7-8FT (2M)
8. DIAMETER: 150FT X 180FT (45 X 55M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: ISOLATED
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 100 OR LESS
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 22

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. TOP: THICK ZONE TAN COLORED SAND 5 FEET THICK- A SECOND MOUND
2. MIDDLE 1: THINNER DARK GRAY 6 INCHES, SHERDS SCATTERED LYING FLAT
3. MIDDLE 2: RED COLOR LENSE-THICK ZONE OF LIGHT GRAY-3 FEET NEAR MOUND CENTER-PRIMARY MOUND
4. BOTTOM: 6-10 INCHES DARK WET SAND CHARCOAL PREPARED MOUND
5. CHARNEL HOUSE: YES

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. MOST BURIALS SECONDARY WITH A FEW PRIMARY BURIALS
2. SECONDARY BURIALS: MASS BURIALS, LONGBONE BUNDLES, SKULL
3. FLEXED BURIALS ALSO POSSIBLY SECONDARY BURIALS
4. CHARNEL HOUSE USED FOR MANY BURIALS
5. CITATIONS: LUER 2002: 118

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: SEVERAL
3. AGE: ?
4. SEX: ?
5. GRAVE GOODS: RED OCHRE ON A FEW BUNDLES, STACKS OF POTTERY BY 1 BURIAL, SHELL ASSOCIATED WITH A FEW BURIALS
6. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: POTTERY COVERING FOR AT LEAST 1 BURIAL
7. CITATIONS: LUER 2002: 118-120

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 18%
2. FEMALE: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 82%
4. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2002:183, 185, 187

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 23%
3. ADULT: 77%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 54%
6. AVERAGE AGE: ?
7. STATURE: MALES 1.73-1.74M
8. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2002: 183, 185, 187

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. CARIES: 6% (HUTCHINSON 2002: 186; HUTCHINSON 2004: 103)
4. 0% MALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 107)
5. 0% FEMALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 107)
7. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 0% (HUTCHINSON 2002: 186; HUTCHINSON 2004: 106)
8. 0% MALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 106)
9. 0% FEMALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 106)
10. PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS: 0% (HUTCHINSON 2002: 186)

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 9% (HUTCHINSON 2002: 186), 4.3% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 102)
3. 50% MALES (HUTCHINSON 2002: 186), 0% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 102)
4. 0% FEMALES (HUTCHINSON 1991: 102)
5. OSTEOMYELITIS: 11% OF TIBIAE (HUTCHINSON 1991: 97, 106)
6. SKELETAL LESIONS: 11% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 114)
7. SYSTEMIC INFECTION: 4.3% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 108)
8. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 30% (HUTCHINSON 2002: 187; HUTCHINSON 2004: 111)
   POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS AND CRIBRA ORBITALIA: 7.7% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 126)
9. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 0% (HUTCHINSON 1991 97, 117)
10. TREPONEMAL INFECTION: 4.5% (HUTCHINSON 2002: 196; HUTCHINSON 1991: 117)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: ?
2. UNKNOWN CONTEXT FOR MANY ARTIFACTS DUE TO EXCAVATION STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES
3. CITATIONS: LUER 2002: 161-167

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SAND TEMPERED, CHARCOAL TEMPERED, ST. JOHNS CHECKED STAMPED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 6202 SHERDS
3. SHELL TOOLS: 16
4. SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS: 25
5. SHELL VESSELS (NON CUPS/ DIPPERS): 21
6. SHELL: 12
VI. REFERENCES:

Hutchinson, Dale L.


Luer, George M.


BAY CADILLAC: (8HI2398)- HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 2800 BP
   2. COUNTY: HILLSBOROUGH
   3. PERIOD: LATE ARCHAIC- TRANSITIONAL (910-790 BC)
   4. SEVERAL C-14 SAMPLES, ARTIFACTS
   5. MOUND: NO- VERY DISTURBED
   6. AREA: 45 X 70FT (13.72 X 21.34M)
   7. ADJACENT FEATURES: MIDDEN AND VILLAGE ON TOP
   8. TOTAL BURIALS: 71
   9. STUDIED BURIALS: 62

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. TOP LAYER: DARK BROWN SAND, SHELL AND RUBBLE, MIDDEN
   2. MIDDLE LAYER: YELLOW-BROWN SAND WITH SOME SHELL
   3. ALL BURIALS: ADULTS BURIED IN A SINGLE GROUP OR SMALL GROUPS IN PRIMARY FLEXED POSITION
   4. CHILDREN BURIED TOGETHER IN GROUPS OF 4 OR MORE- ?SECONDARY BURIALS?
   5. MOST SUBADULTS ONLY IN EAST AREA OF CEMETERY
   6. ADULTS SCATTERED THROUGHOUT REST OF SITE
   7. BOTTOM LAYER: TAN SAND WITH ISOLATED SHELL LENSES
   8. CHARNEL HOUSE: POSSIBLE?
   9. OTHER FEATURES: 7 HEARTHS, BUT NOT ASSOCIATED WITH BURIAL LAYER

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 18%
   2. SECONDARY: 48%
   3. UNKNOWN: 34%
   4. FLEXED: 18%
   5. BUNDLED: 48%
   6. UNKNOWN: 34%
   7. ORIENTATION: 36% EAST, 36% SOUTHEAST, 27% NORTHEAST
   8. ADULTS ORIENTED EAST, SOUTHEAST, NORTHEAST, SOME SUBADULTS ORIENTED RADIAL OR SEMI RADIAL

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
   2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 22%
   3. AGE: 16 ADULTS,
   4. SEX: 4 MALES, 1 FEMALE, 11 UNKNOWN
   5. GRAVE GOODS: MAINLY SHELL OR CHERT, SEVERAL POT SHERDS: SAND TEMPERED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN, FIBER TEMPERED PLAIN
   6. CITATIONS:AUSTIN ET AL. 1992: 159
III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 10%
2. FEMALE: 5%
3. UNKNOWN: 85%

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 5%
2. SUBADULT: 53%
3. ADULT: 32%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 10%
6. STATURE: 1.58-1.78M MALES, 1.2-1.141M FEMALES
7. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 30, 25 MALES, 30 FEMALES
8. CITATIONS: AUSTIN ET AL. 1992: 147-149

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. CARIES: 0%
3. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 3.2%
4. PREMOREM TOOTH LOSS: 0%
5. REABSORPTION/PERIODONTAL DISEASE: 1.63%
6. ABECESSES: 3.2%
7. CALCULUS: 0%
8. HEAVY DENTAL WEAR: COMMON
9. PERIODONTAL DISEASE: 3.2%
10. CITATIONS: AUSTIN ET AL. 1992: 133-147, 149-151

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. PERIOSTITIS: 14.7%
3. OSTEOMYELITIS: SEVERAL
4. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 3.2%
5. TRAUMA/FRACTURES: 3.2%
6. VIOLENT DEATH OR INJURY: 1.6%
7. NONSPECIFIC INFECTION: 1.6%
8. CONGENITAL DEFECTS: 1.6%
9. AUSTIN ET AL. 1992: 133-147, 149-151

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SAND TEMPERED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 18 SHERDS
4. STONES TOOLS: 1
5. SHELL: SEVERAL?
6. PROJECTILE POINTS: 4
7. OTHER: 4 CHUNKS OF LIMESTONE
B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
   1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SAND TEMPERED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN, PINELLAS PLAIN, LIMESTONE TEMPERED PLAIN
   2. TOTAL POTTERY: 365 SHERDS
   3. SHELL TOOLS: 7+
   4. STONE TOOLS: 36?
   5. BONE JEWELRY: 1?
   6. BONE BEADS: 8?
   7. PROJECTILE POINTS: 13
   8. CHERT FLAKES/ CORES: 89

VI. REFERENCES:

Austin, Robert J., Harry M. Piper, Kenneth W. Hardin, Jacquelyn G. Piper, and Barbara McCabe
I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 950 BP
2. COUNTY: PINELLAS
3. PERIOD: LATE WEEDEN ISLAND- EARLY SAFETY HARBOR
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY, CHARNEL HOUSE
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: DOME
7. HEIGHT: 18 FT (5.49 M)
8. DIAMETER: 140 FT (42.67 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 TEMPLE MOUND, 1 BURIAL MOUND, 1 MIDDEN
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 500
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 82 BURIALS (118 INDIVIDUALS)

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: 2 PHASES
2. PHASE B:
3. 1. MASS BURIALS ON SOUTHWEST SLOPE (60 BURIALS & POSSIBLY 20 MORE)
4. 2. TIGHTLY FLEXED LAID IN SHINGLE FASHION
5. 3. CONCH SHELLS PLACED OVER GROUPS OF BURIALS
6. 4. SEVERAL BURIALS PLACED ON FINAL SHELL SURFACE OF MOUND PLATFORM,
   SOME BODIES ON SLOPES
7. PHASE: A:
8. 1. SAND & MIDDEN SHELL LAYERS FORM FLAT TOPPED MOUND, 3 SEPARATE
   SHELL LAYER
9. 2. LARGE NUMBER OF BURIALS ON FLAT TOP OF MOUND
10. 3. PLATFORM ON TOP OF MOUND
11. 4. (FEW BURIALS PLACED IN NORTHEAST CORNER AND 3 CLEAN LAYER OF SHELL
    (NON MIDDEN) ON TOP
12. CHARNEL HOUSE: YES
13. CITATIONS: SEARS 1960a: 17-20

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 0%
2. SECONDARY: 100%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 0%
5. FLEXED: 55%
6. BUNDLE: 2%
7. SKULL: 3%
8. CREMATION: 4%
9. UNKNOWN: 37%
10. 1 DOG BURIAL
11. CITATIONS: SEARS 1960a: 20-23
12. SEARS BELIEVES ALL BURIALS WERE REALLY BUNDLES (SEARS 1967: 30-31)

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 19%
III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 42%
2. FEMALE: 36%
3. UNKNOWN: 23%
4. CITATIONS: SEARS 1960a: 20-24

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 15%
2. SUBADULT: 21%
3. ADULT: 63%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 1%
6. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 32, 33 MALES, 31 FEMALES
7. STATURE: OVERALL: 1.67M?, 1.69M MALES, 1.64M FEMALES
8. CITATIONS: SEARS 1960a: 20-2; SNOW 1962: 15, 2

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. DENTAL CHIPPING: 1%
3. 0% MALES
4. 2.5% FEMALES
5. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 1%
6. 2% MALES
7. 0% FEMALES
8. ABSCESSES: 5.2%
9. 2.1% MALES
10. 12.2% FEMALES
11. HEAVY DENTAL WEAR: COMMON
12. NOTE: SOME DENTAL INFECTION NOTED WITH ABSCESSES

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. OSTEOMYELITIS: 5.2% (SNOW 1962: 18-24)
3. OSTEITIS: 0.8% (SNOW 1962: 18-24)
4. OSTEO ARTHRITIS: OVER 13% (WINLAND 2002: 205)
5. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 0.8% (SNOW 1962: 18-24)
6. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 5% (WINLAND 2002: 206)
7. VIOLENT DEATHS OR INJURIES: 0.9% (SNOW 1962: 18-24)
8. TREPOEMAL INFECTION: 2.0% (WINLAND 2002: 207) 9 CASES OF IT (HUTCHINSON 2004: 119)
9. INFECTIOUS LESIONS: 5% (WINLAND 2002: 207)
V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
   1. PRESENT: YES
   2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: PINELLAS PLAIN, ?PINELLAS?
   3. TOTAL POTTERY 28 SHERDS
   4. ONLY NONE POTTERY INCLUDED 9 LARGE FLATTEN CONCH SHELLS, AND CLEAN SHELL AROUND & OVER BODIES
   5. CITATIONS: SEARS 1960a: 20-24

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
   1. EVERYTHING DISCUSSED IN INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS OR LAYER CONTEXTS
   2. CITATIONS: SEARS 1960a: 20-24

VI. REFERENCES:

Hutchinson, Dale L.

Sears, William H.


Snow, Charles E.

Winland, Kenneth J.
BENTON MOUND: (8FL16)- FLAGLER COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1270 BP
2. COUNTY: FLAGLER
3. PERIOD: ST. JOHNS IB (AD 500-800)
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY, MOUND CONSTRUCTION, 1 C-14- AD 680 +/-80 YRS (SHELL USED FOR C14- UNRELIABLE?)
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CIRCULAR
7. HEIGHT: 1.6FT (0.49M)
8. DIAMETER: 50FT (15.24M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: ?
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 9
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 9

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. TOP LAYER: HUMUS
2. MIDDLE LAYER: LIGHT GREY-WHITE SAND 0.7-0.8FT THICK/MOUND CAP OF MOTTLED GRAY, WHITE, PALE BROWN SAND
3. 2 SMALL DEPOSITS OF SHELL, AT LEAST 15 VESSELS PLACED AND KILLED OVER BURIALS / MOUND CAP OVER THEM
4. MIDDLE LAYER 2: PALE BROWN YELLOW SAND
5. AFTER MOUND FILL AND ZONE IIB-REST OF BURIALS ARRANGED WITHIN 10FT OF CENTER OF MOUND/
6. CEREMONIAL FEATURE: BUSYCON SHELL FRAGMENTS, FINELY MADE POT, 2 QUARTZ CRYSTALS
7. BOTTOM LAYER: ZONE IIB: LIGHT GRAY SAND: 1ST ARTIFICAL FILL
8. 1ST BURIAL (B2) IN PIT THAT GOES INTO ZONE III
9. ZONE III-STERILE PREPARED SURFACE
10. CITATIONS: MILLER 1994: 207-211

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. BONES TOO FRAGMENTED FOR BURIAL TYPES TO BE IDENTIFIED

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: ?
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: SEVERAL GOODS WITH MAIN BURIAL DEPOSIT
3. AGE: ?
4. SEX: ?
5. GRAVE GOODS: 1 ST. JOHNS PLAIN POT, 2 QUARTZ CRYSTALS, SEVERAL SHELL FRAGMENTS
6. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: KILLED POTTERY, SHELL CUP FRAGMENTS AND 2 QUARTZ CRYSTALS ON TOP
7. NOTES: BLACK DRINK CEREMONY LIKELY
8. CITATIONS: MILLER 1994: 211, 215, 219, 221; FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE
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III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 0%
2. FEMALE: 14%
3. UNKNOWN: 86%

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 43%
3. ADULT: 57%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%

IV. HEALTH
1. ACIDIC CONDITIONS DESTROYED ALMOST ALL BONE
2. MILLER 1994: 215

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: ?
2. POOR BODY PRESERVATION MADE ASSOCIATION OF GRAVE GOODS BURIALS IMPOSSIBLE

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHN PLAIN, DUNNS CREEK RED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 16 VESSELS
3. SHELL CUP/ DIPPERS: SEVERAL
4. QUARTZ CRYSTAL: 2
5. CITATIONS: MILLER 1994: 211, 215

VI. REFERENCES:

Hageseth, Elizabeth Carroll

Miller, James

Unnamed
n.d. Florida Master Site File, Bureau of Archaeological Research, Florida Department of State, Tallahassee.
BIRD ISLAND (8DI52)- DIXIE COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 4,570 BP
2. COUNTY: DIXIE
3. PERIOD: EARLY ARCHAIC (8,120-6,980 BP UNCORRECTED; 9,000 BP-7,929 BP CALIBRATED)
4. DATING METHOD: 1- C-14 SAMP (2620 BC- 4570 BP +/-110 YRS- UNCORRECTED), LACK OF POTTERY & STRATIFICATION
5. MOUND: NO- MIDDEN?
6. SHAPE: ?
7. HEIGHT: ?
8. AREA: ?
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: ?
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 36? (POSSIBLE MANY MORE- LOST DUE TO EROSION)
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 36

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. SITE: MIDDEN? EXTREME EROSION
2. DEPTFORD SHELL MIDDEN ON TOP

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. ALL ORIGINAL FEATURES OF BURIALS UNKNOWN DUE TO EROSION

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 19%
2. FEMALE: 14%
3. UNKNOWN: 67%

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 11%
3. ADULT: 89%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
8. STATURE: OVERALL 1.7M, 1.72M-MALES, 1.64M- FEMALES

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
3. PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS: 17% OF PROVIENCED (STOJANOWSKI 1997: 80)
4. ABSCESSES: 10.6% OF PROVIENCED (STOJANOWSKI 1997: 83)
5. HYPERCEMENTOSIS: 10.6% OF PROVIENCED (STOJANOWSKI 1997: 75)
6. CALCULUS: 57% OF TEETH (STOJANOWSKI 1997: 66, 67, 70, 71)

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 31.4 OF TIBIAE (HAMLIN 1995: 18-19)
3. MALES: 23% OF TIBIAE
4. FEMALES: 11.4% OF TIBIAE
5. OSTEOMYELITIS: 2.9% (HAMLIN 1995: 19)
6. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 41.6% (ESTES: 1988: 108)
7. MALES: 38.8%
8. FEMALES 52.3%
9. CRIBRA ORBITALIA: 27.2% (ESTES 1988: 109, 111)
10. MALES: 16.6%
11. FEMALES: 30%
12. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 14% ADULTS (13%CRANIA, 1%POSTCRANIA) (HUTCHINSON 2004: 124)
13. 22%OF INDIVIDUALS (SMITH 2003: 21, 25)
14. MALES: 27.8% (SMITH 2003: 45)
15. FEMALES: 34% (SMITH 2003: 45)
16. BLUNT TRAUMA: 13%, 0% MALES, 0% FEMALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 125)
17. HEALTH STRESS (HARRIS LINES): 92% OF TIBIAES (ESTES 1988: 42)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. UNKNOWN DUE TO NO INTACT BURIALS
2. CITATIONS: STOJANOWSKI 1997: 9

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SOME POTTERY-NOT DISCUSSED
2. NO COUNT OF ARTIFACTS: TYPES OF ARTIFACTS FOUND:
3. BONE PINS, SHELL BEADS, A SHARK TOOTH -IN BURIAL CONTEXTS), SOME LITHICS
4. NOTE: FAR GREATER NUMBER OF POTTERY VS. LITHICS
5. CITATIONS: STOJANOWSKI 1997: 9

VI. REFERENCES:

Estes, Anna M.

Hamlin, Christine
1995 Tibial Infection in Three Prehistoric Florida Populations. Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Stojanowski, Christopher Michael
1997 Descriptive Analysis of the Prehistoric Bird Island (8DI52) Skeletal Population. MS Thesis, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Stojanowski, Christopher M., and Glen H. Doran
1998 Osteology of the Late Archaic Bird Island Site (8DI52), Dixie County. The Florida Anthropologist 51: 139-145.
BROWNE MOUND: (8DU62)- DUVAL COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 950 BP
   2. COUNTY: DUVAL
   3. PERIOD: LATE WEEDEN ISLAND/ ST. JOHNS IIA (AD 800-1200)
   4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY
   5. MOUND: YES
   6. SHAPE: DOME
   7. HEIGHT: ?
   8. DIAMETER: ?
   9. ADJACENT FEATURES: VILLAGE, SEVERAL SHELL MIDDENS, ?SECOND BURIAL MOUND?
   10. TOTAL BURIALS: 50
   11. STUDIED BURIALS: 41
   12. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 9-10; SEARS: UNDATED FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. TOP LAYER: 6. SHELL MANTLE, 1 EXTENDED BURIAL ON PILE OF RED OCHRE
   2. MIDDLE LAYER: 5. MANTLE OF SAND COVER ALL BURIALS, EXTENDED BURIAL PLACED AT WEST EDGE
   3. MIDDLE LAYER 2: 3. PIT FILLED WITH SAND, 4. BUNDLE BURIALS & 1 CREMATION, 1 EXTENDED BURIAL & OTHER W/ RED OCHRE PLACED ON THEM
   4. BOTTOM LAYER: 1. SAND, SMALL CORE MOUND: 18 INCHES IN HEIGHT, 20 FEET IN DIAMETER
   5. 1. RECTANGULAR PIT 15 X 10FT/ 2. PIT LINED W/ THICK LAYER OF ORGANIC SUBSTANCE -EXTENDED BODIES PLACED IN SHINGLE FASHION.
   6. CHARNEL HOUSE: NO
   7. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 9-10

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 10%
   2. SECONDARY: 56%
   3. UNKNOWN: 29%
   4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 10%
   5. BUNDLE: 57%
   6. SKULL: 5%
   7. CREMATION: 2%
   8. UNKNOWN: 26%
   9. NOTE: MOST BURIALS LIKELY EXTENDED
   10. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 4-6

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
   2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 5%
   3. SEX: ?
   4. AGE: ?
   5. GRAVE GOODS: 1 COPPER ORNAMENT, 1 CELT-FOUND W/ MAIN MASS BURIAL, 1 RED OCHRE
   6. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: 1 BURIAL W/ RED OCHRE & OTHER BURIAL LATER PLACED BY RED OCHRE/ ALL POTTERY JUST Fill
7. LARGE SHELL RING AROUND MANY OF BURIALS
8. LOCATION & LAYER: 1 OF THE LAST BODIES: EXTENDED ON WEST EDGE OF MOUND
9. NOTES: VERY TIGHTLY PACKED BODIES IN ROWS
10. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 4-6

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 28%
2. FEMALE: 10%
3. UNKNOWN: 63%
4. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 4-6

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 8%
3. ADULT: 75%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 17%
6. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 4-6

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. PATHOLOGICAL STRIAE: 67%
3. CITATIONS: SIMPSON 2001: 150

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: 0
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 0
4. CELT: 1
5. RED OCHRE: PRESENT
6. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 4-6

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SAND TEMP PLAIN, SWIFT CREEK II COMPLICATED STAMPED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 273 SHERDS
3. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 4-6

VI. REFERENCES:

Sears, William H.

