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CHAPTER 8
ETHNICITY AND CERAMICS ON THE SOUTHEASTERN ATLANTIC COAST: AN ETHNOHISTORICAL ANALYSIS
John E. Worth

For many decades, Southeastern archaeologists have grappled with the issue of ceramic variability in both time and space. The struggle includes not just describing and quantifying that variability, but most importantly, explaining it as a reflection of broader patterns of cultural change and diversity (or lack thereof) among Native American groups across the southeastern United States during the last three millennia before European contact, and for several centuries afterward. The archaeological focus continued until mass-produced Euro-American ceramics largely replaced aboriginal wares during the 19th century. In large part owing to the fact that pottery was made, decorated, used, and discarded in such a diversity of cultural contexts and for such a wide range of functions, combined with the fact that pots were relatively easy to produce and decorate at the household level, and commonly had such a short use life, aboriginal ceramics commonly represent one of the most luminous and robust datasets for archaeologists to employ in their studies of material culture as a reflection of past cultural processes. In the past, and continuing to the present day, prehistoric archaeologists in particular have utilized aboriginal ceramics in many ways, not least of which is in the construction and refinement of local and regional cultural chronologies into ceramic style periods, which are commonly used without particular regard to the cultural phenomena that doubtless underlie the observed chronological and geographical variation. In addition to simple chronology-building, prehistoric aboriginal ceramics are also routinely used to define the geographical distribution of ceramic style zones that range from more or less localized “phases” to extremely far-reaching “cultures” or “traditions” (e.g., Willey and Phillips, 1958), none of which can yet be satisfactorily equated directly with human political or social entities as defined by anthropologists (or by the pottery makers themselves, for that matter). However, even in the aftermath of a general disciplinary rejection of this “culture history” paradigm that characterized most Southeastern archaeology through the 1960s (e.g., Lyman et al., 1997), many fundamental tenets of this approach remain implicit among practicing Southeastern archaeologists today, including a widespread assumption of at least rough equivalency between assemblages of archaeologically defined ceramic types, and indigenous Native American ethnic groupings, whether defined principally by sociopolitical affiliation, language, or something else.

Despite what seems to be a commonly presumed relationship between archaeological ceramics and aboriginal ethnicity, archaeologists have long been aware of difficulties in the very definition and interpretation of ceramic styles using archaeological types and assemblages, and the extent to which these types are either “discovered”—and hence reflect meaningful categories for the potters themselves—or “assigned”—and hence are principally an heuristic device for analytical use by the archaeologist (Spaulding, 1953a, 1953b; Ford, 1954a, 1954b). Even the meaning of ceramic “style” itself is hotly debated, incorporating a range of interpretations from style as a conscious communication of social identity (Wobst, 1977) to style as a secondary reflection of social
interaction patterns (Friedrich, 1970), along with assorted combined approaches that reflect the hierarchical nature of style’s many facets, from the obvious and intentional to the implicit and unconscious. Moreover, particular difficulty has always been evident in the attempts to forge a meaningful relationship between the chronological and geographic dimensions of observed variability in ceramic material culture. Why, for example, does one ceramic style zone expand spatially over the course of time, and another contract or disappear? And why does the ceramic assemblage characterizing an entire style zone undergo transformation, either rapid or gradual, in the first place? And how does ceramic variability in space and time relate to other dimensions of the cultures of the pottery makers themselves?

Strictly speaking, attempts to address these questions for specific regions wholly within the prehistoric era are necessarily limited in scope, given that the only direct source of additional and complementary evidence relative to the groups that inhabited that specific region, beyond the ceramic evidence itself, is still archaeological in nature. While ethnographic analogy and ethnoarchaeology from comparative studies in other regions around the world undoubtedly possess considerable relevance for interpreting such data, even if only indirectly, yet another alternative source of explicitly direct evidence relative to the southeastern United States of course lies in the exploration of aboriginal ceramic variability within the early European colonial era, when ethnohistoric evidence is fortunately available to supplement the archaeological record, sometimes providing remarkable detail and depth regarding sociopolitical integration, ethnicity, language, migration, demography, trade, warfare, and a myriad of other dimensions of human variability with both spatial and temporal dimensions. Though archaeological studies of this sort are by no means new (Smith, 1948; Sears, 1955; Fairbanks, 1958; Mason, 1963; see also critique by Hally, 1971: 61–63), and include exemplary and detailed modern research into aboriginal ceramics during the historic period, some specifically relative to the study area (Saunders, 2000a; Cordell, 2001; Foster, 2004), there still remains much room for productive study in this regard.

While historic archaeologists studying Southeastern Indians have commonly drawn much of their methodological and theoretical foundations from prehistoric archaeology, it is also possible to apply this in reverse, and extrapolate specific inferences and generalizations gleaned from the historic era as an evidentiary critique of prehistoric methodologies and theoretical constructs. Indeed, over the past two decades, I have been increasingly intrigued with the potential of data and analyses from the historic period to contribute substantively and directly to the broader anthropological analysis of ceramic variability as a facet of broader questions relative to human cultural variability and change in colonial and noncolonial contexts alike. In my opinion, the conscious and directed exploitation of the multifaceted evidentiary record of the historic era in the southeastern United States provides many potential opportunities to refine and augment existing models relative to aboriginal ceramic variability and its explanation in anthropological terms.

The broader struggle to relate aboriginal ceramic variability to human cultural diversity in a more general sense is well beyond the scope of the present paper, but in the pages that follow I will explore one specific case study relative to that loftier goal. Specifically, here I hope to address one of the more nagging research questions that have plagued archaeologists along the southeastern Atlantic coast. It concerns the correspondence between ceramic material culture and a series of historically documented ethnic groups during the early Spanish colonial era. In particular, I will marshal detailed ethnohistorical evidence (much of which has only come to light in the past decade and a half) to examine associations between four more or less discrete Native American groups—the Guale, the Orista/Escamaçu, the Mocama, and the Yamasee—and the observed archaeological evidence for ceramic variability during the turbulent centuries between first contact (ca. 1514) and the final abandonment (1763) of the coastal region between Port Royal, South Carolina, and St. Augustine, Florida. The specific question that I hope to explore is whether or not aboriginal ceramics in this region (defined at the typological level as assemblages of associated types) are fundamentally linked to these specific ethnicities that are known to have persisted as distinct entities over time, or whether patterns of ceramic variability in both space and time are instead related to other cultural or geographic
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Factors that are largely independent of ethnicity.

