Chapter 3. THE ARCHAIC

The Archaic tradition (10,000-3000 B.P.) is divided into three parts: Early (10,000-7,000 B.P.), Middle (7000-5000 B.P.), and Late (5000-2500 B.P.) (Milanich and Fairbanks 1980:54, 60). These divisions are based largely on stylistic changes in stemmed projectile points and the presence of fiber-tempered pottery in the Late period. Data on corresponding changes in social organization, economy, and ritual behavior are severely limited. Throughout the Archaic period, lifestyles were generally characterized by a dependence on fishing, hunting, and gathering; increasing sedentism from early to late periods; and, an egalitarian form of social organization.

The Setting

Approximately 1500 Archaic sites are recorded throughout Florida. In some counties (Jefferson, Pasco, and Hillsborough) over 100 sites are known. This variability is undoubtedly dependent in part on the extent of survey coverage in any given area. In general, most Archaic sites are found in the interior highlands, along the Atlantic coast, in the St. Johns River Valley, along the southwest coast, in the Everglades, along the Gulf coast near Tampa, and along the coast of the panhandle, although isolated Archaic points are found throughout the state. Because sea levels continued to rise during the Archaic, many more Archaic sites are undoubtedly located on the continental shelf off the coast of Florida.

Material Culture

There are a number of artifacts, mostly lithic, which characterize the Archaic period, but except for projectile points, there are relatively few that are distinctive to the period. Bullen (1975) has developed a comprehensive listing of Archaic projectile points, but attribute analyses, stratigraphic excavations, and chronometric dates have yet to confirm their chronological relationships. Early Archaic points include side-notched and stemmed, basally chipped types such as Bolen, Dalton, Arredondo, Hamilton, and Kirk Serrated. Middle Archaic points are characterized by their stemmed "Christmas tree" shape and include Levy, Marion, Newnan, and Putnam types. Late Archaic points are generally smaller, stemmed, and corner notched, and include Culbreath, Clay, and Lafayette types. Use-wear analysis suggests that Archaic points were used as tips for projectiles and as hafted knives. They were undoubtedly used to inflict damage on persons (Jahn and Bullen 1978), but their direct association in subsistence production has yet to be demonstrated. The chronological placement of lithic points also remains untested, and they are frequently found out of expected chronological order (e.g., Bullen and Dolan 1959; Jahn and Bullen 1978; Russo 1982). Supposed Archaic points found in ceramic period contexts are frequently explained as heirlooms or curios, or ignored as being out of context. The large number of points found out of context suggests that controlled stratigraphic excavations are needed to refine the temporal use of "Archaic" points across Florida (cf. Ste. Claire 1987).

Other tools of the Archaic include stone scrapers, knives, perforators, drills, choppers, flake knives and scrapers, gouges, and hammerstones (Milanich and Fairbanks 1980; Purdy 1981a). Large cores, blanks, and a variety of lithic debitage are also characteristic of Archaic sites, especially the upland sites.

A large microlith tool complex is known from the Nalcrest site (8PO15), located on Lake Weohyakapka in Polk County (Bullen and Beilman 1973). The tiny artifacts (1-4cm in length) recovered from underwater around the edge of the lake include stemmed points, drills, end scrapers, hafted scrapers, spurred gravers, cores, etc. Artifacts like these have been found elsewhere in association with Early Archaic Bolen points, although similar specimens have been recovered from younger Archaic contexts as well (Milanich and Fairbanks 1980:48). Thermal alteration, or heat-treatment, of chert and silicified coral also seems to be a technological trait of the Archaic, especially of the Middle Archaic (Ste. Claire 1987). The use of this

technology, which increases the ability of chert to flake easily, enabled Archaic people to exploit a wider range of chert resources, and hence, a wider range of environments.