Simpson, Scott W.  
DENT MOUND: (8DU68)- DUVAL COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1610 BP
2. COUNTY: DUVAL
3. PERIOD: ST. JOHNS IA- IB (AD 100-500), SWIFT CREEK
4. DATING METHOD: 2- C-14- AD 340 +/-70 YRS & AD 590 +/-60 YRS, ARTIFACT- AD 100-800
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CIRCULAR
7. HEIGHT: 0.8M
8. DIAMETER: 15M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: SEVERAL MIDDENS
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 113
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 98

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: ST. JOHN II MIDDEN ON TOP
2. TOP LAYER: ST. JOHN II MIDDEN
3. MIDDLE LAYER: OYSTER SHELL, VERTEBRATE FAUNAL BONE, CHARCOAL, POTSHERDS/ GRAY-TAN SAND 80-100CM THICK/ OYSTER SHELL & VERTEBRAE FAUNALS BONES SCATTERED IN FILL-FROM NEARBY MIDDENS
4. MIDDLE LAYER 2: OTHER PRIMARY BURIALS: 20, 53,54 COULD HAVE BEEN PLACED IN SUBSURFACE PITS OR ON ORIGINAL SURFACE BEFORE MOUND CONSTRUCTION
5. BOTTOM LAYER: 1ST STAGE- AT LEAST 2 EXTENDED BURIALS- B29 & B30/ B30 PIT PENETRATED AN OLD BURIED SHELL REFUSE FEATURE- SHELL LINED GRAVE PIT/ ?POTTERY COVERED ALL BURIALS?
6. BOTTOM LAYER: YELLOW SAND BOTTOM
7. FEATURES: 16 FIRE PITS, 7 POSSIBLE FOOD OFFERINGS, 5 PILES OF SHELLS, 2 RED OCHER SPILL, 113 BURIALS
8. CHARCOAL FLECKING COMMON
9. IF AN EARLY SHELL MIDDEN ORIGINALLY EXISTED IT WAS SCRAPPED AWAY WITH
10. MOUND CONSTRUCTION
11. NO POTTERY CONCENTRATIONS
12. CHARNEL HOUSE: USED BUT NOT ON MOUND

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 27%
2. SECONDARY: 69%
3. UNKNOWN: 4%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 22%
5. FLEXED: 4%
6. BUNDLE: 19%
7. SKULL: 34%
8. UNKNOWN: 18%
9. NOTES: MANY OF THE BUNDLES CONTAIN 4 MOR IND
10. ORIENTATION: EXTENDED & BUNDLE BURIALS MORE FREQUENT IN EAST HALF OF MOUND/ BUNDLES/ IN SE CORNER MULTIPLE INTERRMENT
11. SKULLS SCATTERED THROUGHOUT/ LONG BONE BURIALS ALL IN WEST. HALF

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: SEVERAL
3. AGE: ?
4. SEX: ?
5. GRAVE GOODS: EXAMPLE: BURIAL 30-STATUS- DRILLED BEAR TOOTH, CUT WHELK SHELL, 2 FISH EFFIGY PENDANTS, 3 STONE PROJECTILE POINTS.
6. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: ALL 5 SHELL DEPOSITS ASSOCIATED W/ BURIALS. OYSTER LINING FOR GRAVE PIT OF B30/ POTTERY OFFERING, OYSTER SHELLS
7. NOTES: "BLACK DRINK CEREMONY LIKELY"

III. & IV. SEX, AGE, STATURE, & HEALTH
1. NEVER EXAMINED BY A PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGIST BEFORE REINTERNMENT
2. CITATIONS: ASHLEY 1995: 13

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHNS PLAIN & ST. JOHNS CHECKED STAMPED
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 78 SHERDS
4. NOTE: MOST OBJECTS LIKELY ASSOCIATED WITH INDIVIDUALS- CONTEXT-NOT DISCUSSED
5. CITATIONS: ASHLEY 1995: 19-22, 25

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SAND TEMPERED, CHARCOAL TEMPERED, ST. JOHNS CHECKED STAMPED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 7964 SHERDS
3. SHELL TOOLS: 14
4. BONES TOOLS: 1
5. STONE TOOLS: SEVERAL
6. ANTLER TOOLS: 2
7. CELT (STONE OR SHELL): 1
8. MICA SHEET 1
9. SHELL JEWELRY: 2
10. SHELL BEADS: 3
11. ANIMAL/ TEETH BEADS: 1
12. SHELL: 1
13. PROJECTILE POINTS: 10+
14. PEBBLES OR GRAVEL: SEVERAL QUARTZ PEBBLES
15. RED POWDER/ OCHRE: SOME
16. SANDSTONE/ GRAPHITE: SEVERAL
17. BIRD EFFIGIES: 2 FISH EFFIGY PENDANTS

VI. REFERENCES:
Ashley, Keith

Thunen, Robert L., and Keith H. Ashley
ENGLEWOOD MOUND: (8SO1) - SARASOTA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 850 BP
   2. COUNTY: SARASOTA
   3. PERIOD: WEEDEN ISLAND, GLADES, ENGLEWOOD- (SAFETY HARBOR)
   4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY
   5. MOUND: YES
   6. SHAPE: DOME
   7. HEIGHT: 13FT (4 M)
   8. DIAMETER: MOUND: 110FT (33.5 M)
   9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 PLATFORM MOUND, 1 MIDDEN
   10. TOTAL BURIALS: 300+
   11. STUDIED BURIALS: 263

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. NOTE: 2 MOUNDS (ONE CONSTRUCTION ON TOP OF THE OTHER
   2. MOST BURIALS SECONDARY WITH A FEW PRIMARY FLEXED AND KILLED POTTERY
   3. COMPOSITION: YELLOW SAND
   4. MOUND 2: SAND, MANY SECONDARY AND PRIMARY BURIALS, SHELLS, AND POTTERY
   5. MOUND 1: 5FT HIGH AND 50FT DIAMETER
   6. DARK BROWN SAND WITH THIN SURFACE COATING OF WHITE SAND, YELLOW SAND BOTTOM
   7. LARGE SHALLOW PIT 50 X 15-20FT OF MASS INTERNMENT COVERED WITH RED OCHRE
   8. BOTTOM: STERILE YELLOW SAND

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 10%
   2. SECONDARY: 89%
   3. UNKNOWN: 2%
   4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 0%
   5. FLEXED: 6%
   6. BUNDLE: 26%
   7. SKULL: 63%
   8. UNKNOWN: 5%
   9. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 130

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: ?
   2. LAYER OVER BURIALS RED OCHRE COVERING, POTTERY OFFERING
   3. NOTE: IRON OXIDE, RED OCHRE, AND CHARCOAL FOUND IN MOUND
   4. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 130-135

III. & IV. SEX, AGE, STATURE, & HEALTH
   1. NO AVAILABLE DATA
V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
   1. PRESENT: ?
   2. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 131-134

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
   1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHNS CHECK STAMPED, GLADES PLAIN
   2. TOTAL POTTERY: 502 SHERDS (AVAILABLE STUDY SAMPLE)
   3. SHELL TOOLS: 1
   4. SHELL CUPS/DIPPERS: 2
   5. SHARK TEETH: 2
   6. SHELL: SOME
   7. CHERT FLAKES/ CORES: 2
   8. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 131-134

VI. REFERENCES:

Luer, George M.

Penton, Daniel T.

Willey, Gordon R.
   1949 Archaeology of the Florida Gulf Coast. Miscellaneous Contributions No. 113, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
GAUTHIER (ARCHAIC): (8Br193)- BREVARD COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 4340 BP
2. COUNTY: BREVARD
3. PERIOD: LATE ARCHAIC
4. DATING METHOD: C-14- 4340BP +/- 170YRS
5. MOUND: NO- LATE ARCHAIC CEMETERY -ON A LIMESTONE RIDGE
6. SHAPE: ?
7. DIAMETER: 50 X 100 FT (15 X 30M)
8. ADJACENT FEATURES: VILLAGE BY MUCK POND
9. TOTAL BURIALS: 105
10. STUDIED BURIALS: 105

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. INTRUSIVE BURIALS INTO LATE ARCHAIC CEMETERY-ON LIMESTONE RIDGE
2. SAND LAYER: BURIALS
3. MARL: INTRUSIVE BURIALS PITS & MARL LAYER CONTAINED LUMPS OF HEMATITIE & LIMONITE
4. OTHER FEATURES: 5 CLUSTERS OF BURIALS- ARCHAIC PERIOD?
5. CITATIONS: JONES AND CARR 1981: 81-84; MAPLES 1987: 2

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 100%
2. SECONDARY: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 10%
5. PRONE: 1%
6. FLEXED: 89%
7. UNKNOWN: 0%

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: ?
2. CITATIONS: JONES AND CARR 1981: 86

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 24%
2. FEMALE: 38%
3. UNKNOWN: 38%
4. CITATIONS: MAPLES 1987: 3, 13

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 15%
2. SUBADULT: 30%
3. ADULT: 45%
4. 50YRS+: 10%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
6. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 36, 35 MALES, 36 FEMALES
7. STATURE: OVERALL 1.59M, 1.65 MALES, 1.54 FEMALES
8. CITATIONS: MAPLES 1987: 3, 13

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. NOTE: ALL DISCUSSED CONDITIONS SEEN IN ARCHAIC AND RARE IN INTRUSIVE
3. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: SEVERAL
4. ABSCESSES: 15%
5. HYPERCEMENTOSIS: SEVERAL
6. HEAVY DENTAL WEAR: COMMON
7. CITATIONS: MAPLES 1987: 30-31

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. NOTE: LITTLE DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN ARCHAIC AND INTRUSIVE/ ALL DISCUSSED CONDITIONS SEEN IN ARCHAIC AND RARE IN INTRUSIVE
3. PERIOSTITIS: SEVERAL (MAPLES 1987: 30)
4. OSTEOARTHRITIS: COMMON (MAPLES 1987: 30)
5. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 18% (MAPLES 1987: 30) 10% OF ADULTS (HUTCHINSON 2004: 124)
6. BLUNT TRAUMA: 2%, 0% MALES, 5% FEMALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 125)
7. NEOPLASMS: 1.5% (MAPLES 1987: 31)
8. EBURNATION: 9% (MAPLES 1987: 30)
9. KIDNEY STONES: 1.5% (MAPLES 1987: 31)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. NOTE: NO COUNT ON ARTIFACTS JUST SOME BASIC TYPES DESCRIBED AND THIS INCLUDES BOTH ARCHAIC AND INTRUSIVE
3. ALL ARTIFACTS DISCUSSED IN UNKNOWN CONTEXT
4. CITATIONS: JONES AND CARR 1981: 84, 86

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NO POTTERY
2. BONE TOOLS AND ORNAMENTS: INCLUDING AWLS, (SOME OUT OF DOG BONE), CARVED BONE WORK SIMILAR TO TICK ISLAND, BUT SOME DIFFERENCES IN MOTIF, ATLALI Hooks AND HANDLES
3. LITHIC TOOLS: INCLUDING SMALL FLINTS,SCRAPERS, AND KNIVES
4. BONE JEWELRY: HEADRESS: MADE OF 2 PIECES ANTLER & RACOON’S PENIS BONE
5. TUBULAR SHELL BEADS
6. DRILLED SHARKS TEETH
7. BONE HARPOON POINTS
8. RED OCHRE: SEVERAL DEPOSITS

VI. REFERENCES:

Jones, B. Calvin, and Robert Carr
Jones, B. Calvin, Louis Tesar, and Jonathan Lammers

Maples, William R.
1987 *Analysis of Skeletal Remains Recovered at the Gauthier Site, Brevard County, Florida,* Miscellaneous Project 31, Florida State Museum, Department of Anthropology, Gainesville.

Sigler-Eisenberg, Brenda
GAUTHIER (INTRUSIVE): (8BR193)- BREVARD COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1600 BP
2. COUNTY: BREVARD
3. PERIOD: ST. JOHNS I
4. DATING METHOD: C-14- 1600BP +/-190YRS
5. MOUND: NO- INTRUSIVE BURIALS INTO A LATE ARCHAIC CEMETERY- ON A LIMESTONE RIDGE
6. SHAPE: ?
7. DIAMETER: 50 X 100 FT (15 X 30 M)
8. ADJACENT FEATURES: VILLAGE BY MUCK POND
9. TOTAL BURIALS: 26
10. STUDIED BURIALS: 26

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. LATE ARCHAIC CEMETERY-ON LIMESTONE RIDGE
2. SAND LAYER: BURIALS
3. MARL: INTRUSIVE BURIALS PITS & MARL LAYER CONTAINED LUMPS OF HEMATITIE & LIMONITE
4. OTHER FEATURES: 5 CLUSTERS OF BURIALS- ST JOHNS?
5. CITATIONS: JONES AND CARR 1981: 81-84; MAPLES 1987: 2

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 100%
2. SECONDARY: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 1%
5. FLEXED: 99%

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
1. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: SEVERAL
2. 1 INDIVIDUAL WITH 52 GRAVE GOODS INCLUDING HEADDRESS
2. CITATIONS: JONES AND CARR 1981: 86

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 35%
2. FEMALE: 42%
3. UNKNOWN: 23%
4. CITATIONS: MAPLES 1987: 3, 13

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 15%
2. SUBADULT: 31%
3. ADULT: 46%
4. 50YRS+: 8%
IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. NOTE: ALL DISCUSSED CONDITIONS SEEN IN ARCHAIC AND RARE IN INTRUSIVE
3. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: SEVERAL
4. ABSCESSES: 15%
5. HYPERCEMENTOSIS: SEVERAL
6. HEAVY DENTAL WEAR: COMMON
7. CITATIONS: MAPLES 1987: 30-31

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. NOTE: LITTLE DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN ARCHAIC AND INTRUSIVE/ NOTE: ALL DISCUSSED CONDITIONS SEEN IN ARCHAIC AND RARE IN INTRUSIVE
3. PERIOSTITIS: SEVERAL (MAPLES 1987: 30)
4. OSTEOARTHRITIS: COMMON (MAPLES 1987: 30)
5. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 18% (MAPLES 1987: 30) 10% OF ADULTS (HUTCHINSON 2004: 124)
6. BLUNT TRAUMA: 2%, 0% MALES, 5% FEMALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 125)
7. NEOPLASMS: 1.5% (MAPLES 1987: 31)
8. EBURNATION: 9% (MAPLES 1987: 30)
9. KIDNEY STONES: 1.5% (MAPLES 1987: 31)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. NOTE: NO COUNT ON ARTIFACTS JUST SOME BASIC TYPES DESCRIBED AND THIS INCLUDES BOTH ARCHAIC AND INTRUSIVE
3. ALL ARTIFACTS DISCUSSED IN UNKNOWN CONTEXT
4. CITATIONS: JONES AND CARR 1981: 84, 86

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NO POTTERY
2. BONE TOOLS AND ORNAMENTS: INCLUDING AWLS, (SOME OUT OF DOG BONE), CARVED BONE WORK SIMILAR TO TICK ISLAND, BUT SOME DIFFERENCES IN MOTIF, ATLATL HOOKS AND HANDLES
3. LITHIC TOOLS: INCLUDING SMALL FLINTS, SCRAPERS, AND KNIVES
4. BONE JEWELRY: HEADRESS: MADE OF 2 PIECES ANTLER & RACOON’S PENIS BONE
5. TUBULAR SHELL BEADS
6. DRILLED SHARKS TEETH
7. BONE HARPOON POINTS
8. RED OCHRE: SEVERAL DEPOSITS

VI. REFERENCES:

Jones, B. Calvin, and Robert Carr
Jones, B. Calvin, Louis Tesar, and Jonathan Lammers

Maples, William R.
1987 *Analysis of Skeletal Remains Recovered at the Gauthier Site, Brevard County, Florida,* Miscellaneous Project 31, Florida State Museum, Department of Anthropology, Gainesville.

Sigler-Eisenberg, Brenda
GOODMAN (MCCORMICK-GOODMAN) MOUND: (8DU66)- DUVAL COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 450 BP
2. COUNTY: DUVAL
3. PERIOD: VERY LATE ST. JOHNS IIB
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY, ARTIFACTS, ANIMAL BONES
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: ?
7. HEIGHT: 2 M
8. DIAMETER: 45 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: MCCORMICK MOUND SITE AND ADJACENT MIDDEN OR VILLAGE AREA
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 13+
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 13

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. TOP-VERY DARK HUMIC STAND MIXED WHOLE OYSTER SHELL
2. MIDDLE 1: SANDY DEPOSTS-LOWER-YELLOW BROWN, UPPER DARK BROWN
3. MIDDLE 2: RED OCHRE STAINED SAND, THEN A DEPOSIT OR LENS OF RELATIVELY CLEAN WHITE SAND, AND FOLLOWED BY A DEPOSIT OF RELATIVELY LOOSE OYSTER SHELLS MIXED WITH BROWN SAND AND SOMETIMES STRONGLY OCHRE STAINED- THIS LAYER WAS OFTEN INTERRUPTED BY LENSES OF SHELLS
4. MIDDLE 3: SERIES OF SAND DEPOSITS- NATURAL OR UNNATURAL?
5. MIDDLE 4- “3RD LAYER”: MIDDEN-SHELLY ZONE- OF CRUSHED & BROKEN SHELL FRAGMENTS OF FISH BONES, CHARCOAL CRUMBS, AND CULTURAL DEBRIS- ALMOST ALL POTTERY
6. MIDDLE 5: “2ND LAYER” -GRAY SAND LAYER-Sterile-BASE OF MIDDEN
7. BOTTOM LAYER: “1ST LAYER: LOWEST LEVEL-YELLOW SAND- STERILE
8. FEATURES: CHILDREN SACRIFICE
9. CITATIONS: JORDAN 1963: 24-33

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 100%
2. SECONDARY: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 8%
5. FLEXED: 54%
6. UNKNOWN: 38%
7. ORIENTATION: 13% EAST, 38% NORTH, 13% NORTHWEST, 25% NORTHEAST
8. CITATIONS: JORDAN 1963: 28-34

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 62%
3. AGE: 8 CHILDREN
4. SEX: 8 UNKNOWNS
5. GRAVE GOODS: SHELL BEADS, DISC BEADS, PERFORATED CARNIVORE TEETH, BONE PINS W/ RING OF FERRULE, PROJECTILE POINTS
III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 8%
2. FEMALE: 8%
3. UNKNOWN: 84%

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 85%
3. ADULT: 15%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. PATHOLOGICAL STRIAE: 0% (SIMPSON 2001: 150)

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. NO CLEAR PATHOLOGY ON BODIES REPORTED
2. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1963: 61-63

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHNS CHECKED STAMPED.
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 1 SHERD
4. BONE JEWELRY: 5
5. SHELL BEADS: 40
6. ANIMAL TEETH BEADS: 5
7. DISC BEADS: 42
8. PROJECTILE POINTS: 3
9. GRAPHITE: 1

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST JOHNS CHECKED STAMPED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN, ST. JOHNS SCORED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 2271 SHERDS
3. SHELL TOOLS: 3
4. BONE JEWELRY: 4
5. MAMMAL BONES: SOME
6. REPTILE BONES: SOME
7. CHERT FLAKES/ CORES: 4
8. PEBBLES/ GRAVEL: 1
VI. REFERENCES:

Bullen, Adelaide K.  