To foreshadow my conclusions for this chapter, careful examination of available archaeological data from a variety of sites of known identity and ethnicity within the study area reveals that during the study period (1514–1763), what had originally been a diverse indigenous landscape containing at least three major archaeological ceramic traditions in prehistory (Irene, San Pedro, and St. Johns) was ultimately homogenized into what was, at least at a typological level, a ceramic “monoculture” characterized by a single predominant ceramic tradition, variously known as Altamaha and/or San Marcos (and consciously referred to in this chapter as Altamaha/San Marcos, as discussed below). An evaluation of the precise timing of this transformation in ceramic material culture, and its association (or lack thereof) with various well-documented migrations of specific communities and groups within and among the various subregions of the study area (and beyond), provides compelling evidence regarding the presumed relationship between aboriginal ceramics and ethnicity in the southeastern United States, and by extrapolation regarding the origins of, and explanations for, ceramic variability in general.

**HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT**

Before proceeding to a more detailed analysis of the relationship between archaeological ceramics and ethnicity within the study area (Port Royal to St. Augustine) and period (1514–1763), a review of the historical and archaeological context is instructive in order to place subsequent discussions in context. The following overview will trace the history of European contact with indigenous groups within the study area, including archaeological evidence regarding the same, as a benchmark for later analysis.

**FIRST CONTACTS, 1514–1526**

Nearly half a century before the beginning of the primary era of Spanish colonization and missionization along the lower Atlantic coastline (the 1560s), sporadic slave-raiding expeditions and a single abortive colonial attempt characterized the era of “first contact” between Europeans and Native Americans living in the study area. Not long after the discovery and naming of “La Florida” by Juan Ponce de León during his 1513 voyage, Spanish ships began to reach farther and farther north and west from the Florida peninsula, and at some point between 1514 and 1516 as many as 500 Indian slaves were captured and returned to Hispaniola by Captain Pedro de Salazar from an island he named “Island of Giants,” probably along the Atlantic coastline and possibly within or near the present study area (Hoffman, 1980). Other slave-raiding expeditions during this same period resulted in the transport of at least 300 other Florida Indians to Cuba, some of which might also have come from the study area (see Worth, 2006b). Following a subsequent 1521 slave-raiding expedition to this same area under Pedro de Quejo and Francisco Gordillo (resulting in the capture of as many as 60 Indian slaves), Lúcas Vásquez de Ayllón obtained permission for a colonial venture that included a brief 1525 reconnaissance expedition prior to a 1526 colonization attempt with some 600 people on six ships (Hoffman, 1990; 1992). Beset by a multitude of problems including an African slave revolt, the colony (named San Miguel de Gualdape) failed in less than two months, and only a quarter of the original number survived to return to the Caribbean. Despite several attempts to identify possible locations for the archaeological remains of this short-lived settlement on the Georgia coastline (e.g., Smith, 1992), Ayllón’s colony remains undiscovered. Nevertheless, the recovery of a number of possible early 16th-century Spanish artifacts from Taylor Mound on St. Simons Island remains a tantalizing clue to some form of nearby direct contact between Spanish ships and coastal Native Americans during this early period (Wallace, 1975; Pearson, 1977; Saunders, 2000a: 174–176).

**SPANISH RECONNAISSANCE AND FRENCH FORTIFICATION, 1562–1565**

Following Ayllón’s debacle, it was only two generations later, in the early 1560s, that the southeastern Atlantic coastline began to be visited again by authorized colonial expeditions. After Spanish ships under Ángel de Villafranca (the short-lived replacement for Tristán de Luna) briefly visited Port Royal in 1561, Frenchmen, in 1562, under Jean Ribault cruised along the coastline from the mouth of the St. Johns River to Port Royal, establishing a short-lived fort garrisoned by 28 men late in the year (Laudonnière, 2001: 17–51; Bennett, 2001: 12–16). Interaction between the French garrison and local Native...
American groups was fairly extensive, including substantial reliance on gifts of corn and other staple foods from “Audusta” (Orista) and “Maccou” (Escamaçu) and other local chiefs, along with at least two trips for the same purpose into the territory of “Oade” (Guale) and his brother “Covexcís” to the south (Laudonnierre, 2001: 38–48). This fort, ultimately abandoned in 1563, was finally identified archaeologically in 1996 underneath the remains of the later Fort San Felipe associated with the Spanish colony of Santa Elena (DePratter, 1996).

In belated response to news of the French presence, Cuban Governor Diego de Mazariegos sent yet another Spanish reconnaissance expedition under Hernando Manrique de Rojas, which explored the northern Georgia coast up to Port Royal during May and June, visiting the town of Guale itself (and several others) and later discovering a sole survivor of the Charlesfort garrison named Guillermo Rufín before torching the remains of the French fort (Bennett, 2001: 107–124).

Later that same year, French colonists under René de Laudonnière established yet another fortified settlement near the mouth of the St. Johns River (Hann, 1996: 38–49; Laudonnière, 2001: 53–170; Bennett, 2001). Though interaction between French colonists and coastal and riverine Timucuan groups was extensive, it was also short-lived, given the 1565 Spanish capture of Fort Caroline and the massacre of many of its French inhabitants. Nevertheless, early French alliances with the Timucuan chiefs, whose successors would ultimately form the Mocama province, formed the basis for persistent anti-Spanish hostility throughout much of the southern portion of the study area through the 1570s, although subsequent decades would witness a complete reversal in this policy (see Hann, 1996: 50–71). The archaeological site of Fort Caroline has never been found, despite many repeated attempts (e.g., Gorman, 2005).