Bone tools include socketed antler points, antler atlatl hooks, bipointed and simple points, barbed points, fish hooks, and a variety of bone pins. Shell adzes are common, and, as wet sites are excavated, worked wood, wood stakes, and canoes are being recovered along with baskets, cloth and clothing, and woven bags. Shell, bone and lithic beads, perforated shark teeth, wooden knife handles, shell and stone pendants and plummets, bone needles, and sandstone abraders have all been recovered in Archaic contexts. None of these items can be attributed solely to Archaic cultures, however, and a formal chronology has yet to be developed for them.

Pottery first appeared in the Late Archaic around ca. 4000 B.P. in the form of fiber-tempered Orange wares (Bullen and Stoltman 1972; Bullen 1954, 1972). The primary center of Late Archaic Orange ceramics is along the St. Johns River, but Orange pottery can be found throughout the state. In the panhandle and along the Gulf, fiber-tempered pottery has been called Norwood (Phelps 1965) and differs from typical Orange pottery of east Florida in its greater sand content. Some Norwood pottery is also simple-stamped, while some Orange pottery is incised. There have been suggestions, based on the distinctions in ceramic wares, that the Norwood cultures were somehow distinct from the Orange cultures. Recently, however, as a result of technological analysis, George Shannon (1986) has called into question the distinction between fiber-tempered pottery types. He suggests that the minor differences between Norwood and Orange wares are due to differences in geographical sources of clays rather than cultural differences. This does not, however, explain differences in surface decorations.

Settlement Patterns

Many Archaic site types are known, including lithic scatters, presumed villages, quarries, caves, cemeteries, and middens. These categories, however, are tentative. A final definition of Archaic site types must come from additional research.

Lithic scatters occur throughout the state along the coast and rivers as well as in sandy uplands. They are characterized by wide variation in size and density. Some sites extend for many acres, while others are relatively small in areal extent. Lithic tools and debitage diversity also are variable. Small lithic scatters may have been special purpose sites or hunting camps. A few lithic scatters, such as Lake Kanapaha (8AL172) (Hemmings and Kohler 1974), Deerstand (8HI483A) (Daniel 1982), 8HI483B (Gagel 1981), Tampa Palms (8HI557) (Austin and Ste. Claire 1982), Diamond Dairy (8HI476) (Chance 1983), and Ranch House (8HI452) (Estabrook and Newman 1984) have been well studied.

In the uplands, villages or base camps are larger and contain larger amounts of lithic refuse and a more diverse tool assemblage than do the smaller, limited activity sites. There appear to be two types of Archaic village. Although base camps have been tentatively identified (Bullen and Dolan 1959; Clausen 1964; Milanich and Fairbanks 1980:57-58), adequate tests have not yet been applied to determine if they differ significantly from sites identified as special purpose sites. The apparent diversity of tool types may be related more to mixed cultural contexts and extended use of the site than to greater diversity in site function at any one time (Russo 1982).

Middle and Late Archaic villages also appear to lie along the St. Johns River and the Gulf and Atlantic coasts. A few of these middens and midden areas have revealed post molds that may represent structures (e.g., McMichael 1982), but no definitive description of how an Archaic village would be manifest archaeologically has been offered (Goggin 1952b; Milanich and Fairbanks 1980; Rouse 1951; Sigler-Eisenberg et al. 1985). Increased depth and areal extent of midden materials, longer-term (e.g., year-round) occupation observable through the faunal and botanical record, and an increased artifact inventory have all been suggested as signatures of permanent and semi-permanent base camps. No village site has

yet been adequately excavated using these criteria, although current excavations on Horr's Island, Collier County, are yielding evidence of all of these markers (Russo 1990). Quarry sites (Chance 1981, 1982b; Purdy 1975, 1981a, 1981b) are mainly located in the interior uplands although some are found along the central peninsula Gulf coast from Tampa Bay north [e. g., Weatherington Island (8HI473); see Chance 1981, 1892b]. Quarries can easily be distinguished from lithic scatters by the occurrence of natural outcroppings of chert materials and a different assemblage of debitage.