Jordan, Douglas F.  

Thunen, Robert L., and Keith H. Ashley  

Unknown author  
JONES MOUND: (8HI4)- HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1000 BP
2. COUNTY: HILLSBOROUGH
3. PERIOD: LATE WEEDEN ISLAND-EARLY SAFETY HARBOUR AND SAFETY HARBOUR CONTACT PERIOD?
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY, ARTIFACTS (BIRD EFFIGY ARTIFACTS)
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CIRCULAR
7. HEIGHT: 3 FT (0.91 M)
8. DIAMETER: 70 FT, (21.34 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 HORSESHOE RIDGE & 2 BORROW PITS
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 188+
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 188

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: WHOLE COMPLEX FACED EAST
2. MOUND BUILT UP OF YELLOWISH BROWN SAND
3. LARGE FIRE PLACE- 6FT IN DIAMETER- 5-6FT BELOW TOP OF MOUND
4. 2 FEATURES SIMILAR TO HOUSE FLOORS WITH ASSOCIATED FIREPLACES, BUT NO POSTHOLES IN SOUTHWEST QUADRANT OF MOUND
5. FLEXED BURIAL INHUMED PARTLY IN OR PARTLY BELOW SECOND FLOOR- LAST INTERMENT OF MOUND
6. 2ND FLOOR ALSO COMPOSED OD HARD PACKED, MORE OR LESS STICKY SOIL MIXED W/ ASHES AND CHARCOAL
7. 1ST FLOOR- FIREPLACE HAD DEPOSIT OF CHARCOAL AND ASHES CONTAINING BURNED SHELL AND BONE FRAGMENTS
8. FEATURES: 2 FIREPLACES
9. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1952: 43-47

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 76%
2. SECONDARY: 10%
3. UNKNOWN: 14%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 0%
5. FLEXED: 75%
6. BUNDLE: 2%
7. SKULL: 8%
8. CREMATION:1%
9. UNKNOWN: 14%
10. ALL FLEXED AND CREMATIONS ASSUMED TO BE PRIMARY?
11. ORIENTATION: WHOLE COMPLEX FACED EAST
12. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1952: 45, 47

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: MANY OF BURIALS AT LEAST 12%
3. AGE: ?
4. SEX: ?
5. GRAVE GOODS: BEADS, PENDANTS, CELTS, AWLS, SHARK TEETH, RED OCHRE, SHELL CUPS, ETC.
6. LAYER OVER BURIALS: KILLED CUPS & POTTERY CACHES
7. NOTE: ONLY OUTSTANDING BURIALS DESCRIBED INCLUDING TYPES OF GOODS, AMOUNTS OF GOODS, AND AGE AND SEX
8. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1952: 47-53; WILLEY 1949: 337

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 75%?
2. FEMALE: 25%?
3. NOTE: ADULT MEN OUTNUMBER ADULT WOMEN 3 TO 1
4. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1952: 47

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 5%
2. SUBADULT: 12%
3. ADULT: 65%
4. 50YRS+: 13%
5. UNKNOWN: 5%
6. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1952: 47

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL AND OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. NO AVAILABLE HEALTH DATA

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ?
3. TOTAL POTTERY: ?
4. SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS: AT LEAST 6
5. CELTS: 3
6. SHELL JEWELRY: MANY
7. STONE JEWELRY: MANY (MANY OF THEM ARE BIRD-HEAD STONE PENDANTS)
8. SHELL BEADS: MANY
9. STONE BEADS: MANY
10. RED OCHRE: 22 BURIALS
11. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1952: 47-53

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: PAPYS BAYOU PUNCTUATED, PINELLAS PLAIN, ST. JOHNS PLAIN, SAFETY HARBOR INCISED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 51 SHERDS (AVAILABLE STUDY SAMPLE)
3. STONE TOOLS: 61
4. COPPER JEWELRY: 1
5. SHELL BEADS: 1
6. GLASS BEADS: 1
7. EUROPEAN TRAPE PIPE: 1
8. EUROPEAN COPPER CONCAVE SHEET USED ORNAMENT: 1
9. SHELL: SOME
10. PROJECTILE POINTS: 193
11. CHERT FLAKES/ CORES: 52
12. COPPER FRAGMENTS: 1+ (EUROPEAN)
13. SMOOTH STONE BALL: 1

VI. REFERENCES:

Bullen, Ripley P.
LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3: (8LE1)-LEON COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 550 BP
2. COUNTY: LEON
3. PERIOD: FORT WALTON (AD 1250-1500)
4. DATING METHOD: SEVERAL C-14 SAMPLES, ARTIFACTS
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: SQUARE
7. HEIGHT: 5 M
8. DIAMETER: 48 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: SEVERAL MOUNDS INCLUDING: TEMPLE AND BURIAL MOUNDS, MIDDENS AND A VILLAGE
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 25?
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 25

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTE: 3 PHASES
2. 3RD PHASE LEVEL 1 (SURGE IN CONSTRUCTION, 40% OF BURIALS, SOUTHEASTERN CEREMONIAL COMPLEX) (481.5CM-505.5CM)
3. L1 OVER 10 BURIALS SOUTHEASTERN CEREMONIAL COMPLEX (COPPER PLATES) STRUCTURES ON MOUND
4. 2ND PHASES (DECLINE IN BURIALS AND SLIGHT INCREASE IN STRUCTURE LEVELS 2-7 (171.5CM-301.5CM)
5. FLOOR 7-FLOOR 2: (3 BURIALS-INDIVIDUALS) POST PATTERN EVIDENCE OF STRUCTURES
6. 1ST PHASE 5 STRUCTURAL PERIOD LEVELS 8-12 (1.5CM-150.5CM)
7. FLOOR 11- FLOOR 8: 10 BURIALS (9 IN 3 GROUPS) COMPOSED OF THIN SAND AND CLAY LAYERS-PARTIALLY BURNED, COMPACTED SURFACES/ LARGE MASS OF CHARRED CORN COVERING ON B6 OF LEVEL 11
8. PREMOUND MIDDEN CHARCOAL
9. FEATURES: TOMBS NEVER INTRUDED ON OTHER & CARFUL PLACEMENT DONE/ SEVERAL BURIALS PLACED NEAR SUMMIT EDGE
10. ONLY 1 FIRE PIT FOUND ON VERY TOP

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 100%
2. SECONDARY: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 42%
5. FLEXED: 38%
6. CREMATION: 4%
7. UNKNOWN: 17%
8. ORIENTATION: 13% SOUTHEAST, 43% SOUTHWEST, 30% NORTHWEST, 13% NORTHEAST
9. DOG BURIAL: 1 ON LEVEL 11
B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 77%
3. AGE: 10 ADULTS, 2 JUVENILES, 5 SENILES
4. SEX: 15 MALES, 2 FEMALE
5. GRAVE GOODS: 1 BURIAL WITH 25 DIFFERENT TYPES OF GOODS, 3 BURIALS WITH 14-15 DIFFERENT TYPES OF GOODS
6. LARGE MASS OF CHARRED CORN COVERING OF B6 WOODEN TOMB-LEVEL 11
7. OFTEN SERIES OF BODY ENCASEMENTS:
8. OUTERMOST LAYER WOODEN TOMB COVERING/
9. NEXT LAYER LEATHER WRAPPING OR COVERINGS OVER CANE MATTING
10. FOLLOWED BY WOVEN CLOTH COVERINGS, WRAPPINGS OR CLOTHING OVER BODY
11. BODY USUALLY LAY ON LEATHER
12. WHEN COPPER PLATES WERE PRESENT OVER THE BODY, SEVERAL LAYERS OF CLOTH WERE USUALLY BETWEEN THE COPPER AND THE BODY

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 85%
2. FEMALE: 10%
3. UNKNOWN: 5%

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 10%
3. ADULT: 75%
4. 50YRS+: 10%
5. UNKNOWN: 5%
6. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 41
7. MALES: 44
8. FEMALES: 43
9. STATURE: ?

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. CARIES: 85%
3. HYPOPLASIA: 100%
4. PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS: 50%
5. PATHOLOGICAL STRIAE: 75% (SIMPSON 2001: 150)
6. ABSCESSES: 3 BURIALS
7. CITATIONS: ALL DENTAL EXCEPT PATHO. STRIAE; STOREY 2002: 68-75

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. PERIOSTITIS: 41%
2. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 25%
3. OSTEOARTHRITIS: ONLY A FEW SURFACES PRESENT FOR MOST ADULTS - 1 BURIAL SERIOUS
4. ANEMIA: PRESENT BUT RARE
5. LAKE JACKSON'S DESCENDENTS AT PATALE WERE HEATHIER
6. CITATIONS: STOREY 2002: 68-75

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NO IDENTIFICATION OF TYPES
3. TOTAL: 2 POTTERY VESSELS, 3 STONE VESSELS
4. SHELL TOOLS: 3
5. STONE TOOLS: 3
6. SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS: 4
7. WOODEN/ FLORAL ARTIFACTS: 18
8. ANTLER TOOLS: 1
9. CELTS (STONE/ SHELL): 3
10. SHELL JEWELRY: 11
11. COPPER JEWELRY: 15
12. COPPER BREAST PLATES: 12
13. SHELL BEADS: 18
14. PEARL BEADS: 16
15. SHARK TEETH JEWELRY: 1
16. HUMAN TEETH JEWELRY: 1
17. HUMAN HAIR: 1
18. COPPER AXE: 8
19. MAMMAL BONE: 1
20. SHARK KNIFE: 1
21. PROJECTILE POINTS: 5
22. DISCOIDALS: 3
23. MICA: 3
24. GALENA FASTENERS: 1
25. GALENA MIRROR FRAME: 1
26. PEBBLES/ GRAVEL: 2
27. RED OCHRE: SOME DEPOSITS/ 3 WITH GOODS
28. YELLOW OCHRE: SOME DEPOSITS
29. BIRD EFFIGY: 1
30. CITATIONS: JONES 1994: 125-144

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. POTTERY SAMPLE CAME FROM 38 DIFFERENT PROVIENCES.
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: FT. WALTON INCISED, MARSH ISLAND INCISED, SAFETY HARBOR INCISED
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 2959 SHERDS/ 318 SHERDS OF DECORATED CERAMICS STUDIED
4. CITATIONS: JONES 1982: 19, 41

VI. REFERENCES:

Jones, B. Calvin

Jones, B. Calvin and Robert Carr

Simpson, Scott W.

Storey, Rebecca
1993  Catalog of the Lake Jackson Mound 3 Skeletons, Letter to Dr. James Miller, Ms. on file, Florida Master Site File, Bureau of Archaeological Research, Florida Department of State, Tallahassee.

MACKENZIE MOUND: (8MR64)- MARION COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 950 BP
2. COUNTY: MARION
3. PERIOD: LATE WEEDEN ISLAND/ ST. JOHNS IIA (AD 800-1200)
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY, BURIAL STYLE
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CIRCULAR
7. HEIGHT: 3FT (0.91 M)
8. DIAMETER: 75FT (22.86 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: VILLAGE
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 23
11. STUDIED BODIES: 24

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. TOP LAYER : ACTUALCONSTRUCTION OF MOUND: CLEAN SAND
2. EAST AND WEST SIDE SHERD CONCENTRATIONS, 1 SINGLE AND 1 DOUBLE SKULL BURIAL, 1 INFANT WITH NUMEROUS SHELL BDS (SACRIFICE)
3. MIDDLE LAYER 1: COMMON CHARNEL HOUSE, CHARRED LOGS & CHARCOAL
4. 2 FLEXED, 3 BUNDLES ON THEN SURFACE OF MOUND
5. BOTTOM LAYER: HUMUS
6. 14 BODIES IN SHALLOW PITS: 13 BUNDLES, 1 FLEXED
7. CHARNEL HOUSE: YES
8. OTHER FEATURES:
9. SACRED FIRE
10. INFANT SACRIFICE
11. POTTERY CONCENTRATION ON EAST AND WEST SIDES OF MOUND

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 13%
2. SECONDARY: 74%
3. UNKNOWN: 13%
4. FLEXED: 13%
5. BUNDLE: 71%
6. SKULL: 12%
7. UNKNOWN: 4%
8. ORIENTATION: 1 NORTH, 2 NORTHWEST, 1 SOUTHEAST
9. NOTE: ALL BURIALS IN EXTREMELY BAD SHAPE
10. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 22-23

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 9%
3. SEX: 2 UNKNOWN
4. AGE: 1 INFANT, 1 UNKNOWN
5. GRAVE GOODS: 40 SHELL BEADS, 1 ST. JOHNS PLAIN VESSEL, 1 CHERT FLAKE, 1 SHELL DIPPER
6. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 22

221
III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 0%
2. FEMALE: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 100%
4. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 4-6

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 4%
2. SUBADULT: 0%
3. ADULT: 0%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 96%
6. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 22

IV. HEALTH
1. NO HEALTH DATA
2. CITATION: SEARS 1959: 22

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHNS PLAIN
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 1 VESSEL
4. SHELL CUP/ DIPPER: 1
5. SHELL BEADS: 40
6. CHERT FLAKES/ CORE: 1
7. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 22-28

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHNS PLAIN, DUNNS CREEK RED, PASCO PLAIN
   WEEDEEN ISLAND INCISED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 2194 SHERDS
3. MICA SHEETS: SEVERAL UNWORKED SHEETS
4. PROJECTILE POINTS: 4
5. CITATIONS: SEARS 1959: 22-28

VI. REFERENCES:

Sears, William H.
MANASOTA KEY: (8SO1292)- SARASOTA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1730 BP
2. COUNTY: SARASOTA
3. PERIOD: TRANSITIONAL- LATE MANASOTA/ CALOOSAHATCHEE I (AD 220)
4. DATING METHOD: 4- C-14 SAMPLES OF HUMAN BONE AND SHELL- AVERAGE DATE- 1,730 BP)
5. MOUND: NO- CEMETARY?, ?BACKDUNE DEPRESSION?
6. SHAPE: ?
7. HEIGHT: ?
8. DIAMETER: ?
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 MIDDEN
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 120+
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 120

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: BURIAL SITE TYPE UNKNOWN-COULD HAVE SUFFERED SEVERE EROSION AND STORM DAMAGE
2. BURIALS SINGLE OR IN GROUPS 2-5
3. FEW ARTIFACTS IN MIDDEN OR BURIALS
4. ARTIFACTS: SMALL AMOUNTS OF SAND TEMPERED POTTERY, GOODLAND RED POTTERY, A SHELL HAMMER, AND A FEW DEER BONE TOOLS

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 100%
2. SECONDARY: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 0%
5. FLEXED: 100%
6. BUNDLE: 0%
7. UNKNOWN: 0%
8. ORIENTATION: MOST BURIALS ORIENTED WEST TOWARD THE SEA

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: ?
2. GRAVE GOODS: SOME WITH CONCH SHELLS

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 59%
2. FEMALE: 41%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. CITATIONS: DICKEL 1991: 27, 30-32, 64-66
B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 19%
2. SUBADULT: 15%
3. ADULT: 65%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
6. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 29, 28 MALES, 29 FEMALES
7. STATURE: OVERALL: 1.64M, 1.66M MALES, 1.57M FEMALES
8. CITATIONS: DICKEL 1991: 27, 30-32, 64-66

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. CARIES: 9.4% (DICKEL 1991: 68), 9% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 102, 103)
3. 4% MALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 103)
4. 5% FEMALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 103)
5. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 78% (DICKEL 1991: 53, 55, 56, 57; HUTCHINSON 2004: 109, 110;)
   12% OF ADULTS (DICKEL 1991: 53, 55, 56, 57)
   17% MALES (; DICKEL 1991: 53, 55, 56, 57; HUTCHINSON 2004: 110)
   12% FEMALES (DICKEL 1991: 53, 55, 56, 57; HUTCHINSON 2004: 110;)
6. 17% MALES (DICKEL 1991: 53, 55, 56, 57; HUTCHINSON 2004: 110)
7. 4% FEMALES (DICKEL 1991: 53, 55, 56, 57; HUTCHINSON 2004: 110;)
8. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 38%
9. 42% MALES
10. 53% FEMALES
11. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 105, 106
12. REABSORPTION/ PERIODONTAL DISEASE: 58% OF ADULTS,
13. 67% MALES
14. 82% FEMALES
15. CITATIONS: DICKEL 1991: 84, 90-92
16. ABScesses: 38%
17. 42% MALES
18. 53% FEMALES
19. CITATIONS: DICKEL 1991: 71
20. HYPERCEMENTOSIS: 9% OF ADULTS
21. 9% MALES
22. 9% FEMALES
23. CITATIONS: DICKEL 1991: 92
24. CALCULUS: 52% OF CHILDREN, 51% OF ADULTS
25. 58% MALES
26. 64% FEMALES
27. CITATIONS: DICKEL 1991: 81-84
28. PERIODONTAL DISEASE: 58% OF ADULTS
29. 67% MALES
30. 82% FEMALES

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 17.6%
3. 25% MALES
4. 16% FEMALES
5. CITATIONS: DICKEL 1991: 33, 35, 36, 40-43
6. OSTEOMYELITIS: INCLUDED IN PERIOSTITIS
7. SKELETAL LESIONS: 18% (SAME AS PERIOSTITIS)
8. 25% MALES
9. 16% FEMALES
10. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 114, 115
11. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 44%
12. 54% MALES
13. 47% FEMALES
15. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 24% (DICKEL 1991: 50, 52, 53) 26% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 111, 112)
16. 32% MALES (DICKEL 1991: 50, 52, 53) 37% MALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 112)
17. 62% FEMALES (DICKEL 1991: 50, 52, 53; (HUTCHINSON 2004: 112)
18. CRIBRA ORBITALIA: 4.8% (DICKEL 1991: 50, 52, 53)
19. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 13% (DICKEL 1991: 43, 44, 46, 47) 11% OF ADULTS, (10% OF ADULTS POSTCRANIA AND 1% OF ADULTS POSTCRANIA AND CRANIA)
(HUTCHINSON 2004: 124)
20. 21% MALES (DICKEL 1991: 43, 44, 46, 47)
21. 16% FEMALES (DICKEL 1991: 43, 44, 46, 47)
22. BLUNT TRAUMA: 1%
23. 0% MALES
24. 6% FEMALES
25. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 125
26. CONGENITAL DEFECTS: 5.9% (DICKEL 1991: 47-48)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: ?
2. VERY LITTLE DOCUMENTATION ON CONTEXT OF ARTIFACTS

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SAND TEMP PLAIN, GOODLAND RED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: SMALL AMOUNTS
3. SHELL TOOLS: SMALL AMOUNT
4. BONE TOOLS: FEW

VI. REFERENCES:

Austin, Robert J., Harry M. Piper, Kenneth W. Hardin, Jacquelyn G. Piper, and Barbara McCabe

Dickel, David

Hutchinson, Dale L.