Spanish Fortification, 1565–1569

It was not until September of 1565 that the Spanish established the colonial city of St. Augustine near its present location, initially within the Timucuan community of Seloy. Archaeological investigations at this original location (on the present Fountain of Youth Park) have revealed sealed archaeological contexts associated with Menéndez-era Spanish and Timucuan occupations at the site, in addition to nearby evidence for continuing coastal Timucuan occupation at the Nombre de Dios mission throughout the First Spanish Period (Deagan, 2004a; chap. 6, this volume). In immediately subsequent years, Menéndez endeavored to fortify the new colony of Florida by establishing a remarkably ambitious number of out-settlements and military garrisons, which by the summer of 1567 extended from the foothills of the Appalachian summit in western North Carolina (San Juan de Joara) to the southern tip of the Florida peninsula (San Antón de Carlos and Tequesta). The first of these settlements was constructed precisely at Port Royal, at the location of the previous Charlesfort. In 1566, Menéndez led an expedition up the coastline north from St. Augustine to establish this new colonial port city of Santa Elena, the archaeological remains of which have been explored extensively during recent decades on the southeastern corner of Parris Island, South Carolina (e.g., South, 1988; South and DePratter, 1996; DePratter, chap. 1, this volume). During the course of that first expedition, the Spanish also visited the island town of Guale, which would soon receive a small Spanish garrison, which lasted through the summer of 1569, when most of Menéndez’s remaining coastal garrisons seem to have been withdrawn. The first resident missionary in Guale was secular cleric Francisco Enríquez de Fromonte, who remained a year and a half (1566–1567), and following a brief Jesuit reconnaissance in the summer of 1568, resident Jesuit missionaries were stationed in Guale and Tupiquí, before their eventual withdrawal from Florida (Enríquez de Fromonte, 1572; Lowery, 1905: 339–358; Solís de Merás, 1923: 165–181; Zubillaga, 1946; Lyon, 1976: 154–156; Milanich, 1999: 95–97). While the archaeological remains presumably associated with the capital town of Guale at Wamassee Head have been subjected to intensive investigation (e.g., Thomas, 1987, although Jones, 1978, argues for a more northerly original location of Guale at this time), archaeological evidence for this early period remains elusive.

To the south, Menéndez garrisoned old Fort Caroline and renamed it Fort San Mateo, where Spanish soldiers held out against increasing coastal Indian hostility until the fort’s overthrow and abandonment during a combined French-Timucuan raid in 1568 (Lyon, 1976: 199–201; Bushnell, 1994: 40–41; Hann, 1996: 53–68). The
garrison was relocated northward to Tacatucuru on the southern end of Cumberland Island, where it remained as Fort San Pedro at least until the summer of 1570, after which it was likewise withdrawn, leaving only St. Augustine and Santa Elena as Spanish settlements on either end of the study area. While Fort San Mateo/Fort Caroline has (of course) never been located, testing in the vicinity of the presumed location of Fort San Pedro has revealed some limited evidence for Spanish material culture in the midst of a predominantly aboriginal occupation now associated with the San Pedro archaeological culture, discussed below (Milanich, 1971a; Rock, 2006).

**Spanish Contraction (St. Augustine and Santa Elena), 1569–1587**

Following the withdrawal of the military garrisons from Menéndez’s early satellite forts, and the withdrawal of Jesuit missionaries stationed both in Guale and Orista, resident Spanish colonial presence within the study area largely contracted to the twin colonial port cities of St. Augustine and Santa Elena. Even after the removal of the Jesuit missionaries, Spanish contact and interaction with Guale and Orista Indians continued throughout this period, most notably with respect to the ongoing Spanish use of Indian food and labor. There was even a brief Franciscan presence among the Guale during 1574 and 1575, though the missionaries quickly departed in the midst of political squabbling with the lieutenant governor at Santa Elena (Lyon, 1992). In 1576, in response to Spanish abuses originating at Santa Elena, rebellion flared among the Guale and Orista, forcing an evacuation of Santa Elena by its Spanish residents (Jones, 1978: 182; Hoffman, 1990: 269–274; Bushnell, 1994: 60–62). Despite the reconstruction and resettlement of the fort in 1578, Spanish Santa Elena remained in a state of open warfare with the aboriginal inhabitants of Guale and Orista for nearly two more years. A 1579 retaliatory expedition under Governor Pedro Menéndez Márquez resulted in the burning of 19 Indian towns along 45 leagues of coastline, and later military action resulted in the surrender of the rebels by mid-1580. Despite this first Guale rebellion, it is nevertheless important to note that pre- and postrebellion town names generally remained the same throughout this period, suggesting that Spanish retaliation was not so complete as to devastate the entire region.

Coincidentally, but not insignificantly, continuing French intrigue along the Atlantic coastline played an ongoing role in the unfolding of events among Native Americans within the study area (Hoffman, 1990: 278–281; Bushnell, 1994: 62–63; Hann, 1996: 69–71). In 1577, a French ship named *Le Prince* ran aground and wrecked at Port Royal while exploring the coastline, leaving scores of French castaways to construct an impromptu stockade for defense against the Spanish. The fort was eventually overrun by the same Indians who had so recently ejected the Spanish from Santa Elena, imprisoning the Frenchmen and dispersing them to many different locations along the coast and interior. When peace was finally imposed upon the Guale and Orista rebels, one condition was that they deliver the few dozen remaining French captives into Spanish hands, most of whom were subsequently interrogated and executed after having spent many months in Native American hands. Not long thereafter, more French ships appeared at various locations along the coastline between Port Royal and St. Augustine, including Guale and Sapala, as well as Guadalquini to the south, where they attempted to foment additional anti-Spanish activity. Though French forces were finally engaged and defeated in the Battle of San Mateo in 1580, their interaction with coastal groups during previous years was notable, though archaeological traces have yet to be identified.

The final years of Santa Elena’s existence were marked by a return to many prerebellion norms, including the routine contribution of Native American labor to assorted tasks and projects in the town. Nevertheless, in the aftermath of the 1586 burning of St. Augustine by Francis Drake, the Spanish finally abandoned Santa Elena in 1587, consolidating their military and civilian interests in St. Augustine, which thereafter remained the primary colonial hub for all of Spanish Florida.

**St. Augustine and the Franciscan Mission Period**

With the 1587 withdrawal of the Spanish presence at Santa Elena, the social geography of the study area was instantly transformed from an intermediate zone of aboriginal habitation between twin Spanish colonial administrative centers, into an exposed northern frontier zone attached only tenuously to the remote Spanish port at St. Augustine (fig. 8.1). Nevertheless, this year also witnessed what has been charac-
terized as the formal beginning of the Franciscan mission era in Florida (Hann, 1996: 139; Worth, 1998a: 44–46), when the first relatively substantial group of missionaries was distributed to a number of coastal and near-coastal Timucuan missions extending from San Sebastián just south of St. Augustine to San Pedro on the southern end of Cumberland Island. Though Franciscan friars had begun to return to the towns of Guale by 1590, it was only with the distribution of another dozen friars in 1595 that Guale was formally incorporated into the expanding St. Augustine-based mission system that would ultimately dominate the history of the study area for nearly a century to come. Though Guale erupted in a second widespread rebellion just two years later (1597), resulting in the murders of five missionaries and the temporary retreat of Spanish presence to Cumberland Island, initial Spanish retaliation and ongoing military activities through 1601 ultimately led to the suppression of the rebel faction, and the reassimilation of Guale province under Spanish rule (e.g., Jones, 1978: 183–184; Bushnell, 1994: 65–66; Hann, 1996: 147–153). After the 1605 distribution of new Franciscan friars, the missionization of Guale proceeded apace, including the establishment of permanent mission stations in at least three local administrative centers—Asao, Espogache, and Guale. By no later than the 1620s (and probably earlier), all major 17th-century mission stations seem to have been established in both mainland and barrier-island locations across the entire study area, including the following mission convents: six in the Guale province (San Diego de Saturache, San Phelipe de Alave, Santa Catalina de Guale, Santa Clara de Tupiqui, San Joseph de Sapala, Santo Domingo de Talaje), four in the Mocama province (San Buenaventura de Guadalqui, San Pedro de Mocama, Santa María, and San Juan del Puerto), and two in the vicinity of St. Augustine itself, including the local Nombre de Dios mission, and the relocated Guale mission community of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Tolomato (Worth, 2007a).