Bullen and Benson (1964) identified two Archaic "caves" in the uplands near Ocala. One is actually a sink or cenote. The other is a limestone cave which is littered with Archaic period lithic and faunal remains. It is probable that Archaic peoples used the cave for shelter, but cave shelters are probably not a predictable feature of Archaic settlement.

At least five types of Archaic cemeteries/burial patterns have been identified: wet cemeteries, cemeteries, midden burials, mound burials, and burials in solution pockets. At the early and middle period sites of Republic Groves (8HR4), Little Salt Spring (8SO18), Hazeltine (8SO79), Windover (8BR246), and probably Bay West (8CR200), primary, flexed burials were placed in peat-producing ponds or sloughs, pinned down with wooden stakes, and interred with burial goods ranging from finely constructed fabric to antler atlatl hooks (Beriault et al. 1981; Clausen et al. 1979; Doran and Dickel 1988; Wharton et al. 1981). At Warm Mineral Springs qustions have been raised regarding whether the human remains on the submerged ledges represent intentional interments or drowning victims. These sites are situated adjacent to larger wetland environments, such as rivers and marshes, and are found from central to south Florida.

The Gauthier site (8BR193), a Middle to Late Archaic site, differs from the others in not being placed directly in a peat-producing pond. Wetland environments are nearby, however, and the cemetery may have been placed in a slough between a pond and Lake Poinsett. The Gauthier burials were primary and flexed. Adults and children, males and females, were interred in the same burial pit. The distribution of the few grave goods suggests limited variation in status.

The Tick Island cemetery (8VO24), a Middle Archaic site north of Gauthier along the St. Johns River, was placed directly in a shell midden, although it is similar to other Archaic cemeteries in that it was located within a wet environment. Interpretations of the cemetery (Jahn and Bullen 1978) suggest that a large shell midden was dug into. A number of primary, flexed group burials were placed into pits over an extended period of time (suggesting the use of a charnel house); and a sand mound was then placed over the burials and sealed with a layer of muck. It is hard, however, to reconcile known Archaic burial patterns with those at Tick Island. Although this is not to say that Archaic peoples did not bury their dead in middens along the St. Johns River, either singly or in groups. A number of other sites hint that midden burials may have been a common burial pattern (Moore 1892; Rouse 1951:239). The question of Archaic midden burials along the St. Johns River has yet to be adequately explored.

Recent excavations on Horr's Island have revealed human burials in intentionally built, Late Archaic shell mounds (Russo 1990). The Tick Island cemetery may have been originally a similar shell burial mound overlying burials.

A final type of Late Archaic cemetery is found in south Florida where Late Archaic burials are found in solution depressions and middens, with rocks covering the interments. Apparently the burials were primary, extended and flexed, but may have also included secondary burials (Carr et al. 1984). The late temporal placement of these sites and perhaps the geographical placement within the Everglades suggests a different pattern than that associated with earlier, more northerly Archaic pond burials.

Interior upland Archaic middens containing bone and/or shell are virtually non-existent. This seems contradictory since one model of Archaic subsistence suggests high intensity upland hunting and collecting (Milanich and Fairbanks 1980:146). However, the absence of such middens in the uplands is usually explained by the high acidity of the soil, the subsequent poor preservation of organic remains, and the lack of extensive shellfish populations.

Freshwater Archaic middens are common along the St. Johns River basin and its tributaries and to a lesser extent elsewhere in Florida along major bodies of water. There are two types of midden along the St. Johns: shell middens and bone middens. Shell middens, consisting principally of freshwater shellfish and animal bones, vary in size and are found in the middle and lower reaches of the river and (to a lesser extent) the upper reaches. Bone middens seem to be restricted to the upper St. Johns River marsh areas, are relatively small, and consist of dense thicknesses of animal bone with only an occasional presence of shellfish. In the shell middens, ussel dominates in the upper St. Johns sites while apple and mystery snail are more common in the middle reaches (Russo 1986; Sigler-Eisenberg et al. 1985).