Luer, George M.
MAYPORT MOUND: (8DU96)- DUVAL COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1800 BP
2. COUNTY: DUVAL
3. PERIOD: SWIFT CREEK
4. DATING METHOD: C-14- AD 85 +/- 95YRS, POTTERY
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: ELLIPTICAL
7. HEIGHT: 3- 4FT (1.22 M)
8. DIAMETER: 50 FT (15.24 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 MIDDEN
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 43
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 46 BURIAL REMAINS
12. CITATIONS: ASHLEY 1998: 206-211; WILSON 1965: 5-6, 26, 31;

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: MOUND PRECEDED SURROUNDING MIDDEN
2. CENTER AREA AVOIDED DUE TO DISTURBANCE
3. TOP LAYER: GRAY HUMIC SAND
4. MIDDLE LAYER: SHELL/BURIALS (NO PITS FOUND)
5. MIDDLE LAYER 2: GRAY BROWN HUMIC SAND/ BURIALS (NO PITS FOUND)
6. BOTTOM: WHITE SAND
7. FEATURES: 2 REFUSE PITS ON EAST FLANK OF MOUND
8. CHARNEL HOUSE: NO

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 83%
2. SECONDARY: 17%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 43%
5. FLEXED: 9%
6. BUNDLE: 17%
7. SKULL: 9%
8. UNKNOWN: 22%

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 57%
3. AGE: 21 ADULTS, 3 CHILDREN, 1 SENILE
4. SEX: 6 MALES, 1 FEMALE, 19 UNKNOWNS
5. GRAVE GOODS: FOOD OFFERING, POTTERY, STONE TOOLS, MICA SHEETS, ARROWS, COPPER JEWELRY
6. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: POTTERY, SOME POTTERY MAY HAVE HELD FOOD
7. CITATIONS: WILSON 1965: 11-13
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III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 20%
2. FEMALE: 4%
3. UNKNOWN: 76%
4. CITATIONS: WILSON 1965: 11-13

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 7%
3. ADULT: 82%
4. 50YRS+: 4%
5. UNKNOWN: 7%

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PATHOLOGICAL STRIAE: 71% (SIMPSON 2001: 150)
3. DENTAL WEAR: EXTREME WEAR COMMON (WILSON 1965: 11-13, 28)

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 1 INDIVIDUAL: 2.2%- 14.3% MALES
3. VIOLENT DEATH: 2.2%
4. RICKETS: 2.2%
5. CITATIONS: WILSON 1965: 11-13, 28

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SWIFT CREEK COMPLICATED STAMPED, DUNNS CREEK RED, PLAIN POTTERY
3. TOTAL POTTERY: MANY SHERDS
4. STONE TOOLS: 2
5. CELTS (STONE): 1
6. MICA SHEET: 2
7. STONE JEWELRY: 1
8. POTTERY JEWELRY: 1
9. COPPER JEWELRY: 1
10. SHELL BEADS: 208
11. STONE BEADS: 1
12. PROJECTILE POINTS: 3
13. RED OCHRE: 3 BURIALS
14. SHELL: MUCH- OFTEN USED AROUND SEVERAL BURIALS
15. STEALITE DISC FRAGMENT: 1

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SAND TEMPERED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN, DUNNS CREEK RED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 3,433 SHERDS (INCLUDED POTTERY FROM INDIVIDUAL BURIALS)
3. POTTERY JEWELRY: 1
4. PROJECTILE POINT: 4
5. CHERT FLAKES/ CORES: 5
6. CITATIONS: WILSON 1965: 15-25

VI. REFERENCES:

Ashley, Keith H.

Simpson, Scott W.

Thunen, Robert L., and Keith H. Ashley

Wilson, Rex L.
MCKEITHEN MOUND B: (8COL17)- COLUMBIA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1596 BP
2. COUNTY: COLUMBIA
3. PERIOD: WEEDEN ISLAND
4. DATING METHOD: 3 C-14- AD 354 +/- 43 YRS, POTTERY
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: RECTANGULAR (NOW CIRCULAR)
7. HEIGHT: 1 M
8. DIAMETER: 27 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 2 MOUNDS: 1 TEMPLE AND 1 BURIAL, VILLAGE, SEVERAL MIDDENS
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 1
11. STUDIED BODIES: 1

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTE: PLATFORM MOUND 40CM, 3M ABOVE CENTER OF PLAZA
2. PLATFORM COMPOSED OF HUMUS AND MIDDEN DEPOSITS
3. BURNED STRUCTURE WITH RED OCHRE AND CERAMIC DEPOSITS, REMAINS OF 2 DEER
4. TOMB OF RELIGIOUS SPECIALIST OR IMPORTANT WOMAN W/ POSTS
5. BIRD EFFIGY HEAD WITH BURIAL
6. OTHER FEATURES: POTTERY CAP
7. CHARNEL HOUSE: NO
8. CITATIONS: MILANICH ET AL. 1997: XVI, 105-109

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 100%
2. SECONDARY: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 100%
5. FLEXED: 0%
6. BUNDLE: 0%
7. UNKNOWN: 0%

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 100%
3. GRAVE GOODS: RED OCHRE, HEADRESS, TURKEY VULTURE EFFIGY HEAD

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX AND AGE
1. 1 GRACILE FEMALE IN MID TO LATE 30S
2. CITATIONS: MILANICH ET AL. 1997: XVI, 109
IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. NO DENTAL DATA

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. THE SINGLE INDIVIDUAL WAS KILLED BY A PROJECTILE POINT

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NONE
3. BONE JEWELRY: 1 HEADRESS
4. RED OCHRE: BY HEAD
5. BIRD FIGURINES: 1 VULTURE CERAMIC HEAD

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: WEEDEN ISLAND ZONED RED, PAPYS BAYOU PLAIN, WEEDEN ISLAND INCISED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 15 VESSELS
3. MAMMAL BONES: 2 DEER
4. SEVERAL QUARTZ CRYSTALS
5. RED OCHRE: SEVERAL DEPOSITS

VI. REFERENCES:

Kohler, Timothy

Milanich, Jerald T., Anne S. Cordell, Vernon J. Knight Jr., Timothy A. Kohler, Brenad J. Sigler-Lavelle

Simpson, Scott W.
MCKEITHEN MOUND C: (8COL17)- COLUMBIA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1480 BP
2. COUNTY: COLUMBIA
3. PERIOD: WEEDEEN ISLAND (AD 450-480)
4. DATING METHOD: SEVERAL C-14 SAMPLES- AD 200-750, POTTERY
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CIRCULAR
7. HEIGHT: 1M
8. DIAMETER: 21 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 2 MOUNDS: 1 TEMPLE AND 1 BURIAL, VILLAGE, SEVERAL MIDDENS
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 72+
11. STUDIED BODIES: 36

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTE: LARGE PLATFORM MOUND WITH CHARNEL HOUSE
2. COMPOSITION: VERY MOTTLED SOIL
3. MOUND CAP INCLUDED 40 SANDSTONE AND LIMESTONE ROCKS
4. TOP OF MOUND: CHARNEL HOUSE ON TOP, CONTAINING BUNDLE BURIALS
5. EVIDENCE OF FIRE AND FEAST
6. CERAMIC VESSELS AND EFFIGIES ALSO DEPOSITED ON TOP/ 18 VESSEL CACHE
7. EACH BUNDLE LAID ON LAYER OF CLEAN SAND
8. POTTERY CACHE CAP/ SOUTHEAST CORNER OF PLATFORM
9. CHARNEL HOUSE: YES
10. 40 LIMESTONE AND SANDSTONE ROCKS IN SIZE FROM THAN OF A GRAPEFRUIT TO A 12 INCH SCREEN TELEVISION

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 0%
2. SECONDARY: 100%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. FLEXED: 0%
5. BUNDLE: 100%
6. UNKNOWN: 0%

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: NO
2. LAYER OVER BURIALS: EFFIGIES, POTTERY, FEAST

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 28%
2. FEMALE: 25%
3. UNKNOWN: 47%
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B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 28%
3. ADULT: 53%
4. 50YRS+: 19%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
6. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL 45, 47 MALES, 44 FEMALES
7. CITATIONS: MILANICH ET AL. 1997: 116

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. PATHOLOGICAL STRIAE: 67% (SIMPSON 2001: 150)
3. NO OTHER HEALTH DATA AVAILABLE

V. GRAVE GOODS:

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: NO
2. CITATIONS: MILANICH ET AL. 1997: 115

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: WEEDEN ISLAND RED, WEEDEN ISLAND INCISED,
   PAPYS BAYOU PLAIN
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 19 VESSELS
3. MAMMAL BONES: 1 RODENT
4. REPTILE BONES: 1 TURTLE
5. FISH BONES: 1 FISH
6. BIRD EFFIGIES: INCLUDED IN THE POTTERY
7. CITATIONS: MILANICH ET AL. 1997: 115, 105

VI. REFERENCES:

Kohler, Timothy
1980 The Social Dimension of Village Occupation at the McKeithen Site, North Florida. Southeastern
Archaeological Bulletin 22.

Milanich, Jerald T., Anne S. Cordell, Vernon J. Knight Jr., Timothy A. Kohler, Brenad J.
Sigler-Lavelle

Simpson, Scott W.
2001 Patterns of Growth Disruption in La Florida: Evidence from Enamel Microstructure. In
Bioarchaeology of Florida, edited by Clark Spencer Larsen, pp. 146-180, University Press of
Florida, Gainesville.
PALMER MOUND: (8SO2)- SARASOTA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1450 BP
2. COUNTY: SARASOTA
3. PERIOD: WEEDEN ISLAND (AD 500-800?) / MID-LATE MANASOTA (AD 400- 800)
4. DATING METHOD: C-14- AD 910 AND 400 BC, POTTERY, SHELL TOOLS, LITHICS
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: DOME
7. HEIGHT: 4 FT (1.22 M)
8. DIAMETER: 74.6 FT (22.73 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 3 MIDDENS
10. TOTAL INDIVIDUALS: 429
11. STUDIED INDIVIDUALS: 429

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. TOP ZONE: THIN, DARKISH, HUMIC
2. MOD DEBRIS, MOUND CAPPED WITH SEVERAL BURIALS
3. MIDDLE ZONE: LIGHT UPPER LAYER AND DARKER LOWER LAYER/ WHITE SAND
   UPPER LAYER
4. REDDISH DIRT DEPOSIT, SHELL DEPOSIT, BURIALS, POTTERY,
5. BOTTOM ZONE: BLACK, GRAY, OR DARK BROWN
6. CHARCOAL, BURIALS
7. CHARNEL HOUSE: POSSIBLE
8. OTHER FEATURES: 2 LIMESTONE AND 2 BOG IRON ROCKS OVER 1 BURIAL, A
   SHERD PATH
9. NOTES: CONTINUOUSLY USED MOUND
10. NO POTTERY CACHE

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 88%
2. SECONDARY: 12%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. FLEXED: 75%
5. BUNDLE: 7%
6. SKULL: 6%
7. UNKNOWN: 13%
8. DOG BURIALS: 4
9. GATOR BURIALS: 1
10. NOTES: 52 BURIALS HAD 2 INDIVIDUALS,
11. BODY POSITION FOR LESS THAN 400 OF THE SAMPLE
12. STRINGS OF SAWFISH VERTEBRA PLACED PARALELLED TO ALLIGATOR BODY

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: NONE
2. GRAVE GOODS:
3. NO CLEAR EVIDENCE-JUST A LAYER OF MATERIAL OVER TOP OF ALL BURIALS
4. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: INVERTED CLAY VESSELS AND SHARK TEETH OVER 80% OF BURIALS
5. NOTE: 2 LIMESTONE AND 2 BOG IRON ROCKS OVER 1 BURIAL
6. CITATIONS: BULLEN AND BULLEN 1976: 41, 46, 47

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 17%
2. FEMALE: 17%
3. UNKNOWN: 66%
4. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 56

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0.2%
2. SUBADULT: 11%
3. ADULT: 79%
4. 50YRS+: 1%
5. UNKNOWN: 9%
6. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 40, 39 MALES, 38 FEMALES
7. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 56

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. CARIES: 3%
3. 4% MALES
4. 2% FEMALES
5. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 62, 63, 102, 103
6. DENTAL CHIPPING: 19%
7. 26% MALES
8. 32% FEMALES
10. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 78%
11. 80% MALES
12. 71% FEMALES
13. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 63, 64, 109, 110
14. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 14%
15. 14% MALES
16. 21% FEMALES
17. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 105, 106
18. PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS: 26%
19. 29% MALES
20. 31% FEMALES
22. REABSORPTION/ PERIODONTAL DISEASE: 23%
23. 25% MALES
24. 29% FEMALES
25. CITATIONS HUTCHINSON 2004: 66
26. HEAVY DENTAL WEAR: COMMON (HUTCHINSON 2004: 64)

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 8%
3. 8% MALES
4. 14% FEMALES
5. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 72
6. OSTEOMYELITIS: 0.5% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 72)
7. SKELETAL LESIONS: 6%
8. 8% MALES
9. 14% FEMALES
10. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 114
11. SYSTEMIC INFECTION: 4%
12. 7% MALES
13. 8% FEMALES
14. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 75)
15. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 11%
16. 20% MALES
17. 24% FEMALES
18. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 80, 81, 122
19. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 29%
20. 56% MALES
21. 39% FEMALES
22. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 111
23. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 4% OF ADULTS, 1% POSTCRANIA, 2% CRANIA, 1% CRANIA AND POSTCRANIA (HUTCHINSON 2004: 124)
24. BLUNT TRAUMA: 3%
25. 11% MALES
26. 5% FEMALES
27. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 125
28. TREPONEMAL INFECTION: 2%
29. 5% MALES
30. 3% FEMALES
31. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 77

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: NO
2. NO CLEAR EVIDENCE OF INDIVIDUAL GOODS
3. CITATIONS: BULLEN AND BULLEN 1976: 41-44

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHNS CHECKED STAMPED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN, BELLE GLADE PLAIN
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 8569 SHERDS
3. SHELL TOOLS: 8
4. BONE TOOLS: 1
5. STONE TOOLS: 2
6. SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS: 3
7. BONE JEWELRY: 1
8. STONE JEWELRY: 2
9. ANIMAL TEETH OR BONE BEADS: 2 SHARK VERTEBRA BEADS, 2 STRINGS OF SAWFISH VERTEBRA BEADS
10. SHARK TEETH: 52
11. FOSSILS: 16
12. PROJECTILE POINTS: 6
13. CHERT FLAKES/ CORES: 1
14. YELLOW OCHRE CLAY: 1
15. FLUTE OF HUMAN BONE: 1
VI. REFERENCES:

Bullen, Ripley P., and Adelaide K.

Hutchinson, Dale L.

Luer, George M.

Luer, George M., and Marion M. Almy
PARRISH MOUND 2: (8MA2)- MANATEE COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 500 BP
2. COUNTY: MANATEE
3. PERIOD: SAFETY HARBOR- SAFETY HARBOR CONTACT PERIOD? (AD 1200-1500)
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY, ARTIFACTS
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: DOME
7. HEIGHT: 6 FT (1.83 M)
8. DIAMETER: 63 X 65 FT (19.8 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: ISOLATE
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 82
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 41

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: SAND MOUND
2. STAGES IN CONSTRUCTION:
3. 1. CREMATION PIT
4. 2. SAND MOUND OF 6FT HEIGHT
5. 3. TEMPLE/CHARNEL HOUSE WHICH WAS BURNED IN CEREMONY
6. TOP: CHARRED RECTANGULAR WOODEN STRUCTURE ON TOP-WITH ASSOCIATED CREMATIONS
7. MIDDLE: CIRCULAR PIT 5.5FT- 7FT BELOW FILLED WITH CHARCOAL,SECONDARY CREMATIONS, PRIMARY CREMATION, SECONDARY NONCREMATED BURIAL
8. CHARNEL HOUSE: YES
9. FEATURES: LARGE CREMATION PIT, SEVERAL CHARCOAL PITS
10. TEMPLE ON TOP BURNED BY FIRE
11. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 146-149

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 5%
2. SECONDARY: 95%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. FLEXED: 10%
5. BUNDLE: 5%
6. CREMATION: 95%
7. UNKNOWN: 0%
8. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 148

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: LIKELY
2. GRAVE GOODS: SHELL CUPS, FLINT POINTS, EUROPEAN OBJECTS

III. & IV. SEX, AGE, & STATURE & HEALTH
1. NO AVAILABLE DATA ON SEX, AGE, OR HEALTH
V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
   1. PRESENT: LIKELY

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
   1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: PINELLAS PLAIN, PINELLAS INCISED, BELLE GLADE PLAIN
   2. TOTAL POTTERY: 58 SHERDS (AVAILABLE STUDY SAMPLE)
   3. SHELL TOOLS: 1
   4. SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS: 4
   5. WOODEN ARTIFACTS: NUMEROUS, INCLUDING- GORGET OF COILED RATTLESNAKE (MILANICH 1994: 403)
   6. ROPE: SEVERAL FRAGMENTS
   7. STONE JEWELRY: 2
   8. BRASSE JEWELRY: 1
   9. SHELL BEADS: 2
  10. GLASS BEADS: 3
  11. EUROPEAN BONE OR TORTOISE SHELL COMB: 1
  12. PROJECTILE POINTS: 3
  13. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 149-151

VI. REFERENCES:

Willey, Gordon R.
1949 Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast. Miscellaneous Contributions No. 113, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
PATALE (SAN PEDRO Y SAN PABLO PATALE) MISSION: (8LE152)- LEON COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 290 BP
   2. COUNTY: LEON
   3. PERIOD: 17TH CENTURY SPANISH MISSION (AD 1633-1704)
   4. DATING METHOD: HISTORIC DOCUMENTS, ARTIFACTS
   5. MOUND: NO- CHURCH CEMETERY- INSIDE CHURCH
   6. AREA: 20.5 X 10.5- 11 M
   7. ADJACENT FEATURES: INSIDE CHURCH
   8. TOTAL INDIVIDUALS: 67
   9. STUDIED INDIVIDUALS: 58

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. NOTES: CHURCH CEMETERY
   2. ALL BURIALS PLACED WITH THE CHURCH & EACH BURIAL PLACED IN AN INDIVIDUAL PIT
   3. ALL BURIALS IN STRAIGHT ROWS
   4. BURIALS 25-45CM BELOW CURRENT GROUND SURFACE
   5. PITS-OBLong 42-86CM WIDE, 90-245CM LONG & 100-150CM DEEP
   6. ADULTS MOST LIKELY TO BE BURIED IN BACK RIGHT QUADRANT OF CEMETERY
   7. SUBADULTS IN BACK LEFT QUADRANT

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 100%
   2. SECONDARY: 0%
   3. UNKNOWN: 0%
   4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 96%
   5. UNKNOWN: 4%
   6. ORIENTATION: 100% NORTHEAST
   7. NOTE: STRAIGHT ROWS AND PITS ORIENTED PARALLEL TO LONG AXIS OF CHURCH – THE PRESENCE OF THE PITS ALLOWED THE DETECTION OF THE ORIENTATION FOR ALL 67 INDIVIDUALS.