Details of the history of the primary mission era (1587–1702) within the study area are treated synthetically for one or more regions in a number of recent publications with varying historical/ethnohistorical and archaeological emphases (Jones, 1978; Thomas, 1987, 1993b; Bushnell, 1994; Hann, 1996; Saunders, 2000a; Worth 2004a, 2007a). Archaeological fieldwork, while extensive in certain instances, has actually been carried out at relatively few of these primary mission centers that predate the initiation of the retreat phase in 1661 (see below), or for that matter at secondary sites dating to the mission period, despite the fact that probable or possible locations have been postulated for many of these missions. The most well-studied mission community within the study area is unquestionably that of Santa Catalina de Guale at Wamassee Head on St. Catherines Island, which has been the subject of intensive and systematic archaeological scrutiny during the last three decades by teams from the American Museum of Natural History, under the overall direction of David Hurst Thomas (Thomas, 1987, 1988a, 1993a, 2008; Larsen, 1990; Saunders, 1993, 2000a). Intensive fieldwork was also carried out during the late 1980s at the Mocama mission of Santa María on Amelia Island, though at the
time the church and burials were interpreted as principally Yamasee in origin (e.g., Saunders, 1992; 1993; 2000a; but see discussion below). Sporadic archaeological projects have also been carried out over the years at mission San Juan del Puerto on Fort George Island, though clearer definition of this mission will undoubtedly result from ongoing multiyear work at the site (e.g., McMurray, 1973; Dickinson and Wayne, 1985; Gorman, 2008). Considerable work has also been carried out in a number of projects at the successive nearby locations of mission Nombre de Dios north of St. Augustine (see overview by Deagan, 2004a). More limited archaeological work has been carried out at several other postulated mission sites for this period (see locational discussion in Worth, 2007a: 190–199), including those of Tolomato (Harris Neck), Santa Clara de Tupiqui (Pine Harbor), San Joseph de Sapala (Bourbon Field, and/or one of several other possible sites on the northern end of Sapelo Island), Santo Domingo de Talaje (Fort King George), San Pedro de Mocama (Dungeness Wharf), and Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Tolomato (Wright’s Landing), and other sites (Caldwell, 1953, 1954; Milanich, 1971a; Larson, 1980a; Cook, 1980b; Braley et al., 1986; Newman and Weisman, 1992; see also detailed comprehensive overviews of Georgia coastal mission archaeology by Thomas 1987, 1993b).

BEYOND THE MISSION FRONTIER: ESCAMAÇU

Despite the withdrawal of the Spanish town of Santa Elena in 1587, and the failure of the Franciscan mission system ever to extend any farther north than the Ogeechee River mouth (at or near mission San Diego de Satuache) along the northern Georgia coast, the Escamaçu province of the lower South Carolina coastal estuarine region nonetheless remained connected to the broader Spanish colonial system through interaction and trade on both a short- and long-distance scale (fig. 8.2). A number of Spanish sources document the presence of routine maritime corn trade between St. Augustine and Escamaçu, and there is also evidence at least through the 1670s for small-scale canoe-based interaction and trade between remaining indigenous residents of Escamaçu and the Guale province to the south, confirmed by several independent English visits to this area during the 1660s (e.g., Worth, 1998a: 177,179; 2007a: 25–26). The extent of this interaction is also underlined by the fact that several of these unmissionized communities fled directly to mission Santa Catalina in 1667 as a result of Westo Indian slave raiding against Escamaçu, and solicited Spanish permission to resettle inside Guale (Worth, 2007: 21–22, 75–76).

Archaeological evidence for 17th-century Escamaçu occupation is comparatively scarce in the area, and also somewhat ambiguous given the apparent similarity in material culture with subsequent Yamasee occupation in the same vicinity (see discussion below), but at least a few sites have been identified that may correspond to Escamaçu villages mentioned in Spanish and English accounts, and that include some European materials of probable Spanish origin (Green and DePratter, 2000).

Fig. 8.2. Early 17th-century Spanish missions and indigenous provinces within the lower Atlantic coastline (ethnicity indicated by color).
RETREAT AND ABANDONMENT

In 1661, what had been feared in Spanish Florida for nearly two years became a reality: armed Indian slave-raiders who had first penetrated the near frontier of greater Spanish Florida in 1659 mounted their first direct assault on a Spanish mission. This assault took place precisely along the Guale-Mocama frontier, at the southernmost Guale mission of Santo Domingo de Talaje, near present-day Darien, Georgia. The survivors of this attack initially fled to nearby Sapelo Island, though ultimately the mission would be rebuilt on the northern end of St. Simons Island, technically within Mocama territory and on the same island as the Guadalquini mission. From this point onward, the study area was effectively under siege from the mainland. While I have elaborated at length on the details of this overall process elsewhere (Worth, 2007a: 9–55), it is important to note here that the primary response to the ongoing threat of slave-raiding from what were known as Chichimeco Indians (more commonly known as the Westo; see Bowne, 2005) was a combined Guale-Spanish retreat seaward and southward, as well as assorted strategic defensive measures, including the first placement of a formal Spanish garrison (at mission Santa Catalina) within the study area for more than a century. In addition to Talaje’s movement to Asajo on St. Simons Island, major early relocations of mainland Guale missions during this era included the aggregation of San Diego de Satuache to mission Santa Catalina de Guale on St. Catherines Island, San Phelipe de Alave’s movement to a new location on Cumberland Island, and Santa Clara de Tupiqui’s aggregation to mission San José de Sapala on Sapelo Island (fig. 8.3).