Coastal Archaic middens consisting principally of marine shellfish have been tested from the panhandle to southwest Florida. These are located along estuaries, beaches, and the mouths of rivers. Along the east coast, Late Archaic middens are known from the Florida/Georgia border to the Indian River as far south as Jupiter Island (Russo 1988a, 1988b; Miller 1992). Preceramic Archaic middens have also been identified along the northeast coast (Bond 1988a, 1988b). These middens consist of shellfish common to both beach and brackish estuarine environments as well as small components of freshwater shellfish. They are also characterized by the significant presence of small and large marine fish and, to a lesser extent, terrestrial vertebrates. They range from shell heaps to linear ridges and include occasional shell rings.

Subsistence

All Archaic peoples were undoubtedly hunters. The evidence from both coastal and riverine middens is convincing that terrestrial animals were frequently hunted and consumed, and their by-products fashioned into tools. These animals include deer, raccoon, and waterfowl, among many other species. In the interior uplands, the evidence for hunting is less direct and comes in the form of projectile points and other lithic tools assumed to be produced for hunting and preparing animals.

Fishing was a common activity during the Archaic along the coasts and rivers. The kinds of fishing, however, may have differed through time and across geographical regions. At Horr's Island (8CR37-42) on the southwest coast of Florida, Alan McMichael (1982) suggested (based on size) that bottom-dwelling estuarine fish such as catfish and sheepshead were commonly caught on lines. Smaller fish were apparently netted (Russo 1990). At the Useppa Island site (8LL51) a wide variety of species of fish were being captured (Milanich et al. 1984). At the Meig's Pasture site (8OK102) along the panhandle Gulf coast, the size and kinds of fish in the midden indicate that netting was a common method of capture (Curren et al. 1987). At the Cotten site (8VO83) on the Atlantic near Daytona, both large and small sharks were being captured along with other fish, suggesting a variety of capture techniques (Hale 1984).

Along the upper St. Johns River, within the marshlands and along shallow lakes, small fish, many as small as minnows, were the dominant species in Late Archaic middens, suggesting mass-capture techniques (Russo 1986). Farther downstream, large fish may have been more common than the small fish that characterize the upper portions of the river. In short, the Archaic peoples were capable of capturing both small and large fish through the use of a variety of capture techniques which probably included nets, hooks, gigs, and traps.

Shellfish also played an important part in the subsistence of Archaic peoples. At the Cotten site, coquina was the dominant shellfish species (Hale 1984). A variety of species including oyster, quahog, and crossbarred venus were also used in the Late Archaic and earlier (Russo 1988b). Along the middle St. Johns River, mystery and apple snail were commonly used along with a variety of freshwater mussel. Along the Gulf coast marine shellfish, such as quahogs, whelks, and conchs, were common food items, as were oysters and other locally abundant shellfish such as *Rangia* (in northwest Florida) and scallops. Coquina were apparently not used along the Gulf coast to the degree that they were along the Atlantic

coast. Also along the Atlantic, freshwater shellfish have been found in coastal middens in small amounts, suggesting a different aquatic regime than exists now.

Shellfish has been suggested as one of the resources that allowed the beginnings of semi-permanent and permanent village life. The reliability, attainability, and predictability of the food source perhaps allowed people to collect significant sources of animal protein, which in turn allowed increased sedentism. Shellfish represented a natural "stored" source of protein next to which people could settle for long periods of time. This food source could have allowed predictable movements of large numbers of people for extended periods of time, when seasonally abundant shellfish, such as coquina and scallops, became numerous.

These hypotheses regarding Archaic sedentism have yet to be adequately tested. One test suggests that, contrary to predictions, in the upper St. Johns River, the intensive use of shellfish seems to come after the Late Archaic, not during or before (Sigler-Eisenberg et al. 1985). Elsewhere, criteria for determining permanent versus semi-permanent settlement through the increased use or seasonal use of shellfish have yet to be developed or adequately explored. Shellfish seasonality studies, however, have been employed at several Archaic sites, including Horr's Island (Russo 1990).