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
   2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 21%
   3. AGE: 8 ADULTS, 4 JUVENILES, 2 UNKNOWNS
   4. SEX: 2 MALE, 12 UNKNOWNS
   5. GRAVE GOODS: GLASS, COPPER, & OTHER BEADS, LEATHER POUCHES, SHELL FASTENERS OR PENDANTS, COPPER RINGS, QUARTZ PEBBLES
III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 13%
2. FEMALE: 19%
3. UNKNOWN: 67%

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 1%
2. SUBADULT: 28%
3. ADULT: 42%
4. 50YRS+: 12%
5. UNKNOWN: 16%
6. AVERAGE AGE:?
7. STATURE: ?
8. CITATIONS: JONES ET AL. 1991: 118

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. CARIES: 24%,
3. 44% MALES
4. 15% FEMALES
5. CITATIONS:
6. PATHOLOGICAL STRIAE: 100% (SIMPSON 2001: 150)
7. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 1.7%
8. PREMORTHEM TOOTH LOSS: 5.2%
9. REABSORPTION/ PERIODONTAL DISEASE: 3.4%
10. HEAVEY DENTAL WEAR: NOT PRESENT
11. CALCULUS: 1.7%
12. PERIODONTAL DISEASE: 1.7%

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 3.4%
3. OSTEOMYELITIS: 1.7%
4. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 1.7%
5. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 0%
6. C Ribra Orbitalia: 0%
7. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 0%
8. BLUNT TRAUMA: 0%
9. VIOLENT DEATH OR INJURY: 0%
10. ANEMIA: 0% OR 3.4%?
11. LYTIC DISEASE: 5.2%
12. NONSPECIFIC INFECTION: 1.7%
13. HEALTH STRESS: 3.4%
14. CONGENITAL DEFECTS: 0%
15. OVERALL HEALTH: VERY GOOD
17. BODIES HEALTHIER THAN THOSE OF THEIR ANCESTORS FROM HIGH STATUS LAKE JACKSON MOUND 3 (STOREY 2002: 68-75)
V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
   1. PRESENT: YES
   2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NO POTTERY
   3. SHELL JEWELRY: 6
   4. STONE JEWELRY: 4
   5. SHELL BEADS: 24
   6. GLASS BEADS: 891
   7. COPPER BEADS: 153
   8. UNLISTED BEADS: 3
   9. LEATHER OR CLOTH POUCH: 3

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
   1. ALL GRAVE GOODS WERE FOUND WITH INDIVIDUAL BURIALS

VI. REFERENCES:

Jones, B. Calvin, Rebecca Storey, and Randolph J. Widmer

Storey, Rebecca

Storey, Rebecca, and Randolph J. Widmer
PERICO ISLAND: (8MA6)- MANATEE COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 2100 BP
2. COUNTY: MANATEE
3. PERIOD: GLADES I/ MANASOTA?
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY AND BURIAL AND MOUND STYLE (500 BC- AD 200)
5. MOUND: YES AND 1 REGULAR CEMETERY AREA
6. SHAPE: CONICAL
7. HEIGHT: ALMOST 5 FT (1.5 M)
8. DIAMETER: MOUND: 60 FT (18.3 M), CEMETERY: 40 FT (12.2 M) DIAMETER
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 SMALL AND 1 LARGE MIDDEN
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 185 MOUND, 43 CEMETERY
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 185 MOUND, 43 CEMETERY

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: LAYERS OF MOUND
2. SAND MOUND
3. FILL WAS SAND MIXED WITH SHELL, ANIMAL BONE, ASH, POTsherds AND
   GENERAL DETRITUS
4. BURIALS SCATTERED THROUGH MOUND/ BURIALS IN CEMETERY AREA-SMALL
   PIT LINED WITH SHELL
5. NO INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS IN MOUND OR CEMETERY, OBJECTS LARGELY
   JUST FILL
6. LAYERS OF RELATIVELY PURE SHELL IN MOUND-STERILE-NOT MIDDEN-
   DELIBERATE
7. BASE OF MOUND WAS A HARD CONGLOMERATE OF ASH, BURNED SHELL, AND
   ANIMAL BONE- ? OLD OCCUPATION AREA?
8. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 172-175, 180

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 100%
2. SECONDARY: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 0%
5. FLEXED: 100%
6. BUNDLE: 0%
7. UNKNOWN: 0%
8. NOTE: NO MENTION OF ORIENTATION, AND BODIES SCATTERED THROUGHOUT
   MOUND

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: NONE
2. GRAVE GOODS: FEW OF OBJECTS EVEN IN MOUND-MOSTLY LIKELY PART OF THE
   FILL
3. BODIES IN CEMETERY AREA PLACED IN SMALL SHELL LINED PITS
4. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 175-176, 180, 181
III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 38%
2. FEMALE: 62%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. NO AGING DONE ON BURIALS
5. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 180

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. CARIES: 5%
3. 10% MALES
4. 7% FEMALES
5. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 102
6. DENTAL CHIPPING: 62%
7. 91% MALES
8. 60% FEMALES
10. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 52%
11. 65% MALES
12. 51% FEMALES
13. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 110
14. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 50%
15. 52% MALES
16. 47% FEMALES
17. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 105

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS AND CRIBRA ORBITALIA: 44%
2. 50% MALES
3. 43% FEMALES
4. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 111
5. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 1% OF ADULT CRANIA (HUTCHINSON 2004: 124)
6. BLUNT TRAUMA: 1%
7. 0% MALES
8. 1% FEMALES
9. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 125
10. TREPONEMAL INFECTION: 2 INDIVIDUALS (HUTCHINSON 2004: 119)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: NONE
2. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 176-180

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: GLADES PLAIN
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 497 SHERDS (AVAILABLE STUDY SAMPLE)
3. STONE TOOLS: 3
4. SHELL CUPS/DIPPERS: 1 (KILLED)
5. MAMMAL BONE: SOME
6. BIRD BONE: SOME
7. FISH BONE: SOME
8. PROJECTILE POINTS/ KNIVES: 3
9. ChERT FLAKES/ CORES: 1
10. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 176-180

VI. REFERENCES:

Bullen, Ripley P.

Hutchinson, Dale L.

Willey, Gordon R.
1949 Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast. Miscellaneous Contributions No. 113, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
PIERCE MOUND A: (8FR14)- FRANKLIN COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 1800 BP
   2. COUNTY: FRANKLIN
   3. PERIOD: SWIFT CREEK, YENT COMPLEX
   4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY
   5. MOUND: YES
   6. SHAPE: RECTANGULAR
   7. HEIGHT: 8 FT (2.44 M)
   8. DIAMETER: 96 X 76 FT (29.26 X 23.6 M)
   9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 2 MOUNDS: 1 TEMPLE, 1 BURIAL, LARGE MIDDEN, SEVERAL SMALLER MIDDENS (ALL THE MOUNDS AND MIDDENS EXCEPT FOR A FEW MIDDENS DATED TO WEEDEN ISLAND OR FT. WALTON)
   10. TOTAL BURIALS: 106+ (MANY MORE SECONDARY BURIALS-NOT COUNTED)
   11. STUDIED BURIALS: 106

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. NOTES: SAND MOUND
   2. COMPOSITION: YELLOW SAND EXCEPT NEAR BASE & OCCASIONAL IRREGULAR LENSES IN BODY, WHERE OYSTER SHELL WAS COMMONST. JOHN II MIDDEN
   3. BURIALS SCATTERED THROUGH MOUND: MAINLY PRIMARY/ SOME SECONDARY
   4. SEVERAL MASS BURIALS & ASSOCIATIONS W/ SHELL LAYERS
   5. FEATURES: CEREMONIAL FIREPLACE ON TOP, EVIDENCE OF COOKING AT BASE
   6. MOUND NOW DESTROYED
   7. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 281; MOORE 1999c: 217

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: MOST APPEAR PRIMARY, BUT MOORE HINTS AT POSSIBLE MANY SECONDARY
   2. SECONDARY: ?
   3. UNKNOWN: ?
   4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 12%
   5. FLEXED: 83%
   6. BUNDLE: 0%
   7. SKULL: 4%
   8. UNKNOWN: 1%
   9. ORIENTATION: 30% WEST, 6% EAST, 10% SOUTH, 6% SOUTHEAST, 19% SOUTHWEST, 10% NORTHWEST
   10. NOTES: MOST APPEAR PRIMARY, BUT MOORE HINTS AT POSSIBLE MANY SECONDARY- MANY OF THE BUNDLES CONTAIN 4 MORE INDIVIDUALS

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
   2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 8%
   3. AGE: 1 INFANT, 7 UNKNOWN
   4. SEX: ?
5. GRAVE GOODS: SHELL BEADS, PROJECTILE POINTS, STONE JEWELRY, POTTERY, COPPER JEWELRY, MICA SHEET, STONE CELT, GLOWWORM EFFIGY
6. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: SEVERAL BURIAL DEPOSITED IN SHELL LAYERS, POTTERY CACHES SOMETIMES NEAR BURIALS

III. & IV. SEX, AGE, & STATURE & HEALTH
1. NO AGING OR SEXING DONE, 2 INFANTS REPORTED
2. NO HEALTH STUDY DONE
3. CITATIONS: MOORE 1999c: 219

V. GRAVE GOODS:
A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ? EXCAVATED BY MOORE
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 5 VESSELS
4. CELT (STONE): 1
5. MICA SHEET: 1
6. BONE JEWELRY: 1
7. STONE JEWELRY: 1
8. COPPER JEWELRY: 2
9. SHELL BEADS: SOME
10. PEARL BEADS: SOME
11. PROJECTILE POINTS/KNIVES: 5
12. EFFIGY: 1 GLOWWORM

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ? EXCAVATED BY MOORE
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 6? VESSELS
3. SHELL TOOLS: 4
4. STONE TOOLS: SOME
5. SHELL CUPS/DIPPERS: SOME
6. STONE JEWELRY: 1
7. COPPER JEWELRY: 2
8. SHELL: 1
9. MAMMAL BONE: SOME
10. PROJECTILE POINTS/KNIVES: 1
11. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 281-282; MOORE 1999c: 219-228

VI. REFERENCES:
Horne, Ken
1991 *An analysis of the distribution and kinds of artifacts found in burials in Florida and Interpretation of the patterns observed through time*. Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Moore, Clarence Bloomfield
Penton, Daniel T.
1972 *National Register of Historic Places Inventory Nomination Form: Pierce Site*. Ms. on file, Florida Master Site File, Bureau of Archaeological Research, Florida Department of State, Tallahassee.

Willey, Gordon R.
1949 *Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast*. Miscellaneous Contributions No. 113, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
QUAD BLOCK (FORT BROOKE’S CEMETERY): (8HI998)-HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 110 BP
   2. COUNTY: HILLSBOROUGH
   3. PERIOD: SECOND SEMINOLE WAR
   4. DATING METHOD: HISTORIC DOCUMENTS, ARTIFACTS
   5. MOUND: NO- FORT CEMETERY
   6. AREA: 50 X 90 M
   7. ADJACENT FEATURES: DESTROYED?
   8. TOTAL BURIALS: 38 (NATIVE)
   9. STUDIED BURIALS: 38 (NATIVE)

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. NOTES: FORT CEMETERY
   2. MOST BURIALS IN STRAIGHT ROWS/ ALL BUT 6 BODIES OR. EAST/WEST WITH HEAD IN DIRECTION OF WEST EDGE OF GRAVE
   3. RECT. GRAVE PITS/ HEXAGON OR RECTANGULAR WOODEN COFFINS
   4. NO SEGREGATION OF SEX, RACE, OR MILITARY
   5. CHILDREN ONLY IN SOUTHWEST CORNER, BUT EVEN THENL ADULTS WITH THEM

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 100%
   2. SECONDARY: 0%
   3. UNKNOWN: 0%
   4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 100%
   5. UNKNOWN: 0%
   6. ORIENTATION: 95% WEST, 5% UNKNOWN
   7. NOTE: ALL BUT 6 BODIES ORIENTED E-W- (GRAVE ORIENTED EAST) HEAD ORIENTED WEST, DIRECTION ON WEST EDGE OF GRAVE
   8. CITATIONS: PIPER ET AL. 1982A: 132-197, 310, 311

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. NOTE: BUTTONS WERE FREQUENTLY ONLY THE GRAVE GOOD FOR MANY BURIALS AND NOT CALCULATED FOR NUMBER OF BURIALS WITH GOODS. THE BUTTONS ARE LIKELY THE ONLY PARTS OF A PERSON’S CLOTHING TO SURVIVE DECOMPOSITION
   2. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
   3. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 63%
   4. AGE: 17 SUBADULTS, 7 ADULTS, (ADDITIONAL 11 ADULTS POSSESSED ONLY BUTTONS)
   5. SEX: 4 MALES, 4 FEMALE, 19 UNKNOWNS, (ADDITIONAL 6 MALES, 4 FEMALES, 1 UNKNOWN- BUTTONS ONLY)
   6. GRAVE GOODS: BUTTONS, PERFORATED COINS, METAL CUPS & OTHER OBJECTS, NECKLACES AND SEED BEADS, MANY MORE TYPES OF ARTIFACTS
   7. NOTES: ALL BURIALS IN WOODEN COFFINS
   8. NO STONE TOOLS, BONE, OR SHELL ARTIFACTS
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III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 32%
2. FEMALE: 21%
3. UNKNOWN: 47%
4. CITATIONS: WIENKER 1982: 9, 16, 17, 24

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 42% (MAY INCLUDED INFANT AGE)
3. ADULT: 58% (INCLUDES INDIVIDUAL 17 AND OLDER)
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: %
6. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 25, 27 MALES, 25 FEMALES
7. STATURE: 165.1-172.7M MALES, 152.4-165.1M FEMALES
8. CITATIONS: WIENKER 1982: 9, 16, 17, 24

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. CARIES: 2.8%
3. DENTAL CHIPPING: 2.8%
4. PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS: 2.8%
5. OVERBITE: 5.5%

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. NOTES: FEW INDIVIDUALS DISPLAYED ANY HEALTH PROBLEMS INCLUDING NONNATIVE AMERICANS – MANY OF THE DEATHS LIKELY DUE TO TROPICAL DISEASE
2. OF THE 12 OUT 93 INDIVIDUALS WITH OSTEOPTHLOGICAL EVIDENCE- ONLY 1 NATIVE AMERICAN POSSIBLY SUFFERED AN OSTEOPATHOLOGY OR ANOMALY
3. POOR SKELETAL PRESERVATION ONE REASON FOR THIS LACK OF PATHOLOGIES
4. CITATIONS: WIENKER 1982: 29-37

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: TRADE SEMINOLE BRUSHED
3. PEWTER BUTTONS: 58
4. BONE BUTTONS: 18
5. BRASS BUTTONS: 18
6. BRASS FRAGMENTS: 2
7. CONE SHAPE WHITE METAL EARBOBS: 10
8. TEAR DROP SHAPED WHITE METAL ORNAMENTS: 8
9. NECKLACE BEADS: 5349
10. SEED BEADS (OZ.): 22.35 OZ
11. SEED BEADS: 226
12. BEAD VIALS: 2
13. IRON BUCKLE: 1
14. GOLD EARRING: 2
15. GLASS BOTTLE: 1
16. GLASS MOLD: 3
17. COPPERING EARRINGS: 2
18. COINS: 16
19. PERFORATED COINS: 21
20. IRON SPOONS: 6
21. IRON KNIVES: 4
22. IRON CUPS: 9
23. BRASS DOOR KNOB: 1
24. METAL PENDANTS: 5
25. WHITE METAL BODIC PIECES: 7
26. GLASS TRADE BEADS: 839
27. WHITE METAL BRACELETS: 2
28. WHITE METAL CRESCENT GORGET: 1
29. BRASS MILITARY DECORATION HOLDER: 1
30. GUN FLINT: 1

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. ALL GRAVE GOODS WERE FOUND WITH INDIVIDUAL BURIALS
2. A FEW UNASSOCIATED TRADE SEMINOLE BRUSHED POTTERY SHERDS FOUND AROUND THE SITE

VI. REFERENCES:

Piper, Harry M. and Jacquelyn G. Piper
1982a Archaeological Excavations at the Quad Block Site, 8Hi998 Located at the Site of the Old Fort Brooke Municipal Parking Garage Tampa, Florida. Piper Archaeological Research, Inc. St. Petersburg, Florida.

Piper, Harry M., Kenneth W. Hardin, and Jacquelyn G. Piper

Wienker, Curtis W.
1982 The Human Remains From 8 Hi998. In Archaeological Excavations at the Quad Block Site, 8Hi998 Located at the Site of the Old Fort Brooke Municipal Parking Garage Tampa, Florida edited by Harry M. Piper and Jacquelyn G. Piper, Piper Archaeological Research, Inc. St. Petersburg, Florida.
REPUBLIC GROVES: (8HR4)- HARDEE COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 4595 BP
   2. COUNTY: HARDEE
   3. PERIOD: MIDDLE-LATE/ TRANSITIONAL ARCHAIC (4600-500 BC)
   4. DATING METHOD: C-14 FROM STAKES: UNCORRECTED: 5745BP +/- 105YRS, 2485BP +/- 80YRS, OTHER SAMPLES: 6430BP +/-80YRS, 6520BP +/-65 YRS
   5. MOUND: NO- POND SITE
   6. SHAPE: POND
   7. HEIGHT: ?
   8. AREA: 400 X 250 FT (122 X 8 M)
   9. ADJACENT FEATURES: VILLAGE
   10. TOTAL BURIALS: 37 MINIMUM (SEVERAL HUNDRED TO OVER A THOUSAND)
   11. STUDIED BURIALS: 37

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. SITE: MIDDLE/LATE ARCHAIC CEMETERY-
   2. LOWLAND PEAT MUCK (LIKELY POND AS AREA SUBMERGED BY SPRINGS IN MIDDLE OF SITE)
   3. WOODEN STAKES PLACED BY BURIALS, IN GROUPS & VERTICAL OR IN A STRAIGHT LINE
   4. WHITE SAND LENS OVER BURIALS IN 2 AREAS. MOUNDED CONTOUR IN SOME AREAS
   5. NOTES: CLUSTER OF 6 INDIVIDUAL BURIALS
   6. CITATIONS: WHARTON ET AL. 1981: 59, 60, 63, 76-78

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 100%
   2. SECONDARY: 0%
   3. FLEXED: MOST%
   4. CITATIONS: WHARTON ET AL. 1981: 76

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
   2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: ?
   3. CHILD BURIALS MORE RICHLY SUPPLIED WITH GRAVE GOODS THAN ADULTS-
   4. STONE BEADS- EXAMPLE OF OBJECT WITH CHILDREN BURIALS
   5. MOST BURIALS TOO DISTURBED TO ASSESS GRAVE GOOD DEPOSITS

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
   1. MALE: 28%
   2. FEMALE: 28%
   3. UNKNOWN: 4%
B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 8%
2. SUBADULT: 8%
3. ADULT: 84%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
6. STATURE: 5FT 2IN-5FT 8IN (1.57-1.72M)

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. CARIES: 3.1%
3. ABSCESSES: 19 REPORTED
4. DENTAL WEAR: HEAVY
5. PERIODONTAL DISEASE: ALL ADULTS WHICH WERE TESTED FOR IT- 83% OF POPULATION?

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 10.8% (SAUNDERS 1972:30)
3. OSTEOARTHRITIS: MOST COMMON PATHOLOGY ON SITE (SAUNDERS 1972: 29)
4. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 7% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 111), 86% (SAUNDERS 1972: 17)
5. SPINA BIFIDA: 1 EXAMPLE (SAUNDERS 1972: 31)
6. HERNIATED DISC: 1 EXAMPLE (SAUNDERS 1972: 31)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NO POTTERY
3. BONES TOOLS: 1
4. ANTLER ARTIFACTS: 1
5. STONE BEADS: 111

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. THE ASSOCIATION OF MOST ARTIFACTS WITH INDIVIDUAL BURIAL WAS UNKNOWN, BUT MOST THESE ARTIFACTS WERE LOCATED IN THE BURIAL AREA
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NO POTTERY
3. BONE TOOLS: SEVERAL
4. STONE TOOLS: 11
5. ANTLER JEWELRY: 5
6. STONE JEWELRY: 1
7. SHARK TEETH: SEVERAL
8. SHELL: 2
9. MAMMAL BONE: SEVERAL
10. PROJECTILE POINTS/KNIVES: 11
11. CHERT FLAKES/CORES: 5
VI. REFERENCES:

Hutchinson, Dale L.

Purdy, Barbara A.

Saunders, Lorraine

Wharton, Barry, George Ballo, and Mitchell Hope
SAFETY HARBOR: (8PI2)- PINELLAS COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 450 BP
2. COUNTY: PINELLAS
3. PERIOD: SAFETY HARBOR CONTACT PERIOD
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY, ARTIFACTS, SPANISH ARTIFACTS
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: PLATFORM
7. HEIGHT: 10-12 FT (3.67 M)
8. DIAMETER: 80 FT (24.4 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: TEMPLE MOUND, VILLAGE, SEVERAL MIDDENS, 1 BORROW PIT
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 100+
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 100

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: SAND MOUND
2. TOP: THICK AND EXTENSIVE SHELL AND DEBRIS LAYER- MAY MARK INHABITATION OR SIMPLE ENLARGMENT USING VILLAGE MATERIAL
3. POST HOLES IN TOP OF THIS LAYER COULD MEAN TEMPLE ON TOP SINCE MOUND IS PLATFORM SHAPED
4. MIDDLE: SHELL, SAND, OTHER MATERIAL USED TO INCREASE AREA, BUT NOT HEIGHT
5. 2 SUPERIMPOSED CLAY FLOORS- MOUND USED FOR INHABITATION
6. BOTTOM: CLAY & SAND MOUND CAPPED BY CLAY MANTLE WHICH WAS POSSIBLY USED FOR BURIAL
7. POTTERY FOUND MAINLY AT BASE OF MOUND NEAR EDGE -KILLED
8. SEVERAL EUROPEAN ARTIFACTS FOUND ASSOCIATED WITH INDIVIDUAL BURIALS IN UPPER PART OF MOUND, BUT BURIALS DISRUPTED BY FARMERS USING BONE FOR FERTILIZER

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 0%
2. SECONDARY: 100%
3. NO AVAILABLE DESCRIPTION OF EXACT BURIAL TYPES
4. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 140

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: MANY
3. AGE: ?
4. SEX: ?
5. GRAVE GOODS: MANY INDIVIDUAL BURIED WITH GRAVE GOODS INCLUDING EUROPEAN ARTIFACTS
6. NOTE: POTTERY KILLED
7. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 136, 140
III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 53%
2. FEMALE: 47%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 2%
3. ADULT: 73%
4. 50YRS+: 25%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
6. MORE CHILDREN LIKELY, BUT SINCE ONLY BODIES THAT COULD BE SEXED WERE REPORTED-ONLY ADULTS AND 1 SUBADULT STATED IN AVAILABLE MATERIAL
7. AVERAGE AGE: 46
8. MALES: 51
9. FEMALES: 39
10. STATURE: ?