The impact of Westo slave-raiding was not limited to the Guale mission province; Spanish documents reveal that several unmissionized Escamaçu communities within the coastal zone north of Guale received permission to resettle within the missions for protection, and subsequent evidence reveals at least one such new community along the new Guale-Mocama frontier in the middle of St. Simons Island. In addition, within the space of a few short years after the initial arrival of the Westo in 1659, a number of fugitive communities from the interior coastal plain and lower Piedmont regions of Georgia and South Carolina appear to have relocated closer to the coast, positioning themselves roughly between the coastal provinces and the new Westo slave-raiding base along the Savannah River near Augusta (see more detailed discussion below). Not long thereafter, continued Westo depredations against these refugee towns, by then known collectively as the Yamasee (see Worth, 2004b), evidently prompted further relocations, this time directly into Spanish mission territory. By the end of the 1660s, unmissionized Yamasee communities were scattered throughout the Mocama province, with the greatest population densities on St. Simons and Amelia islands.

By the mid-1670s, the mainland portions of the study area from the St. Johns River to Port Royal appear to have been wholly abandoned in fear of Westo slave raiding, while the barrier islands of Mocama were now crowded with new and
aggregated immigrant communities of multiple ethnicities, including Guale, Mocama, and Yamasee Indians living in close proximity. The old Guale province itself was now limited to two aggregate mission communities on St. Catherines and Sapelo islands (not counting Asajo and Alave on St. Simons and Cumberland islands within old Mocama) and the only remaining purely Mocama communities were Guadalquiviri on St. Simons and San Juan del Puerto on Fort George Island. The entire social geography of the study area had been almost wholly reworked within the space of little more than a decade.

In 1680, a bold Westo assault against the Guale garrison-capitol at mission Santa Catalina resulted in the abandonment of St. Catherines Island, and the aggregation of all four surviving northern Guale communities in or adjacent to mission San José on Sapelo Island (along with the concurrent relocation of the Spanish garrison). While the Carolina-sponsored destruction of the Westo threat during the 1681–1682 Westo War resulted in a brief respite from slave raiding, it was actually pirates who dealt the final blow to surviving Georgia coastal populations in 1683 and 1684. In the aftermath of a scandalous French raid during the first half of 1683, the Yamasee Indians withdrew en masse from the coastal mission provinces by June, instantly halving Spanish-allied Native American population levels within the study area. Though mission Santa Catalina, with its aggregated Guale and Satuache communities, subsequently effected its own long-distance move south to Amelia Island by the summer of 1684, establishing the first phase of a planned withdrawal from the Georgia coast, a second major pirate raid during the fall of 1684 resulted in the destruction of all remaining barrier-island missions north of the St. Marys River, prompting the rapid implementation of existing evacuation plans. By early 1685, all remaining Guale mission communities were located on Amelia Island, and the two surviving Mocama missions were clustered just south on Black Hammock and Fort George islands. All Guale and Mocama had been reduced to a small portion of the original Mocama province, though even this strategic retreat would only last 17 years (tables 8.1 and 8.2).

In 1702, the remnants of Guale and Mocama were swept away as part of the English assault on St. Augustine itself. Though refugees were settled for a short time on the south bank of the St. Johns River at a location called Pilijiriba (largely unexplored archaeologically), by the end of 1704 these communities had been withdrawn fully to St. Augustine’s immediate environs, where they remained through the 1763 end of First Period Spanish occupation in Florida (Hann, 1996: 298–325; Worth, 1998b: 147–156). By 1711, Guale and Mocama refugees were evidently living in two new local communities, initially still named Santa Catalina de Guale and San Juan del Puerto, augmenting existing Guale numbers in nearby Tolomato, as well as Mocama living in Nombre de Dios, all of whom totaled in population between 150 and 300 individuals during subsequent decades (Worth, 2004a: 244; 2007a: xiii–xiv). Despite considerable population mobility in the immediate area around St. Augustine during this period, as well as ongoing demographic collapse, by 1759 grand totals of 18 Guale and 15 Mocama Indians were enumerated in a detailed census that year, and after the 1763 transportation of 89 surviving Florida mission Indians to Cuba, some 8 out of 22 total Florida Indian households were still predominantly Guale or Mocama. In addition, after the return of most of the surviving Yamasee Indians from Carolina after the 1715 Yamasee War, Yamasee survivorship was similarly robust during this era, constituting a substantial portion of the Florida Indian evacuees to Cuba as well (Worth, 2004b: 252). While intermarriage between and among all remaining ethnicities, including interior Timucuan, was increasingly common over the course of the 18th century, the birthplace and ethnicity of most Florida Indians in Cuba was generally recorded with careful consistency. Despite proportionally huge population losses in concert with increasingly minimal residential stability over the course of the last century before their evacuation to Cuba, the ethnic identity of surviving remnants of the former Guale, Mocama, and Yamasee inhabitants of the present study area was nevertheless one of the most long-lasting and persistent features of the cultural landscape during this traumatic period (table 8.3).

Direct archaeological evidence for the southward retreat of Guale and Mocama throughout this period is still remarkably limited as of the writing of this chapter, though ongoing projects hold considerable promise in this regard. The most notable early project is excavation of the Harrison Homestead site, where archaeological work uncovered extensive
### TABLE 8.1
Original and Relocated Mocama Communities on the Southeastern Atlantic Coast, 1661–1702

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Simons Island</td>
<td>San Buenaventura de Guadalquini</td>
<td>through 1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Island</td>
<td>San Pedro de Mocama</td>
<td>through ca. 1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Island</td>
<td>Santa María</td>
<td>through 1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hammock Island</td>
<td>Santa Cruz de Guadalquini</td>
<td>1684–1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort George Island</td>
<td>San Juan del Puerto</td>
<td>through 1702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8.2
Original and Relocated Guale Communities on the Southeastern Atlantic Coast, 1661–1702