Collecting has often been viewed as an activity dominated by women, children, and the aged in foraging and hunting societies. In reality, all age and sex classes are involved, although the reliance on the contribution by women is probably greater. Therefore the identification of collected resources is potentially important in understanding social structure and economic contribution by various classes of Archaic peoples. Typical resources collected include shellfish, small and slow game, and certain classes of fish and other aquatic organisms. Also included are plants which yield seeds, nuts, fruits, roots, or greens.

Collected game such as snake and tortoise have been recovered in virtually all Archaic middens investigated in Florida, although their relative contributions to the overall economy of Archaic peoples have not been well studied. Collected plants are less well-known due to poorer preservation. In dry and inundated sites, hackberry, sabal palmetto, hickory, acorns, squash, and bottle gourd are some of the most noteworthy plant species recovered. The latter two may represent semi-domesticated or "tame" varieties and have been obtained from Early through Late Archaic sites (Newsom 1988). Non-food botanical specimens include a variety of woods such as pine and oak that were used for fuel and for tool manufacture. A variety of fibers has also been recovered that were collected for use in the manufacture of clothing and baskets (Andrews et al. 1988). In short, collecting activity was a major part of the economy of the Archaic peoples and its contribution warrants further investigation.

Important Sites

Eleven sites that have Archaic components are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. These are the Windover site (8BR246) and Jupiter Inlet Archaeological District (8PB34) on the Atlantic coast; the Bowers Bluff Middens Archaeological District (8LA88), the Kimball Island Midden (8LA89), and Mount Royal (8PU35) sites along the St. Johns River; the Upper Tampa Bay Archaeological District (8HI2271) and the Osprey (8SO2), Little Salt Spring (8SO18), and Warm Mineral Springs (8SO19) sites on the Gulf coast; and Thomas Creek Archaeological District (8SR338) and Waddells Mill Pond (8JA65) in northwest Florida. In addition to these, other important sites include the Gauthier (8BR193) and Tick Island sites in the St. Johns Valley, the Cotten site (8VO83) on the Atlantic coast; the Cutler Fossil site (8DA2001) in South Florida; the Horr's Island (8CR37-42), Useppa Island (8LL51), and Bay West (8CR2000) sites in southwest Florida; the Republic Groves site (8HR4) in Hardee County; the the Page/Ladson site (8JE591) and Meig's Pasture site (8OK102) in northwest Florida; Newnan's Lake in north central Florida; and the Diamond Dairy and Myakkahatchee (8SO397) sites in the central Gulf coast region.

Research Questions

Chronology and technology. We need stratigraphically and chronologically (via chronometric dating) controlled excavations to establish formal typologies and chronologies for Archaic tools. In particular, lithic points or bifaces (many of which may be knives) and other tools, fiber-tempered ceramic designs and technological attributes, and (with the advent of wet site archaeology) perishable artifacts, such as wooden and reed implements, need to be placed in time and space in order to overcome temporal inadequacies in the current typologies. We need also to examine Archaic lithic assemblages and assemblage variability through time and among different types of sites.

Do point/biface types overlap through time and from one place to another?

Are there temporal or geographical differences in non-point/biface lithic artifacts?

Are cultural distinctions reflected in the differences between Orange and Norwood ceramics assemblages?

Are cultural distinctions reflected in the differences between lithic assemblages?

Are temporal or cultural distinctions reflected in bone, wood, reed, and other organic artifacts?

Settlement patterns. We need to understand better the settlement structure and seasonal movements of Archaic peoples. More emphasis should be placed on identifying chert types and sources of lithic artifacts. Similarly, more data should be gathered on the use of shell and bone artifact types and sources. Such data can inform us about the movements of Archaic peoples and interactions among regions of the state.

Are there really base camps in the uplands?

Can seasonality of site occuptions be determined?