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. CARIES: 14%
3. 22% MALES
4. 12% FEMALES
5. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 103
6. DENTAL CHIPPING: 40%
7. 48% MALES
8. 30% FEMALES
10. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 35%
11. 33% MALES
12. 36% FEMALES
13. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 110
14. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 22%
15. 30% MALES
16. 14% FEMALES
17. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 106

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 6% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 102)
3. OSTEOMYELITIS: 3.5% OF TIBIAE (HUTCHINSON 1991: 97, 106)
4. SKELETAL LESIONS: 6% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 114)
5. SYSTEMIC INFECTION: 5% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 108)
6. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 30% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 111) POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS AND CRIBRA ORBITALIA: 0% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 126)
7. 33% MALES
8. 27% FEMALES
9. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 111
10. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 0% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 97, 117) 1% OF CRANIA ADULT (HUTCHINSON 2004: 124)
11. TREPONEMAL INFECTION: 67% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 119); 17% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 117)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST ARTIFACTS LIKELY INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS- CONTEXT- NOT DISCUSSED
3. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 137-140

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: PINELLAS PLAIN, SAFETY HARBOR INCISED, PINELLAS INCISED.
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 130 SHERDS (AVAILABLE STUDY SHERDS)
3. SHELL TOOLS: 1
4. SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS: 1
5. SILVER BEADS: 1
6. IRON AXES: 2
7. SILVER JEWELRY: 1
8. SHELL: 13
9. PROJECTILE POINTS: 1
10. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 137-140

VI. REFERENCES:

Griffin, John W., and Ripley Bullen

Hutchinson, Dale L.


Mitchem, Jeffery M.

Weiss, Francine, and Cecil McKithan
1981 National Register of Historic Places Inventory Form: Safety Harbor. National Park Service Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA. Ms. on file, Florida Master Sites Files, Bureau of Archaeological Research, Florida Department of State, Tallahassee.

Willey, Gordon R.
1949 Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast. Miscellaneous Contributions No. 113, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
Unknown author

n.d. Santa Maria/Lewis Site. Ms on file, Florida Master Site, Bureau of Archaeological Research, Florida Department of State, Tallahassee.
SARASOTA BAY MOUND: (8SO44)- SARASOTA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 700 BP
2. COUNTY: SARASOTA
3. PERIOD: SAFETY HARBOR (EARLY SAFETY HARBOR-AD 1000- PRECONTACT AD 1500)
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CIRCULAR
7. HEIGHT: 2 M+
8. DIAMETER: 30-40 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 MIDDEN
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 18+ (SOME ADDITIONAL BURIALS REMOVED IN 1920S)
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 15

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: HOUSE BUILT ON TOP OF
2. TOP & POSSIBLY 2ND PERIOD OF BURIAL DEPOSITION DESTROYED
3. MIDDLE: DARK LENS, WITH SHERDS MAY REPRESENT SECONDARY MOUND BASE
4. MIDDLE 2: LIGHT COLORED SAND
5. SHERDS SCATTERED HORIZONTALLY ON ZONE AND BURIALS B AND C NEAR ZONE SUPPORT CASE FOR RITUAL MORTUARY ACTIVITY AT BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION
6. BOTTOM: BASAL BLACK ZONE (CHAROCAL FECKLED) PREPARED MOUND BASE-SIM TO OT. MOUND IN AREA
7. BOTTOM 2: STERILE REDDISH SAND
8. CITATIONS: LUER 2005: 26-30

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. FEW DETAILS ON BURIAL TYPES- MANY OF BURIALS SECONDARY FLEXED INTERMENTS
2. CITATIONS: LUER 2005: 21-26

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: ?
2. LITTLE DETAIL AND MUCH SITE DISRUPTION

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. IDENTIFICATION NOT POSSIBLE
2. CITATIONS: LUER 2005: 21-26

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 7%
3. ADULT: 47%
IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 88%
3. HEAVY DENTAL WEAR: COMMON

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. PERIOSTITIS: 69%
3. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 45%
4. CRIBRA ORBITALIA: 30%

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. NOTE: AT LEAST TOP OF MOUND DESTROYED
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SAND TEMPERED PLAIN, ST. JOHNS CHALKY, PINELLAS PLAIN, LAKE JACKSON PLAIN
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 68 VESSELS

VI. REFERENCES:

Cordell, Ann S.

Freas, Laurel and Michael W. Warren

Luer, George M.
SNOW BEACH: (8WA52)- WAKULLA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 348 BP
2. COUNTY: WAKULLA
3. PERIOD: FORT WALTON: VELDA- SAN LUIS PHASES (AD 1500-1704)
4. DATING METHOD: FORT WALTON & SPANISH ARTIFACTS
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CONICAL
7. HEIGHT: 8.5 FT (2.6 M)
8. DIAMETER: 75 FT (22.86 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 SWIFT CREEK VILLAGE MIDDEN
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 8
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 7

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. CAPPED WITH LAYER OF WHITE SAND
2. 5 OFFERING DEPOSITS
3. MOUND CONSTRUCTED OF FILL FROM SWIFT CREEK MIDDEN AND MOUND ITSELF PLACED OVER HABITATION RIDGE CREATED BY A SWIFT CREEK PEOPLE

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 100%
2. SECONDARY: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 86%
5. FLEXED: 14%
6. UNKNOWN: 0%
7. ORIENTATION: 17% SOUTHWEST, 67% NORTWEST, 17% NORTHEAST
8. CITATIONS: MAGOON ET AL. 2001: 19

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 43%
3. AGE: 2 ADULTS, 1 SUBADULT
4. SEX: 1 FEMALE, 2 UNKNOWNS
5. GRAVE GOODS: 1 BONE BEAD, 1 SANDSTONE ABRADER, 212 GLASS BEADS AND 61 GLASS BEAD FRAGMENTS
6. 5 OFFERING DEPOSITS: 4 COPPER PENDANTS, STONE PROJECTILE POINTS, RED OCHRE, 1 FORT WALTON CERAMIC BOWL
7. CITATIONS: MAGOON ET AL. 2001: 20

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 14%
2. FEMALE: 29%
3. UNKNOWN: 57%
4. CITATIONS: MAGOON ET AL. 2001: 19

**B. AGE:**
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 14%
3. ADULT: 86%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
7. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 26, 30 MALES, 33 FEMALES
8. CITATIONS: MAGOON ET AL. 2001: 19

**IV. HEALTH**

**A. DENTAL:**
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. CARIES: 80%
3. 100% MALES
4. 0% FEMALES
5. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 33%
6. 0% MALES
7. 50% FEMALES
8. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 67%
9. REABSORPTION/ PERIDONTAL DISEASE: 67%
10. HYPERCEMENTOSIS: 67%

**B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:**
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. PERIOSTITIS: 29%
3. 100% MALES
4. 0% FEMALES
5. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 29%
6. 0% MALES
7. 50% FEMALES
8. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 67%
9. 100% MALES
10. 50% FEMALES
11. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 0%
12. TREPONEMAL INFECTION: 33%
13. LYTIC INFECTION: 33%

**V. GRAVE GOODS:**

**A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:**
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NONE
3. STONE TOOLS: 1
4. BONE BEADS: 1
5. GLASS BEADS: 212+
6. CITATIONS: MAGOON ET AL. 2001: 20

**B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:**
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: 1 FORT WALTON INCISED BOWL
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 1 BOWL
3. COPPER JEWELRY: 4
4. GLASS BEADS: 324+
5. PROJECTILE POINTS: SOME
6. RED OCHRE: SOME
7. MAGOON ET AL. 2001: 20

VI. REFERENCES:


Unknown author n.d.   Snow Beach. Ms on file, Florida Master Site, Bureau of Archaeological Research, Florida Department of State, Tallahassee.
I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1340 BP
2. COUNTY: BAY
3. PERIOD: LATE WEEDEN ISLAND
4. DATING METHOD: 1 C-14, AD 610 +/- 125YRS, POTTERY
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CIRCULAR
7. HEIGHT: 3-3.3 FT (1.01 M)
8. DIAMETER: 60-70 FT (21.34 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 MIDDEN
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 100
11. STUDIED INDIVIDUALS: 169

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. TOP: SOUTHEAST: 0-0.6 FT DISTURBED GRAY SURFACE SOIL
2. MIDDLE: 0.5-1.5 FT BLACK COLORED SAND
3. ORGANIC MATERIAL, OYSTER, CERAMIC SHERDS, HUMAN BONE
4. MIDDLE 2: 1.5-2.0 FT CLEAN WHITE SAND
5. BOTTOM: 2.0-2.5 FT BARREN ORANGE SAND
6. FEATURES: SHERD PATH
7. POTTERY CACHE EAST SIDE (DESCRIBED BY MOORE?)

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. NOT MUCH IN THE WAY OF CONTEXT OF BODIES PRESERVED OR DESCRIBED
2. MOSTE WERE SECONDARY BUNDLE BURIALS
3. 2 FLEXED BURIALS-1 POSSIBLY A PRIMARY BURIAL
4. CITATIONS: ROBBINS 1994: 191

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: ?
2. CITATIONS: ROBBINS 1994: 191

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 40%
2. FEMALE: 46%
3. UNKNOWN: 14%
4. CITATIONS: ROBBINS 1994: 79-83

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 36%
3. ADULT: 64%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
6. AVERAGE AGE: 22
7. CITATIONS: ROBBINS 1994: 79-83

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. CARIES: 4 TEETH HAD CARIES
3. HEAVY DENTAL WEAR: COMMON
4. CITATIONS: ROBBINS 1994: 87, 89

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 58.5% OF BONE INFLAMMATIONS (ROBBINS 1994: 90)
3. 26.8% OF TIBAES, 12.8% TIBAES OF MALES, 7.8% TIBAES OF FEMALES (HAMLIN 1995: 23-24)
4. OSTEOMYELITIS: 19.4% OF BONE INFLAMMATIONS (ROBBINS 1994: 90)
5. 0.9% OF TIBAES (HAMLIN 1995: 23-24)
6. OSTEITIS: 22.1% OF INFLAMMATIONS (ROBBINS 1994: 90)
7. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 0.3% OF BONE INFLAMMATIONS (ROBBINS 1994: 90)
8. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 4 EXAMPLES OF HEALED FRACTURES (ROBBINS 1994: 89-90)
9. VIOLENT DEATHS OR INJURIES: 0% (ROBBINS 1994: 89-90)
10. TREPONEMAL INFECTION: 1 CASE (HUTCHINSON 2004: 119)
11. HEALTH STRESS: 4% OF LONG BNS WITH HARRIS LINES (ROBBINS 1994: 85)
12. CONGENITAL DEFECTS: 1.8%? (ROBBINS 1994: 81)
13. SPINIA BIFIDIA: 0.6%? (ROBBINS 1994: 81)
14. MYELOMA: 1 CASE (ROBBINS 1994: 81)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: ?

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SMOOTH PLAIN, RESIDUAL PLAIN, WEEDEN ISLAND PLAIN
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 2452 SHERDS
3. CITATIONS: ROBBINS 1994: 110-113
4. 1969 SEASON SAMPLE:
5. STONE TOOLS: 1
6. SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS: 3 (KILLED)
7. CELTS (STONE/ SHELL): 1
8. COPPER JEWELRY: 1 ROLLED FRAGMENT, 1 ROLLED POINT OR AWL
9. STONE BEADS: SOME DISC, 1 TRIANGULAR, 1 CYLINDRICAL
10. CHERT FLAKES/ CORES: SEVERAL
11. MUSCOVITE MICA FLAKES- AMOUNT?
12. CITATIONS: PERCY ET AL. 1971: 18

VI. REFERENCES:

Birdsong, Vincent S., and William B. Yates
1994 Dental Attrition Rates and Their Application to the Estimation of Skeletal Age- at-Death of the Sowell Mound (8By3) Population, St. Andrew Bay, Panama City, Bay County, Florida. Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
Dailey, R.C. and Dan Morse  

Hamlin, Christine  
1995  *Tibial Infection in Three Prehistoric Florida Populations*. Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Percy, George, Calvin Jamison, Katherine Gagel, Robin Heath, and Mark Gottlob  

Robbins, Laura E.  
1994  *An Analysis of Weeden Island Period Ceramic Variability at the Sowell Site (8BY3) in Northwest Florida*. MS Thesis, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
TATHAM MOUND (PRE-CONTACT): (8CI203)-CITRUS COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 650 BP
2. COUNTY: CITRUS
3. PERIOD: SAFETY HARBOR (AD 1200-1400)
4. DATING METHOD: C14-OVER 9 SAMPLES, ARTIFACTS, POTTERY
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: SQUARE
7. HEIGHT: 1.7 M
8. DIAMETER: 17 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: ISOLATE
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 28+
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 28

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. DARK, GREASY LAYER, COVERING SMALL LOW MOUND OF DARK SOIL-1M HIGH
2. 24 BURIALS WITH SHELL, COPPER, AND POTTERY

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 39%
2. SECONDARY: 61%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 18%
5. FLEXED: 46%
6. BUNDLE: 0%
7. UNKNOWN: 36%
8. NOTE: ONLY HAVE EXACT BURIAL TYPE FOR 3RD SEASON OF EXCAVATION- THIS IS WHY THE TYPES OF PRIMARY BURIALS APPEAR GREATER THAN THE SECONDARY BURIALS TYPES.

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. AS MOST BURIALS WERE FROM THE POSTCONTACT PERIOD- (SEE TATHAM POST CONTACT)

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 5%
2. FEMALE: 21%
3. UNKNOWN: 74%
4. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 1991: 96
B. AGE:
1. NOTE: HUTCHINSON DOES NOT STATE WHICH AGED BURIALS WERE PRECONTACT AND WHICH WERE POST CONTACT
2. SEE AGING IN (TATHAM POST CONTACT)
3. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 1991: 129

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. CARIES: 14% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 102)
3. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 33% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 109)
4. PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS: 1.9% (MITCHEM AND HUTCHINSON 1986: 20, 22)- MIGHT BE FROM POSTCONTACT-AUTHORS DO NOT SPECIFY

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 16%
3. 0% MALES
4. 25% FEMALES
5. CITATIONS: (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 102)
6. OSTEOMYELITIS: 0% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 97, 106)
7. SKELETAL LESIONS: 25% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 114)
8. SYSTEMIC INFECTION: 11% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 108)
9. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 1.9% (HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1986: 20, 22)- MIGHT BE FROM POSTCONTACT-AUTHORS DO NOT SPECIFY
10. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 11% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 111) 9% (INCLUDING CRIBRA ORBITALIA- HUTCHINSON 1991: 126)
12. TREPONEMAL INFECTION: 0% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 111)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. AUTHORS DO NOT STATE EXACT PERIOD FOR MOST ARTIFACTS
3. ALL GRAVE GOODS ARE DISCUSSED IN THIS PAPER IN THE TATHAM POST CONTACT SECTION

VI. REFERENCES:

Hutchinson, Dale L.


Hutchinson, Dale L. and Jeffrey M. Mitchem
Mitchem, Jeffery M.

Mitchem, Jeffery M. and Dale Hutchinson

TATHAM MOUND (POST-CONTACT): (8CI203)- CITRUS COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 415 BP
2. COUNTY: CITRUS
3. PERIOD: SAFETY HARBOR POST-CONTACT (AD 1525-1550)
4. DATING METHOD: C-14- OVER 9 SAMPLES, SPANISH ARTIFACTS, POTTERY
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: SQUARE
7. HEIGHT: 1.7 M
8. DIAMETER: 17 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: ISOLATE
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 339
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 314

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTE: RAMP AND PLATFORM ON TOP
2. 77 INDIVIDUALS LAID IN STRAIGHT ROWS-S/E AXIS
3. ALL THESE BODIES LAID IN SHORT TIME OF EACH OTHER-EUROPEAN DISEASE
4. NUMEROUS OTHER BURIALS IN JUMBLE-CHARNEL HOUSE
5. BUNDLE BURIALS ALSO MIXED INTO LAYER
6. RAMP ON WEST SIDE
7. PRECONTACT:
8. DARK, GREASY LAYER, COVERING SMALL LOW MOUND OF DARK SOIL-1M HIGH
9. 24 BURIALS WITH SHELL, COPPER, AND POTTERY
10. CHARNEL HOUSE: POSSIBLE
11. NOTES: POTTERY AND SHELLS CUPS ON TOP LAYERS, RED OCHRE SPOTS

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 28%
2. SECONDARY: 66%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 0%
5. FLEXED: 53%
6. BUNDLE: 21%
7. CREMATION: 2%
8. UNKNOWN: 24%
9. NOTE: ONLY HAVE EXACT BURIAL TYPE FOR 3RD SEASON OF EXCAVATION- THIS IS WHY THE TYPES OF PRIMARY BURIALS APPEAR GREATER THAN THE SECONDARY BURIALS TYPES.
10. ORIENTATION: HEADS NORTHWEST FOR ALL PRIMARY BURIALS EXCEPT 2

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 10% OF PRIMARY BURIALS
3. AGE: 31 ADULTS, 3 JUVENILES
4. SEX: 10 MALES, 17 FEMALES, 7 UNKNOWNS
5. GRAVE GOODS: OFTEN BEADS- EUROPEAN GLASS, METAL, OR SHELL BEADS, OTHER EURP METAL OBJECTS, NATIVE COPP JEW, ONLY1 BURIAL WITH A PIECE OF POTTERY, SHELLS WITH AT LEAST 6 BURIALS
6. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: POTTERY AND SHELL CUPS- TOP OF MOUND
7. ARROWS SHOT INTO EAST SIDE OF MOUND

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 11%
2. FEMALE: 15%
3. UNKNOWN: 74%
4. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 1991: 96

B. AGE:
1. NOTE: BOTH PERIODS OF TATHAM AS HUTCHINSON MAKES NO PERIOD DISTINCTION IN AGING
2. INFANT: 0%
3. SUBADULT: 23%
4. ADULT: 72%
5. 50YRS+: 5%
6. UNKNOWN: 54%
7. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 32, 26 MALES, 23 FEMALES
8. STATURE: ?