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>San Diego de Satuache</td>
<td>through ca. 1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Phelipe de Alave</td>
<td>through ca. 1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Clara de Tupiqui</td>
<td>through ca. 1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santo Domingo de Talaje</td>
<td>through 1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherines Island</td>
<td>Santa Catalina de Guale</td>
<td>through 1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapelo Island</td>
<td>San Joseph de Sapala</td>
<td>through ca. 1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Simons Island</td>
<td>Santo Domingo de Asajo</td>
<td>1661–1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Island</td>
<td>San Phelipe de Alave II</td>
<td>ca. 1670–1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Island</td>
<td>Santa Clara de Tupiqui III</td>
<td>1684–1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Phelipe III</td>
<td>1684–1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa María de Guale</td>
<td>1683–1702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence for the relocated Santa Catalina mission community in close proximity to the earlier Santa María mission site, which had previously hosted successive Mocama and immigrant Yamasee populations (e.g., Saunders, 1992; 1993; 2000a). Precious few other archaeological sites associated with immigrant Guale or Yamasee communities have been explored intensively as such, though the identities of certain sites can be hypothesized based on the results of unrelated archaeological work. Proceeding from north to south, the archaeological remains of Mission San José de Sapala and its probable near-neighbors or aggregates of Santa Clara, Santa Catalina, and San Diego (between 1680 and 1684), now seem most likely to be in the vicinity of the north of the Shell Ring site, currently under direct investigation (e.g., Jeffries and Thompson, 2005; my own previous suggestion of the nearby Bourbon Field site [Worth, 2007a: 194] seems less likely for the late 17th-century component based on recent work by Norma Harris and Victor Thompson [personal commun., 2007], which may date the occupation there considerably earlier in the Spanish era; see also Worth, 2008). On St. Simons Island, the relocated mission of Santo Domingo de Asajo has yet to be unambiguously identified or explored archaeologically, though it seems most likely to be associated with Cannons Point or Hampton Point, or perhaps both (e.g., Larson, 1980a; Worth, 2007a: 195). The Escamaçu community (known as Colon) at San Simón is only suspected from Spanish and Indian artifacts embedded in the 18th-century English Fort Frederica, and the nearby Yamasee community of Ocotonico to the south is similarly unknown.

On Cumberland Island, despite early testing (Milanich, 1971a), no Spanish-era mission or refugee community has ever received extensive archaeological attention, including not just the Mocama mission of San Pedro (subsequently reoccupied by Yamasee immigrants), but also the relocated Guale mission of San Phelipe, as well as a nearby Yamasee community (Worth, 2007a: 196). Likewise, other than Santa María and its successor Santa Catalina, none of the other immigrant Yamasee or Guale communities on Amelia Island has yet been subjected to intensive archaeological work designed to elucidate mission-era occupation (Worth, 2007a: 197–198). To the south, however, two recent projects have

### Table 8.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sapelo Island</td>
<td>[unnamed community]</td>
<td>ca. 1680–1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Simons Island</td>
<td>San Simon/Colon</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocotonico</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Island</td>
<td>[unnamed community]</td>
<td>ca. 1680–1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Pedro</td>
<td>ca. 1680–1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Island</td>
<td>[unnamed community]</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocotoquej</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Tama</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
been initiated on both the immigrant Mocama mission of Guadalquini (at Black Hammock Island), and at nearby San Juan del Puerto on Fort George Island, to which Guadalquini was subsequently aggregated (see Thunen and Whitehurst, 2005; Gorman, 2008).

Archaeological work in the immediate environs of St. Augustine has provided important information regarding several of the 18th-century refugee missions there, though the most comprehensive work has been carried out at the predominantly Yamasee mission of Nuestra Señora del Rosario de la Punta (e.g., White, 2002; Boyer, 2005; see also Waters, chap. 7, this volume). While the locations of a number of these successive refugee communities (as well as the longest-lasting Florida mission at Nombre de Dios/Nuestra Señora de la Leche; see Deagan, 2004a; chap. 6, this volume) have doubtless been identified at least in broad outline, targeted archaeological investigation of many of these sites remains to be done.

**ANALYSIS OF SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL PATTERNS**

In a general perspective, several important patterns are evident during the span of the early European colonial era along the southeastern Atlantic coast. First, apart from at least two notable episodes of Native American insurrection and Spanish retaliation within the study area (the two Guale rebellions of 1576–1580 and 1597–1601), there were probably no substantial and permanent interregional population movements along the Atlantic coastline until 1661, when Chichimeco slave raiders launched their first assault against the southernmost Guale mission at Talaje. Before 1661, population movements that can be documented or hypothesized are generally on a local scale, conforming to what I have described elsewhere as contraction, in which subordinate satellite communities within local chiefdoms were abandoned in favor of more populous and central locations (Worth, 2002: 50–51). By the time of the 1655 Franciscan visitation, only 10 primary Guale and Mocama mission communities could be documented within the study area (not counting Escamaçu to the north), representing only a fraction of the broader constellation of literally scores of outlying communities that characterized the same region only half a century earlier (Worth, 2007a: 10–12; 2004a: 238–240).

Not only were these population movements largely localized in scale, they may also be inferred to have been carried out within the context of the preexisting sociopolitical, economic, and linguistic framework of the estuarine landscape along the Atlantic coastline within the study area, and there is consequently no evidence for the type of population mixing and ethnic diversity that would typify the later colonial era. Indeed, the only longer-distance relocation that can be documented during this early colonial phase involved the movement of an interior Timucuan group—Utinahica—downriver to the mouth of the Altamaha River and into yet another Timucua-speaking community—Guadalquini—on St. Simons Island, a process best described as aggregation (Worth, 1993: 34–37; 2002: 51–52; 2007a: 111, 124).

Beginning shortly after the dawn of the Indian slave trade era in 1659, the Atlantic coastal region witnessed a new era in settlement dynamics, one characterized by frequent and sometimes abrupt population movements on both a short- and long-distance scale. Between 1661 and 1675, two general processes seem to have been in operation: population movement southward and away from the mainland, and increasing intraprovincial ethnic diversity, owing in part to the in-migration of formerly extralocal populations. By no later than 1675, all remaining mainland communities in the Guale and Mocama provinces had apparently been relocated to the barrier islands in order to provide some measure of protection against land-based slave-raiding, and during this same period, there was a concurrent in-migration of substantial populations of Yamasee Indians into then-unoccupied barrier-island locations within the old Mocama province (Worth, 2004b; 2007a: 18–22, 27–30). Not only were these newly relocated Guale communities scattered among older Mocama communities from the Altamaha River southward, but a number of immigrant Yamasee communities were also scattered during this same era. The barrier islands of old Guale were largely unaffected by this new ethnic mix (with the exception of a single small Yamasee community on the southern end of Sapelo Island), but Mocama’s islands of St. Simons, Cumberland, and Amelia were now home to Mocama, Guale, and Yamasee settlements, spatially distinct but still in far closer proximity than ever before. Consolidation of all settlements seaward and southward during this period therefore occurred.
concurrently with a substantial increase in localized ethnic diversity, which was nonetheless limited to island locales, and almost entirely within the old Mocama province. However, despite the newfound proximity of these diverse communities of differing ethnicities, there is no clear evidence for notable intermarriage or other ethnic mixing between communities, and substantial evidence to indicate that distinct sociopolitical and ethnic identities were maintained among these communities during this period.