To answer these questions we need to undertake more than just lithic studies in the uplands. Innovative techniques, such as phosphate and pH testing, need to be employed to help determine intensity of site use. Thermoluminescence and radiocarbon dating will help us determine when and how long lithic scatter, quarry, and base camps were used when diagnostic artifacts are not present. Seasonal analyses of midden and burial sites away from the upland lithic centers should be undertaken in order to determine where Archaic peoples gathered throughout the year.

What archaeological evidence constitutes a village along the coasts or rivers and what sets it apart from a seasonal camp?

Were Archaic peoples in Florida chiefly upland dwellers or coastal and river dwellers? What is the distribution of variation of Archaic sites?

We need to study a variety of different types of lithic scatters in order to better understand settlement systems.

We also need to determine how lithic scatter sites are formed so that we can unravel their depositional histories. Sites may represent a series of short-term occupations rather than a single long-term occupation. Both cultural and non-cultural formation processes should be considered.

Economy. The notion that over thousands of years, Archaic people slowly and gradually evolved from the semi-nomadic lifestyle of Paleoindian hunter-gatherers into village dwellers and ultimately incipient horticulturists, needs to be reexamined in light of recent finds along the east coast of Early Archaic peoples whose economic strategy was apparently geared to marine resources, the growing of squash and gourds, and the production of intricate fabrics requiring involved loom-work.

Lithic point/biface typology implies that influence from the Southeast largely directed the development of point types in Florida. It has been suggested that Poverty Point and other cultures directed stylistic influences on the Late Archaic in Florida. Conversely, some of the earliest sedentary villages, ceramics, and gourd and squash dates in the Southeast have been found in Florida, and the direction and influence of cultural development must remain open to question.

Were Archaic peoples mainly hunters or largely fisherfolk or both?

What types of plants were used for food, fiber, wood, and so forth?

Was the evolution from Paleoindian to Late Archaic village dweller gradual, or did the transition to a semi-permanent village life occur relatively early in the Archaic, and then slowly evolve?

Was the Late Archaic a time of incipient agricultural development?

Were there trade and exchange connections with the different regions of Florida and with the rest of the Southeast?

Social organization. We need to understand better burial and ritual patterns of Archaic people. Burial goods, population distributions, and physical anthropology should tell us whether there existed ascribed or achieved status distinctions, differences among age and sex classes, or differences in physical conditions among groups of Archaic peoples. Distinctions in tool and ceramic designs, ritual behavior as exhibited in burial patterns, and economies as exist in midden materials indicate whether distinctions between larger social groups of Archaic people existed across Florida.

Five types of burial patterns are known. Do these represent temporal or regional variations? Excavation and chronometric dating of more burial sites should be done.

Drowned terrestrial and wet sites. We need to look under the water. It is now known that that is where some Archaic cultures buried their people. Due to rising water levels, Early through Late Archaic middens also should lie underwater, in whole or part, along the St. Johns River, the Atlantic coast, and the Gulf beaches and estuaries. We can no longer limit ourselves to testing terrestrial components of survey tracts. Minimally, probes should be used in testing shallow water areas of known high potential for Archaic sites. Augers or postholes in shallow lakes and ponds can reveal the presence of Archaic sites, even though provenience data may not be recoverable in controlled contexts. With the use of sandbags and pumps, however, contexts can be well controlled, and important data, such as wooden tools and plant foods, can be recovered from small-scale excavations. Terrestrial development has the potential for altering drainage patterns, introducing adverse mechanical action on sites, and adding pollution to the water environment, all of which may adversely affect the condition and preservation of drowned sites. Experiments are needed to quantify and qualify such changes and factors affecting them.

Preservation Goals

Locate unrecorded Archaic sites, especially in areas endangered by development, altered drainage patterns, or pollution.

Evaluate previously recorded but unevaluated and inadequately evaluated Archaic sites to determine their National Register eligibility.

Acquire and/or protect endangered sites. Immediate action for threatened sites that meet National Registry criteria is needed.

Excavate and preserve sites of various types, e.g., lithic scatters, base camps, quarries, cemeteries, freshwater shell middens, and coastal shell middens.

Nominate sites representing various types to the National Register.