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. CARIES: 19%
3. 18% MALES
4. 24% FEMALES
5. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 102, 103
6. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 57%
7. 56% MALES
8. 50% FEMALES
9. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 109, 110
10. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 7%
11. 10% MALES
12. 16% FEMALES
13. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 105-106
14. PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS: 1.9% (MITCHEM AND HUTCHINSON 1986: 20, 22)- MIGHT BE FROM POSTCONTACT-AUTHORS DO NOT SPECIFY

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIODITIS: 8%
3. 8% MALES
4. 17% FEMALES
5. CITATIONS: (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 102)
6. OSTEOMYELITIS: 1% OF BONES (HUTCHINSON 1991: 97, 106)
7. SKELETAL LESIONS: 23%
8. 20% MALES
9. 20% FEMALES
10. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 2004: 114, 115
11. SYSTEMIC INFECTION: 8% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 108)
12. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 1.9% (HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1986: 20, 22)- MIGHT BE FROM PRECONTACT-AUTHORS DO NOT SPECIFY
13. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 1% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 111) 1% (INCLUDING CRIBRA ORBITALIA- HUTCHINSON 1991: 126)
14. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 7% OF BONES, 1% OF TIBAE (HUTCHINSON 1991: 97, 117
   2% OF POSTCRANIA OF ADULTS- BOTH PERIODS OF TATHAM (HUTCHINSON 2004: 124)
15. VIOLENT DEATH, INJURY OR USE OF METAL ON BODIES: 1% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 97, 119)
16. TREPONEMAL INFECTION: 1% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 111)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
   1. NOTE: INCLUDES PRECONTACT TATHAM
   2. PRESENT: YES
   3. MOST COMMON POTTERY: 1 PASCO PLAIN VESSEL
   4. TOTAL POTTERY: 1 VESSEL
   5. WOODEN OBJECTS: 1
   6. COPPER JEWELRY: 1
   7. COPPER BREAStPLATE: 2
   8. SHELL BEADS: 2943- MOST INDIVIDUALS POSSESSED THEM
   9. GLASS BEADS: 107
   10. SILVER BEADS: 210
   11. GOLD BEADS: 4
   12. BRASS BEAD: 1
   13. COPPER BEADS: 1 BROKEN BEAD
   14. SPANISH NAILS/ SPIKES: 1
   15. IRON FRAGMENTS: 1
   16. COPPER FRAGMENTS (NATIVE): 6
   17. GALENA: 128.5 GRAMS (3 BURIAL CONTEXTS)
   18. RED OCHRE: 90 FRAGMENTS + 47 VIALS (COMMON IN BOTH INDIVIDUAL AND UNKNOWN CONTEXT)
      MITCHEM AND HUTCHINSON 1987: 15-35, 53-65

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
   1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: PASCO PLAIN, ST. JOHNS PLAIN, SAND TEMPERED
      PLAIN, ST. JOHNS CHECK STAMPED.
   2. TOTAL POTTERY: 10665 SHERDS
   3. STONE TOOLS: 2
   4. SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS: 36
   5. CELTS (STONE/ SHELL): 5
   6. SHELL JEWELRY: 1
   7. STONE JEWELRY (QUARTZ PENDANTS): 2
   8. COPPER JEWELRY: 1
   9. SHELL BEADS: SOME?
   10. GLASS BEADS: 43
   11. IRON BEADS: 1
   12. SILVER BEADS: 88
13. GOLD BEADS: 6
14. COPPER BEADS: 3 BROKEN BEADS
15. SHELLS: 139+
16. MAMMAL BONE: SOME (BUT MOST ARE A NATURAL DEPOSIT)
17. PROJECTILE POINT: 113
18. CHERT FLAKES/CORES: 523
19. SPANISH NAILS/ SPIKES: 3
20. IRON ARMOR: 1
21. IRON FRAGMENTS: 23
22. COPPER FRAGMENTS (EUROPEAN): 1
23. BRASS OBJECT: 1
24. TALC: 1
25. MICA: 1
26. GALENA: 7 (NONBURIAL CONTEXT)
27. PEBBLES OR GRAVEL: 21
28. CONCRETIONS: 1200
29. RED OCHRE: (STATED IN INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS)

VI. REFERENCES:

Hutchinson, Dale L.


Hutchinson, Dale L. and Jeffrey M. Mitchem

Mitchem, Jeffery M.

Mitchem, Jeffery M. and Dale Hutchinson

THOMAS MOUND: (8HI1)- HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 1150 BP
   2. COUNTY: HILLSBOROUGH
   3. PERIOD: LATE WEEDEN ISLAND- EARLY SAFETY HARBOR & ?SAFETY HARBOR CONTACT PERIOD?
   4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY
   5. MOUND: YES
   6. SHAPE: IRREGULAR CIRCULAR
   7. HEIGHT: 6 FT (2 M)
   8. DIAMETER: 58 FT (20 M)
   9. ADJACENT FEATURES: SEVERAL SAND AND MIDDEN MOUNDS, HOUSES ON SHELL HEAPS, 2 CANALS
   10. TOTAL BURIALS: 419
   11. STUDIED BURIALS: 112

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. NOTES: 2 MOUNDS (ONE BUILT OVER AN OLDER ONE?)
   2. SAND MOUND
   3. 42-40IN BELOW INTERMENT LAY A BLACK MIDDEN
   4. EXCAVATED BY MOORE & LATER, HOLDER AND FINALLY SIMPSON
   5. BUNDLE BURIALS AND SINGLE SKULLS IN UPPER PART, PRIMARY BURIAL IN LOWER PART OF MOUND
   6. POTTERY COMMUNAL OFFERING FOR INHUMATIONS- STILL POTTERY TOO SCATTERED FOR CORRELATIONS WITH BURIALS
   7. SAFETY HARBOR-EUROPEAN MATERIAL LIKELY ADDED LATER
   8. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1952: 12; WILLEY 1949: 114-115;

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 10%
   2. SECONDARY: 86%
   3. UNKNOWN: 4%
   4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 0%
   5. FLEXED: 8%
   6. BUNDLE: 85%
   7. SKULL: 3%
   8. CREMATION: 1%
   9. UNKNOWN: 3%
   10. NOTE: MOST THE PRIMARY BURIALS IN WEST-CENTRAL
   11. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 116

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: ?
   2. GRAVE GOODS: BEADS, PENDANTS, CELTS, AWLS, SHARK TEETH, RED OCHRE, SHELL CUPS, ETC.
   3. GRAVE GOODS: POSSIBLE ASSOCIATONS OF POTTERY & CHARCOAL WITH A FEW BURIALS
   4. POTTERY CONCENTRATION IN CENTER OF MOUND
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III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 53%
2. FEMALE: 24%
3. UNKNOWN: 24%
4. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 117

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 15%
3. ADULT: 85%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
6. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 117

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL AND OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. ONLY SKULL SHAPE EXTENSIVE LOOKED AT
2. NO AVAILABLE HEALTH DATA (WILLEY 1949: 117)
3. 6 SKULLS WITH FRACTURED LEFT TEMPORAL BONE, 1 SKULL WITH FRACTURED RIGHT TEMPORAL BONE (WILLEY 1949: 117)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: ?
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: WEEDEN ISLAND PUNCTUATED, WEEDEN ISLAND INCISED, WEEDEN ISLAND PLAIN
3. TOTAL POTTERY: SOME
4. CITATIONS: WILLEY 1949: 119-124

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: WEEDEN ISLAND PUNCTUATED, WEEDEN ISLAND INCISED, WEEDEN ISLAND PLAIN
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 1402 SHERDS (AVAILABLE STUDY SAMPLE)
4. STONE TOOLS: 4
5. SHELL CUPS/DIPPERS: 1
6. STONE JEWELRY: 7 (2 BIRD HEAD PENDANTS)
7. SILVER JEWELRY: 1
8. SHELL BEADS: 4
9. STONE BEADS: SEVERAL
10. GLASS BEADS: 200
11. SILVER BEADS: 1
12. SHARK TEETH: SEVERAL
13. COPPER TABLETS: 1
14. SILVER TABLET: 1
15. SHELL: 27
16. MAMMAL BONE: VARIOUS
17. REPTILE BONE: VARIOUS
18. BIRD BONE: VARIOUS
19. FISH BONE: VARIOUS
20. PROJECTILE POINTS: 15

VI. REFERENCES:

Bullen, Ripley P.

Willey, Gordon R.
1949 Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast. Miscellaneous Contributions No. 113, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
TICK ISLAND (HARRIS CREEK): (8VO24)- VOLUSIA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 6084 BP
   2. COUNTY: VOLUSIA
   3. PERIOD: MIDDLE ARCHAIC
   5. MOUND: YES
   6. SHAPE: ?
   7. HEIGHT: 11 FT (3.35 M)
   8. DIAMETER: 134 X 67 FT (40.84 X 20.42 M)
   9. ADJACENT FEATURES: MIDDEN-AREA MINED FOR SHELL
   10. TOTAL BURIALS: 184+ (1,000S MORE?)
   11. STUDIED BURIALS: 184
   12. CITATIONS: ATEN 1999: 131, 143, 151, 170

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. NOTES: SHELL MIDDEN OVER MOUND
   2. LAYER 10-VARIETY OF DEPOSITS/ LAYER 9- MUCK & BLACK TO DARK BROWN- A CONSTRUCTION LAYER THAT DATES TO ST. JOHNS I?
   3. LAYER 8-NOT MUCH OF LAYER IN MANY AREAS CREATED BY MODIFICATION OF MOUND-DARK BROWN DIRT, DEPOSITS SHELL -FRESH AND MARINE
   4. LAYER 7-SNAIL SHELL, BROWN TO DARK BROWN MATRIX, CRUSHED SHELL DEPOSITS, FISH BONES AND SEVERAL HEARTHS, AT LEAST 1 GRAVE PIT
   5. LAYER 6-CLEAN SHELL -5TH CONSTRUCTION LAYER/ LAYER 5-DARK DIRT, W/ SMALL SNAIL SH. ONLY ON EAST SIDE OF MOUND/LAYER 4-MORTUARY B-3RD CONSTRUCTION PHASE OF MOUND-DARK BROWN SANDY MATRIX & SMALL SNAIL SHELLS, SEVERAL PITS W/ FLEXED BURIALS
   6. LAYER 3-WHITE SAND ZONE (MORTUARY A) -MUCH VARIATION, CHARCOAL & ASH -EVIDENCE OF FIRES, GRAVE PITS, A LARGE BLACK ZONE (CHARNEL HOUSE)
   7. LAYER 2-2A-SMALL SNAILS & LIGHT BROWN TO DARK BROWN, 2B-CLEAN SNAIL SHELL LAYER-NO BURIAL MATERIAL IN IT
   8. LAYER- POSSIBLE SOME ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIAL
   9. CHARNEL HOUSE: YES
   10. CITATIONS: ATEN 1999: 131, 151, 170, 138-147

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 99%
   2. SECONDARY: 1%
   3. UNKNOWN: 0%
   4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 1%
   5. FLEXED: 79%
   6. UNKNOWN:20%
   7. ORIENTATION: 11% WEST, 11% NORTH, 5% SOUTH, 8% SOUTHWEST, 3% NORTHWEST, 67% NORTHEAST
   8. CITATIONS: ATEN 1999: 146

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
   2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 14%
III. & IV. SEX, AGE, & STATURE & HEALTH

1. NO HEALTH OR DEMOGRAPHIC DATA DUE TO INCONSISTENT DOCUMENTATION
2. CITATIONS: ATEN 1999: 179

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NONE
3. TOTAL POTTERY: NONE
4. SHELL TOOLS: 1
5. BONE TOOLS: 3
6. STONE TOOLS: 1
7. ANTLER TOOLS: 1
8. CELT (STONE OR SHELL): 1
9. ANTLER JEWELRY: 2
10. UNLISTED BEADS: 12
11. PROJECTILE POINTS: 8
12. CHERT FLAKES/CORES: 2
13. RED POWDER/OCHRE: 2 BURIALS
14. CITATIONS: ATEN 1999: 152-161

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHNS INCISED, ORANGE INCISED, ST. JOHNS CHECKED STAMPED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 15 SHERDS
3. SHELL TOOLS: 7
4. BONE TOOLS: 14
5. SHELL CUPS/DIPPERS: 12
6. ANTLER TOOLS: 2
7. BONE JEWELRY: 10
8. SHELL JEWELRY: 2
9. UNLISTED BEADS: 2
10. SHELL: 35
11. PROJECTILE POINT: 2
12. CHERT FLAKES/CORES: 14
13. CITATIONS: ATEN 1999: 152-161

VI. REFERENCES:

Aten, Lawrence E.

Bushnell, Francis F.

Jahn, Otto L., and Ripley P. Bullen
Miller, James J. and John W. Griffin  
1978 *Cultural Resource Reconnaissance of Lake Woodruff NWR*. Florida Site Files, Bureau of Archaeological Research, Florida Department of State, Tallahassee.

Russo, Michael  
TIERRA VERDE MOUND (CABBAGE KEY MIDDEN): (8PI51)-PINELLAS COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 825 BP
   2. COUNTY: PINELLAS
   3. PERIOD: SAFETY HARBOR (AD 900-1350)
   4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY
   5. MOUND: YES
   6. SHAPE: DOME
   7. HEIGHT: 8 FT (2.4 M)
   8. DIAMETER: 100 FT (30.48 M)
   9. ADJACENT FEATURES: SEVERAL MIDDENS
  10. TOTAL BURIALS: 48
  11. STUDIED BURIALS: 48

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. TOP: HUMIC
   2. SAND MOUND WITH SOME SHELL LAYERS
   3. MIDDEN BELOW MOUND
   4. CHARNEL HOUSE: POSSIBLE
   5. POTTERY DEPOSITS EAST OF MOUND

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 0%
   2. SECONDARY: 100%
   3. UNKNOWN: 0%
   4. FLEXED: 55%
   5. BUNDLE: 33%
   6. SKULL: 5%
   7. UNKNOWN: 3%
   8. SEARS: BELIEVES ALL BURIALS WERE REALLY BUNDLES

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: ?
   2. GRAVE GOODS: SOME POTTERY ASSEMBLAGES COULD HAVE BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH INDIVIDUAL BURIALS
   3. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: POTTERY
   4. CITATIONS: SEARS 1967: 30-31, 62-64

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
   1. MALE: 4%
   2. FEMALE: 10%
   3. UNKNOWN: 85%
   4. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 1993: 266, 270
B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 6%
3. ADULT: 25%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 62%
6. AVERAGE AGE: ?
7. STATURE: 1.56-1.63 +/- 3CM MALES- ONLY 2 BODIES COULD BE STUDIED
8. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON 1993: 266, 270

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. CARIES: 2.08% (HUTCHINSON 1993: 268, 270), 1% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 102)
3. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 2.1% (HUTCHINSON 1993: 265)
4. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 2.08% (HUTCHINSON 1993: 268, 270; HUTCHINSON 2004: 105)
5. DENTAL CALCULUS: 2.1% (HUTCHINSON 1993: 270)

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 17% (HUTCHINSON 1993: 265, 267), 41.6% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 102)
3. OSTEOMYELITIS: 2.1% (HUTCHINSON 93: 265, 267), 9.1% TIBAE (HUTCHINSON 1991: 97, 106)
4. SKELETAL LESIONS: 9% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 114)
5. SYSTEMIC INFECTION: 16% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 108)
6. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 2% (HUTCHINSON 1993: 268), 4% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 122)
   2.56% (INCLUDING CRIBRA ORBITALIA- HUTCHINSON 1991: 126)
8. CRIBRA ORBITALIA: 4.2% (HUTCHINSON 1993: 270)
9. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 0% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 87, 117) 0% OF ADULTS
   (HUTCHINSON 2004: 124)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: NO
2. NO CLEAR EVIDENCE OF INDIVIDUAL GOODS
3. ONLY ARTIFACTS RECOVERED IN MOUND WERE POTTERY SHERDS

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHNS CHECKED STAMPED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN,
   PINELLAS PLAIN, SAND TEMPERED, BELLE GLADE PLAIN
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 1202 SHERDS

VI. REFERENCES:

Hutchinson, Dale L.
1993 Analysis of Skeletal Remains from the Tierra Verde Site, Pinellas County, West-Central Florida.


Sears, William H.
TURTLE SHORES: (8SJ3262)- ST. JOHNS COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 1450 BP
2. COUNTY: ST. JOHNS
3. PERIOD: ST. JOHNS I (500 BC- AD 800)
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY
5. MOUND: MIDDEN/ MOUND?- MOUND MISSING ITS TOP?
6. SHAPE: ?
7. HEIGHT: ?
8. DIAMETER: 400 X 175 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 MIDDEN, AND THE SITE IS POSSIBLY PART OF ANOTHER MIDDEN
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 8
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 8

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: BASE OF DUNE RIDGE & MIDDEN- MOUND MISSING ITS TOP?
2. SAND MOUND MAY HAVE BLOW AWAY
3. SOILS: VERY DARK GRAYISH BROWN SURROUNDED BY VERY PALE BROWN
4. ROUND PIT LINED WITH OYSTER SHELLS
5. OYSTER SHELL LINING, SOIL BELOW VERY PALE BROWN SAND
6. FEATURES: 1 MASS BURIAL

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 100%
2. SECONDARY: 0%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. FLEXED: 100%
5. CITATIONS: HAGESETH 1993: 38-45

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 38%
3. AGE: 2 ADULTS, 1 SUBADULT
4. SEX: 1 MALE, 1 FEMALE, 1 UNKNOWN
5. GRAVE GOODS: 2 ST. JOHNS PLAIN SHERDS, 3 QUAHOG SHELLS
6. FEATURES: SHELL LINING FOR BURIAL DEPOSIT
7. CITATIONS: HAGESETH 1993: 38-45

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 25%
2. FEMALE: 25%
3. UNKNOWN: 50%
4. CITATIONS: HAGESETH 1993: 44
B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 13%
2. SUBADULT: 38%
3. ADULT: 50%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 7%
6. CITATIONS: HAGESETH 1993: 44

IV. HEALTH:

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. ABSCESSES: 25%
3. DENTAL CONDITIONS ALL STUDIED?: BUT LITTLE EVIDENCE OF DIFFERENT CONDITIONS FOUND-TEETH ONE ELEMENT VERY WELL PRESERVED
4. CITATIONS: HAGESETH: 1993: 54-59

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. WHILE HEALTH & PATHOLOGY EXAMINED- NO MAJOR PROBLEMS REPORTED?
2. CITATIONS: HAGESETH 1993: 54-59

V. GRAVE GOODS:

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ST. JOHNS PLAIN
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 2 SHERDS
4. SHELL: 3
5. CITATIONS: HAGESETH 1993: 38-45

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. SITE SO DISTURBED ONLY BURIAL DEPOSIT COULD REALLY BE UNDERSTOOD
2. CITATIONS: HAGESETH 1993: 38-45

VI. REFERENCES:

Hageseth, Elizabeth Carroll
WALKER POINT MOUND: (8NA43)- NASSAU COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 800 BP
2. COUNTY: NASSAU
3. PERIOD: ST. JOHN IIA (AD 1100-1200)
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CONICAL
7. HEIGHT: 10 FT (3 M)
8. DIAMETER: 60-70 FT (21.35 M)
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 3 MIDDENS, 1 VILLAGE
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 30
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 6
12. CITATIONS: HEMMINGS AND DEAGAN 1973: 30-34, 39

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. FINAL LAYER: ZONE 4- PINK SAND-FINAL CONSTRUCTION FILL, 3FT WIDTH
   MOUND NOW 10 FT IN HEIGHT SEALED BURIAL LAYER, VERY VISIBLE FOR MILES
2. HERMATITITE NODULES, SCATTERED HUMAN BONES, OCCASIONAL ISOLATED
   OYSTER & CLAM VALVES 28 SHERDS AFTER 1100AD
3. MIDDLE LAYER 2: ZONE 3- 7 FT IN AREAS, MOUND FILL GRAY SAND-SMALL
   CONICAL MOUND 6 X 32 FT
4. 6 HUMAN BURIALS-NORTHEAST, FEW HEAVILY WEATHERED OYSTER, CLAM
   KNOBBED WHELK SHELLS, 6 PLAIN SHERDS
5. BOTTOM LAYER: ZONE 2-1 FT OR LESS SUBMOUND SHELL MIDDEN-AFTER 1100AD
   USED MOSTLY OYSTER
6. CHARNEL HOUSE: BODIES MOVES FROM CHARNEL HOUSE LOCATED ELSEWHERE
7. NOTES: OTHER LAYERS SLOPE WASH, INNER CORE OF MOUND DUG INTO IN
   RECENT TIMES- HUMAN BONE AND VESSELS SCATTERED AND LOST

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 83%
2. SECONDARY: 17%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 40%
5. FLEXED:40%
6. BUNDLE: 20%
7. ORIENTATION: 50% SOUTHEAST, 25% NORTHWEST, 25% NORTHEAST
8. CITATIONS: HEMMINGS AND DEAGAN 1973: 39-41

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 17%
3. AGE: 1 ADULT
4. SEX: 1 MALE
5. GRAVE GOODS: FOOD OFFERING
III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 67%
2. FEMALE: 33%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1973: 72-76

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 0%
3. ADULT: 100%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. CARIES: 0%
3. DENTAL CHIPPING: 0%
4. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 25%, 33% MALES, 0% FEMALES
5. PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS: 50%, 33% MALES, 100% FEMALES
6. REABSORPTION/ PERIODONTAL DISEASE: 25%, 33% MALES, 0% FEMALES
7. ABSCESSES: 25%, 33% MALES, 0% FEMALES
8. HEAVY DENTAL WEAR: 50%, 33% MALES, 100% FEMALES
9. DENTAL CALCULUS: 25%, 33% MALES, 0% FEMALES
10. PERIODONTAL DISEASE: 75%, 67% MALES, 100% FEMALES
11. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1973: 72-76

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 20% (SLIGHT), 67% MALES, 0% FEMALES
3. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 25%, 0% MALES, 100% FEMALES
4. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1973: 72-76

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NO POTTERY
3. SHELL TOOLS: 1
4. RED HEMATITE: MANY SMALL NODULES
5. CITATIONS: HEMMINGS AND DEAGAN 1973: 41-48

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: SAND TEMPERED, ST. JOHNS PLAIN, SAVANNAH CHECK STAMPED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 94
3. SHELL TOOLS: 1
4. BONE TOOLS: 1
5. SHELL BEADS: 1
6. PROJECTILE POINTS: 1
7. CITATIONS: HEMMINGS AND DEAGAN 1973: 41-48
VI. REFERENCES:

Bullen, Adelaide K.