A third phase in the settlement history of the study area was inaugurated with the 1683 flight of the Yamasee from the Guale and Mocama provinces, and the abrupt abandonment and retreat of these missions south of the St. Marys River following the pirate raids of 1684 (Worth, 2007a: 36–47). Between 1685 and 1702, remnant Guale and Mocama communities (minus their former Yamasee neighbors) were clustered on Amelia Island and around the mouth of the St. Johns River (Black Hammock and Fort George islands, respectively). Most or all of these locations were either on or near abandoned Mocama communities, or were themselves continuously occupied Mocama villages that survived all the way through 1702 (in the case of San Juan del Puerto).

A fourth and final phase was marked by the retreat of these Guale and Mocama communities south of the St. Johns River after 1702, and by 1706 to the vicinity of St. Augustine itself, where they remained through 1763. Though marked by frequent relocation of refugee villages within the area near the city of St. Augustine, this phase was characterized for the first time by increasing interaction with other refugee Indian communities from the western mission chain, including Apalachee, Timucua, and other ethnic groups, as well as small numbers of refugees from central and southern Florida, many of whom had never been involved in the Spanish mission system. In addition, the return of Yamasee immigrants to the vicinity of St. Augustine after 1715 effectively doubled the local Indian population, augmenting the ethnic diversity represented in the surviving mission communities around the city. As populations dwindled over the next decades to just a few hundred surviving individuals in the immediate environs of St. Augustine, for the first time there is clear evidence for substantial multiethnic intermarriage among aggregated refugee populations, resulting in a notable number of multiethnic households by the 1750s (see Hann, 1996: 296–325; Worth, 1998b: 140–158; 2007a: xiii–xiv).

An examination of this four-phase categorization of Native American settlement distribution along the lower Atlantic coastline between first European contact (ca. 1514–1516) and the evacuation to Cuba in 1763 provides the basis for several important assertions. First, with few exceptions (i.e., Utinahica during the 1630s or 1640s), there is no current unambiguous evidence for any significant interregional settlement relocations within the study area until 1661. There were unquestionably periods of localized Spanish-Indian warfare, site abandonment, and subsequent site reoccupation (sometimes in different locations); and there is also considerable evidence for localized contraction of outlying communities to centralized locations. However, there is no reason to infer that the sum total of these small-scale population movements during this period resulted in significant or permanent geographic “mixing” between previously disparate local socioethnic groups. In other words, prior to 1661, when the first Guale mission community (Talaje/Asajo) was relocated just across the former “boundary” between the Guale and Mocama provinces, most population movements and village relocations within the study area seem to have been carried out within, rather than between, the existing territories of local and regional sociopolitical groups. For this reason, any observed changes in material culture that occurred during this first phase (ca. 1514–1661) are not likely to have been a result of the permanent physical relocation of populations from one area to another. Any changes that occurred would therefore most likely have been in situ transformations experienced by localized populations with geographically stable residential patterns (even while undergoing localized contraction).

After 1661, population mobility and immigration became a significant factor in the settlement systems of coastal populations in the study area, though the target destinations of all relocated communities (whether Guale, Mocama, or Yamasee) were exclusively on the barrier islands, resulting in a complete abandonment of the coastal mainland by 1675. This observation is of considerable importance, since it means that there is no evidence for any interregional migration of nonlocal groups to mainland locations...
in the southern portion of the study area during the second and third phases described above (1661–1702). Moreover, during the fourth and final phase (after 1702), all remaining populations were evacuated south of the St. Johns River and finally to St. Augustine, leaving the mainland portion of old Mocama and Guale similarly vacant. Consequently, with the exception of the comparatively short-lived and spatially restricted occupation of English-allied Yamasee Indians in mainland portions of the old Escamaçu province between 1685 and 1715, there is no evidence for any interregional migration and settlement on any mainland locations within the study area during the post-1661 era. Any archaeological evidence for material culture change on mainland sites therefore almost certainly relates to pre-1661 patterns of intraregional settlement contraction and aggregation, as noted above, and hence most likely derives from in situ change among local indigenous populations.

Barrier islands within the study area represent a radically different situation, however. Multiple population movements by all three ethnic groups (Guale, Mocama, and Yamasee) throughout the period between 1661 and 1702 resulted in an almost bewildering pattern of double- and even triple-ethnicity habitation sites, some that have been identified and explored archaeologically, and others that are best known from the documentary record. Not only do many of these sites contain sequential and presumably overlapping occupations by two or more completely different ethnic groups, but many are also characterized by intervening periods of abandonment, all of which occurred within a relatively short span of time, adding to the anticipated complexity of archaeological deposits associated with each site. Tables 8.4 and 8.5 list the known and probable triple- and double-ethnicity sites on specified barrier islands within the study area, and tables 8.6 and 8.7 provide information on single-ethnicity sites within the same region, including those that appear to have been newly established at previously uninhabited (or long unoccupied) locations, and those that represented continuously occupied sites with probable indigenous prehistoric roots. Many barrier-island sites within the old Mocama province, therefore, are almost certain to contain not only direct evidence for any pre-1661 transformations in ceramic material culture, but also subsequent (and probably overlying) evidence for direct immigration by one and sometimes two completely distinct ethnic groups during the second and third periods noted above (from 1661 to 1702). While many “unadulterated” pre-1661 indigenous Mocama sites doubtless exist on these same barrier islands, the presence of so much succeeding settlement on these islands by Guale and Yamasee immigrants makes almost any archaeological context initially suspect without considerable attention to chronological detail (some of which may not even be possible within such short spaces of time for immigrant occupations). Far better sample control seems likely on mainland sites within the Mocama region, which have unfortunately received far less archaeological attention than several of the more visible barrier-island locales. Nevertheless, only detailed study of single- and multiple-ethnicity sites throughout the entire region (mainland and island) will likely provide the data for broadscale synthesis of ceramic variation (both spatial and temporal) within the region.

ETHNICITY AND CERAMICS: STEPS TOWARD A SYNTHESIS

At the “moment” of first contact between the Native Americans and European explorers, dating to approximately A.D. 1514–1516, archaeologists currently recognize at least three contemporaneous aboriginal ceramic “style zones” within the study area—Irene-Altamaha along the southern South Carolina and northern Georgia coastline (and apparently extending into the middle Georgia coast on St. Simons Island), San Pedro along the southern Georgia and far northeastern Florida coastline, and St. Johns in and around St. Augustine proper. Of these three groupings, possibly the most problematic cultural association (though not the most recent to have been intensively investigated) is the middle Georgia coastal region, including St. Simons and Jekyll islands and adjacent mainland areas, as will be discussed further below.