Hemmings, E. Thomas, and Kathleen Deagan

Thunen, Robert L. and Keith H. Ashley
WEEKI WACHEE MOUND: (8HE12) - HERNANDO COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 415 BP
2. COUNTY: HERNANDO
3. PERIOD: SAFETY HARBOR- POST CONTACT (AD 1525-1550)
4. DATING METHOD: SPANISH ARTIFACTS, POTTERY
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: CIRCULAR
7. HEIGHT: 0.8- 0.9 M
8. DIAMETER: 13.7 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: ?DESTROYED?
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 84
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 84

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: MODERN DISTURBANCES
2. 2 STAGES OF CONSTRUCTION
3. TOP LAYER: WHITE SAND WITH MODERN DEBRIS
4. MIDDLE LAYER: SAND MOUND, LITTLE STRATIGRAPHY
5. LARGE SHELLS AND SHELL CUPS IN TOP LAYER- BLACK DRINK CEREMONY
6. POTTERY ALL COVERED BURIALS
7. 1ST CAPPED AT 0.4 M AND LATER BURIALS THEN ADDED
8. SEVERAL PRIMARY & SECONDARY BURIALS, 1 BUNDLE BURIAL ADDED SLIGHTLY LATER
9. CHARNEL HOUSE: USED- BUT NOT ON MOUND

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 10%
2. SECONDARY: 90%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. FLEXED: 10%
5. BUNDLE: 90%
6. UNKNOWN: 0%
7. CITATIONS: MITCHEM AND HUTCHINSON 1996: 54

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 13%
3. AGE: 4 ADULTS, 3 SUBADULTS, 4 UNKNOWNS
4. SEX: 2 MALES, 9 UNKNOWNS
5. GRAVE GOODS: GLASS, SILVER, AND SHELL BEADS, ELLIPTIO SHELLS, ABOUT (417+)
   TOTAL NUMBER OF ARTIFACTS (INCLUDING ALL BEADS) WITH INDIVIDUAL BURIALS
6. GRAVE GOODS
7. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: POTTERY
8. CITATIONS: HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1996: 53-54

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 13%
2. FEMALE: 4%
3. UNKNOWN: 83%

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 20%
3. ADULT: 26%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 54%
6. AVERAGE AGE: ?
7. STATURE: 1.74M

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. CARIES: 3.8% (HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1996: 56-57 2% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 102)
3. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 75% (HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1996: 55-56)
4. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 0% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 105)

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 13% (HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1996: 54, 57) 7.3% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 102)
3. MALES: 18% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 102)
4. FEMALES 0% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 102)
5. OSTEOMYELITIS: 2.3% (HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1996: 54), 5.78% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 97, 106)
6. SKELETAL LESIONS: 15% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 114, 115)
7. SYSTEMIC INFECTION: 9.8% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 108)
8. MALES: 36% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 108)
9. FEMALES: 0% (HUTCHINSON 1991: 96, 108)
10. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 4% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 111) 2.56% (INCLUDING CRIBRA ORBITALIA- HUTCHINSON 1991: 126)
11. CRIBRA ORBITALIA: 4.35% (HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1996: 58)
12. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 1.2% (POSTCRANIA- HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1996: 57) 5% (ADULTS- POSTCRANIA HUTCHINSON 2004: 124) 2.6% TIBIAE (HUTCHINSON 1991 97, 117)
13. ANEMIA: 4.4% (HUTCHINSON AND MITCHEM 1996: 58)

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: 1 SHERD-TYPE NOT DISCUSSED
3. SHELL BEADS: 108+
4. GLASS BEADS: 127
5. SILVER BEADS: 151
6. AMBER BEADS: 1
7. SHELLS: 26
8. MAMMAL BONES: 1
B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
   1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: PASCO PLAIN, SAND TEMPERED PLAIN, ST. JOHNS PLAIN
   2. TOTAL POTTERY: 1539 SHERDS
   3. STONE TOOLS: 4
   4. SHELL CUPS/ DIPPERS: 7
   5. SHELL BEADS: 343
   6. STONE BEADS: 1
   7. SHELLS: 39
   8. FISH BONE: 1
   9. MAMMAL BONE: 1
   10. FOSSIL: 1
   11. PROJECTILE POINT: 1
   12. CHERT FLAKES/CORES: 29

VI. REFERENCES:

Hutchinson, Dale L.


Hutchinson, Dale L. and Jeffrey M. Mitchem

Mitchem, Jeffery M.
WINDOVER POND: (8BR246)- BREVARD COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 7400 BP
   2. COUNTY: BREVARD
   3. PERIOD: EARLY ARCHAIC (8,120-6,980BP UNCORRECTED, 9,000 BP-7,929 BP CALIBRATED)
   4. DATING METHOD: NUMEROUS C-14 SAMPLES FROM VARIETY OF MATERIALS
   5. MOUND: NO- POND SITE
   6. SHAPE: POND
   7. HEIGHT: -1 M
   8. AREA: 7,000 M
   9. ADJACENT FEATURES: ?
   10. TOTAL BURIALS: 336+
   11. STUDIED BURIALS: 169

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. SITE: ARCHAIC POND CEMETERY
   2. BURIALS PLACED AT BOTTOM OF POND/ WOODEN STAKES IMBEDED BY BURIALS
   3. CITATIONS: DICKEL 2002: 73-75

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 100%
   2. SECONDARY: 0%
   3. UNKNOWN: 0%
   4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 3%
   5. FLEXED: 95%
   6. UNKNOWN: 0%
   7. ORIENTATION: 33% WEST, 19% EAST, 6% NORTH, 5% SOUTH, 8% SOUTHEAST, 22% SOUTHWEST, 5% NORTHEAST, 3% NORTHWEST

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
   2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 62%
   3. AGE: 46 ADULTS, 22 SUBADULTS
   4. SEX: 27 MALES, 19 FEMALES, 22 UNKNOWNS
   5. GRAVE GOODS: VARIOUS: BONE AND ANTLER ARTIFACTS AND TOOLS, FABRIC WRAPPINGS, SEEDS, TEETH, MODIFIED AND UNMODIED BONE, FEW SHELL BEADS, LITHICS, GOURDS, ATLATLS
   6. NOTES: 27% OF FEMALES -MULTIPLE ARTIFACTS, 38% OF MALES MULTIPLE ARTIFACTS,
   7. 18% OF JUVENILES MULTIPLE ARTIFACTS/ 10.34% INDIVIDUALS WITH HUNTING / WEAPONS 15/145
   8. CITATIONS: DICKEL 2002: 78-96

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 28%
2. FEMALE: 28%
3. UNKNOWN: 44%
4. CITATIONS: HAMLIN 1998: 19

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 8%
2. SUBADULT: 42%
3. ADULT: 29%
4. 50YRS+: 14%
5. UNKNOWN: 6%
6. AVERAGE AGE: OVERALL: 36
7. MALES: 45
8. FEMALES: 38
9. STATURE: OVERALL 1.65M, 1.7M-MALES, 1.59M- FEMALES

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: NO
2. CARIES: 5% OF TEETH (HUTCHINSON 2004: 101)
3. ALVEOLAR INFECTION: 38% (HUTCHINSON 2004: 105)
4. ENAMEL HYPOPLASIA: 2.8% OF TEETH (WALSH-HANEY 1999:?)

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: BOTH
2. PERIOSTITIS: 7-8% OF TIBIAE
3. MALES: 1.8% OF TIBIAE
4. FEMALES: 1.1% OF TIBIAE
5. CITATIONS: HAMLIN 1995: 10-11
6. OSTEOMYELITIS: 0.4% (HAMLIN 1995: 11)
7. POROTIC HYPEROSTOSIS: 41.6%
8. MALES: 38.8%
9. FEMALES 52.3%
11. CRIBRA ORBITALIA: 27.2%
12. MALES: 16.6%
13. FEMALES: 30%
14. CITATIONS: ESTES: 109, 111
15. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 98% OF ADULTS
16. 100% MALES
17. 97% FEMALES
18. CITATIONS: MARIEL SMITH 2004: 30
19. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 14% ADULTS (13%CRANIA, 1%POST) HUTCHINSON 2004: 124
20. 22% OF INDIVIDUALS (RACHEL SMITH 2003: 21, 25)
21. MALES: 27.8% (RACHEL SMITH 2003: 45)
22. FEMALES: 34% (RACHEL SMITH 2003: 45)
23. BLUNT TRAUMA: 13%, 0% MALES, 0% FEMALES (HUTCHINSON 2004: 125)
24. HEALTH STRESS (HARRIS LINES): 92% OF TIBIAES (ESTES 1988: 42)

V. GRAVE GOODS:

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NO POTTERY
3. BONES TOOLS: 24
4. WOOD OR FLORAL ARTIFACTS: 204
5. ANTLER ARTIFACTS: 32
6. SHELL BEADS: 82
7. BONE BEADS: 11
8. SHARK TEETH: 12
9. MAMMAL TEETH: 15
10. SHELL: 18
11. MAMMAL BONES: 17
12. REPTILE BONE: 20
13. BIRD BONE: 37
14. CHERT FLAKES/CORES: 8
15. CITATIONS: DICKEL 2002: 79-96

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: NO POTTERY
2. SHELL TOOLS: 20
3. STONE TOOLS: 1
4. SHELL CUPS/DIPPERS: 23
5. WOOD OR FLORAL ARTIFACTS: 7
6. SHELL BEADS: 5
7. UNLISTED BEADS: 1
8. SHARKE TEETH: 8
9. LEATHER OR CLOTH: 7
10. SHELLS: 90
11. MAMMAL BONE: 1
12. FISH BONE: 3
13. PROJECTILE POINT: 2
14. CHERT FLAKES/CORES: 29
15. CITATIONS: DICKEL 2002: 79-96

VI. REFERENCES:

Dickel, David
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Smith, Heather Mariel
2004  *Degenerative Joint Disease in the Windover Population.* MA Thesis, Department of Anthropology, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
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WOODWARD (TACOMA) MOUND: (8AL47)- ALACHUA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
   1. DATE: 850 BP
   2. COUNTY: ALACHUA
   3. PERIOD: LATE WEEDEN ISLAND (HICKORY POND)/ ST. JOHNS IIA
   4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY
   5. MOUND: YES
   6. SHAPE: CIRCULAR
   7. HEIGHT: 3 FT (0.91 M)
   8. DIAMETER: 50 FT (15 M)
   9. ADJACENT FEATURES: VILLAGE
   10. TOTAL BURIALS: 43+
   11. STUDIED BURIALS: 28

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
   1. NOTES: 10-15 SKELETONS REMOVED BEFORE ACHAEOLOGICAL WORK DONE
   2. 3 ZONES
   3. TOP LAYER: SUPERIOR BROWN
   4. CHIPS, WORKED CHERT, CHARCOAL
   5. MIDDLE LAYER: MOTTLED BROWN; TAN, BROWN, DARK BROWN SAND & LOAM, CHARCOAL
   6. CHIPS, FEW SHERDS, 3 PROJECTILE POINTS, CELT, CLAYSTONES
   7. EXTENDED BURIALS IN ON EASTERN AREA OF MOUND
   8. BOTTOM LAYER: DARK GRAY; SAND MIXED W/ CHARCOAL
   9. CHIPS, WORKED CHERT, CHARCOAL/ 2 CENTRAL BURIAL PITS INSTALLED INTO LAYER, FIREPLACE
   10. OTHER: FEATURES: CENTRAL BURIAL PIT, 1 FIREPLACE

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
   1. PRIMARY: 89%
   2. SECONDARY: 11%
   3. UNKNOWN: 0%
   4. EXTENDED SUPINE: 61%
   5. BUNDLE: 11%
   6. SKULL: 4%
   7. UNKNOWN: 25%
   8. NOTE: MANY BURIALS ON EAST SIDE OF MOUND
   9. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1949: 54-57

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
   1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
   2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 18%
   3. AGE: 3 ADULTS, 2 CHILDREN
   4. SEX: 2 MALES, 1 FEMALE, 2 UNKNOWNS
   5. GRAVE GOODS: RED POWDER, 3 SHELL BEADS, 1 ALACHUA PLAIN SHERD, 1 SHELL
   6. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1949: 54-57
III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 29%
2. FEMALE: 21%
3. UNKNOWN: 50%
4. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1949: 54-57

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 4%
2. SUBADULT: 21%
3. ADULT: 57%
4. 50YRS+: 14%
5. UNKNOWN: 4%
6. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1949: 54-57

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. CARIES: 8%
3. PREMORTEM TOOTH LOSS: 32%
4. HEAVY DENTAL WEAR: 12%
5. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1949: 54-57

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. VIOLENT DEATH: 4%
3. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1949: 54-57

V. GRAVE GOODS

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: ALACHUA PLAIN
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 1 SHERD
4. SHELL BEADS: 3
5. RED OCHRE: 4 BURIALS
6. SHELL: 1
7. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1949: 54-60

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: PRAIRE CORD MARKED
2. TOTAL POTTERY: 24
3. STONE TOOLS: 1
4. CELT (STONE): 1
5. PROJECTILE POINT: 3
6. CHERT FLAKES/ CORES: 150
7. CITATIONS: BULLEN 1949: 54-60

VI. REFERENCES:

Bullen, Ripley P.
Milanich, Jerald T.
YELLOW BLUFFS-WHITAKER MOUND: (8SO4)- SARASOTA COUNTY

I. LOCATION, AGE, CULTURE, PERIOD, LAYOUT, BURIAL COUNT

A. BASIC ISSUES:
1. DATE: 500 BP
2. COUNTY: SARASOTA
3. PERIOD: SEMI SAFETY HARBOR/ GLADES III (AD 1300-1500)/ MANASOTA
4. DATING METHOD: POTTERY, TOOLS
5. MOUND: YES
6. SHAPE: RECTANGULAR- ORIGINALLY ELLIPTICAL IN SHAPE
7. HEIGHT: 2.49 M
8. DIAMETER: 29 X 37 M
9. ADJACENT FEATURES: 1 LARGE MIDDEN, 2 MOUNDS
10. TOTAL BURIALS: 13+
11. STUDIED BURIALS: 10

B. LAYERS OF SITE:
1. NOTES: TOP OF MOUND REMOVED WITH CONSTRUCTION OF PERGOL, 3 BY 15FT HOLE THROUGH TOP OF MOUND, AND SUMMER HOUSE HAD TO BE REMOVED BEFORE EXCAVATION.
2. 8 LAYERS
3. TOP: HUMUS
4. 2. MEDIUM-GRAY CHARCOAL-STAINED SAND LEACH
5. 3. LIGHT YELLOW-MOTTLE WITH BROWN
6. 4. WHITE, MOTTLED WITH GREY LEACHED SAND
7. 5. STERILE, CHOCOLATE BROWN REDEROS LAYER
8. 6. BROWN MOTTLED-WITH GREY-SAND BASKET LOADED, MOUND FILL (FOOD BONES AND SHELL FRAGMENTS SCATTERED THROUGHOUT)
9. 7. MEDIUM GRAY, MOTTLED, MOUND FILL
10. 8. BUFF, LENSED WITH GRAY SAND, VERY DISTINCT ALMOST STRIPED
11. PREPARED MOUND OF TWO DISTINCT LAYERS OF SHELL AND FOOD BONES SEPARATED BY A STERILE LAYER OF SOIL
12. FEATURES: EVIDENCE OF SACRIFICIAL VICTIMS OR TROPHIES,
13. CIRCULAR AREAS SIMILAR TO POST HOLES ON SOUTH SIDE,
14. 14 CONCH SHELLS IN E-W ROW
15. AT LEAST OP ONE FIRE PIT

II. INDIVIDUAL BURIAL TYPES

A. BURIAL TYPE:
1. PRIMARY: 90%
2. SECONDARY: 10%
3. UNKNOWN: 0%
4. PRONE: 20%
5. FLEXED: 50%
6. BUNDLE: 10%
7. UNKNOWN: 20%
8. ORIENTATION: MAJORITY OF BURIALS WERE EAST FACING
9. NOTES:
10. BUNDLE BURIALS MIGHT REPRESENT INTRERRMENT OF TRPHY OR CLEANED AND STORED BURIALS
11. THE PRONE BURIALS MIGHT REPRESENT SACRIFICIAL OFFERING OF FAMILY OR RETAINERS
12. CITATIONS: MILANICH 1972: 34-35, 37, 39

B. INDIVIDUAL BURIALS & GRAVE GOODS:
1. INDIVIDUALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: YES
2. BURIALS W/ GRAVE GOODS: 60%
3. AGE: 6 ADULTS, 1 CHILD
4. SEX: 3 MALES, 1 FEMALES, 3 UNKNOWNS
5. GRAVE GOODS: FOOD OFFERING, SNAKE VERTEBRAE, SHARK TEETH, STONE TOOLS
6. LAYERS OVER BURIALS: FOOD OFFERING-MAINLY FISH- MOST OF THE OTHER MATERIAL POSSIBLY THE RESULT OF MIDDEN FILL
7. POSSIBLE SACRIFICIAL VICTIMS OR TROPHIES
8. CITATIONS: MILANICH 1972: 34-35, 37, 39

III. SEX, AGE, & STATURE

A. SEX
1. MALE: 30%
2. FEMALE: 30%
3. UNKNOWN: 40%
4. CITATIONS: MILANICH 1972: 34-35, 37

B. AGE:
1. INFANT: 0%
2. SUBADULT: 20%
3. ADULT: 86%
4. 50YRS+: 0%
5. UNKNOWN: 0%
6. AVERAGE Age: ?
7. STATURE: ?
8. CITATIONS: MILANICH 1972: 34-35, 37

IV. HEALTH

A. DENTAL:
1. NO DENTAL PROBLEMS REPORTED AND ONLY 1 BURIAL WITH ANY NOTABLE PATHOLOGIES REPORTED
2. CITATIONS: MILANICH 1972: 34-35, 37

B. OTHER HEALTH INDICATORS:
1. CALCULATED BY ME: YES
2. OSTEOARTHRITIS: 11%
3. TRAUMA/ FRACTURES: 11%
4. CITATIONS: MILANICH 1972: 34-35, 37

V. GRAVE GOODS:

A. INDIVIDUAL GRAVE GOODS:
1. PRESENT: YES
2. MOST COMMON POTTERY: PINELLAS PLAIN
3. TOTAL POTTERY: 5 SHERDS
4. STONE TOOLS: 2
5. SHARK TEETH: 87
6. MAMMAL BONE: SOME
7. FISH BONE: SOME

298
8. QUARTZ PEBBLES: 2

B. UNKNOWN CONTEXT OR FILL:
   1. MOST COMMON POTTERY: PINELLAS PLAIN, GRIT TEMPERED
   2. TOTAL POTTERY: 668 SHERDS
   3. BONE TOOLS: 9
   4. STONE TOOLS: 3
   5. SHARK VERTEBRA BEAD: 1
   6. SHARK TOOTH BEAD: 1
   7. SHARK TEETH: 20
   8. PROJECTILE POINTS/ KNIVES: 11

VI. REFERENCES:

Bullen, Ripley P.

Luer, George M.

Luer, George M., and Marion M. Almy
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