The entire northern half of the study area, minimally from Port Royal south to the Altamaha River, and possibly even farther south, was characterized by a regional variant of the far-reaching Lamar culture, which extended hundreds of miles west and northwest across the coastal plain and Piedmont physiographic provinces of Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama, and even to the Appalachian summit region of North
TABLE 8.4
Documented Triple-Ethnicity Sites, 1661–1702

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Santa María (Amelia Island)</th>
<th>Indigenous Mocama mission</th>
<th>through 1665</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant Yamasee community</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocated Guale mission</td>
<td>1683–1702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8.5
Documented Double-Ethnicity Sites, 1661–1702

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Pedro de Mocama (Cumberland Island)</th>
<th>Indigenous Mocama community</th>
<th>through ca. 1660</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant Yamasee community</td>
<td>ca. 1680–1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara III (Amelia Island)</td>
<td>Immigrant Yamasee community</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocated Guale mission</td>
<td>1684–1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tama–San Phelipe III (Amelia Island)</td>
<td>Immigrant Yamasee community</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocated Guale mission</td>
<td>1683–1702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carolina and into the Ridge and Valley district of Tennessee (Williams and Shapiro, 1990; Hally, 1994). The late prehistoric variant of this Lamar culture is known locally as Irene, and at some point prior to A.D. 1600, this Irene material culture underwent a transformation into another Lamar-related ceramic series named Altamaha, which under this name and a different name (San Marcos) eventually rose to predominance in the southern portion of the study area during the following century (see DePratter, chap. 1, this volume). Precisely when, where, how, and why this transformation in ceramic material culture took place has been the subject of considerable debate among archaeologists, and is the primary focus of this chapter, as discussed below. At this point, however, it is important to note that while Irene and its successive Lamar variant Altamaha can indeed be distinguished archaeologically (even if the precise typological “boundaries” are not unambiguously defined or universally agreed upon), the distinction between Altamaha and its “southern” cousin San Marcos is far less clear. As emphasized by Saunders (2000a: 45–49), who has conducted the most thorough and in-depth study of the Irene-to-Altamaha transition to date, the types are “badly conflated in the literature” and seem more likely to reflect a generalized “areal distinction” between Georgia and Florida assemblages, despite several attempts to distinguish the two on more detailed stylistic grounds. This conclusion was reinforced by the participants in the Second Caldwell Conference, who compared ceramic examples identified regionally as “Altamaha” and “San Marcos,” and determined that they could not be distinguished (see Preface, Deagan and Thomas, this volume). Given this difficulty, and the very fact that precise distinctions between “northern” and “southern” may well have important ethnic
as well as spatial and temporal explanations, for
the purposes of this paper I will simply combine
the names and refer to “Altamaha/San Marcos”
pottery and assemblages, lumping both “types”
into a single category for purposes of explanation
and synthesis.

In point of fact, not just Altamaha and San
Marcos, but also Irene itself, all represent
regional variations of what is elsewhere simply
referred to as Lamar. Using chronological priority
of the original type descriptions—Jennings
and Fairbanks (1939) for Lamar, Caldwell and
McCann (1941) for Irene, Smith (1948) for San
Marcos, and Larson (1953) for Altamaha—as
well as geographical extent and precedent in
the literature (e.g., Williams and Shapiro, 1990;
Hally, 1994), a viable argument could be made
for subsuming all three types within a type-
variety system under the overall Lamar rubric
(sensu Scarry, 1985). Nevertheless, in an effort
not to succumb to the temptations of what has
been humorously (and not inaccurately) referred
to as “Lamarchaeology” (Jung, 1992), I will
restrict myself only to lumping Altamaha and San
Marcos into a single analytical unit.

What seems quite clear from existing data
is that the ultimate origin of the “Lamaroid”
Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic tradition was

---

### TABLE 8.6

**Documented Single-Ethnicity Sites at Newly Established Locations**

*(without prior documented occupation), 1661–1702*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sapelo Island</th>
<th>San Joseph de Sapala: Possible expanded occupational areas associated with three immigrant Guale communities</th>
<th>ca. 1680–1684</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unnamed Yamasee community at southern tip</td>
<td>ca. 1680–1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Simons Island</td>
<td>Santo Domingo de Asajo</td>
<td>1661–1684 (Guale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Simón/Colon</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1684 (Yamasee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocotonico</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1680 (Yamasee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Island</td>
<td>San Phelipe II (possibly underlain by Mocama Puturiba?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unnamed Yamasee community between San Phelipe and San Pedro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Island</td>
<td>Ocotoque</td>
<td>ca. 1667–1680 (Yamasee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hammock Island</td>
<td>Santa Cruz de Guadalquiini</td>
<td>1684–1696 (Mocama)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
among the people who were producing similarly Lamaroid Irene ceramics during the late prehistoric period, evidently corresponding to the historically documented Guale and Orista/Escamaçu people of the northern Georgia and lower South Carolina coastal estuaries. Whether or not these sociopolitical groupings from the 1560s correspond directly to similar groupings at the moment of first European contact nearly half a century earlier is presently unclear, but for the purposes of the present discussion, it is sufficient to note that both Irene and Altamaha ceramic types have been recovered together in late 16th-century contexts in several places within the northern portion of the study area, indicating that Irene and Altamaha ceramics apparently coexisted to some extent among both the Guale and Orista/Escamaçu at least as late as the 1580s. At least some stages of the in situ ceramic transformation from Irene to Altamaha/San Marcos appear to have been captured archaeologically in the sealed contexts from the period between 1566 and 1587 at Santa Elena (South and DePratter, 1996: 43–56; DePratter, chap. 1, this volume). Likewise, the archaeological site of Mission Santa Catalina de Guale, located at what would become the primary administrative center of the Guale chiefdom in the aftermath of the 1597 Guale rebellion (and the fall of Tolomato), is clearly dominated by ceramics that are attributable to the Altamaha/San Marcos series (e.g., Saunders 2000a: 90–110), but the appearance of a small percentage of Irene ceramics at the site (Thomas, chap. 2, this volume) may provide evidence either for a much earlier (and hence pre-Altamaha/San Marcos transformation) Irene occupation at the site, or simply for the persistence of at least some Irene attributes within the posttransformation assemblage (like the material at Santa Elena).

Distinguishing between these two alternative explanations will require a clear delineation of precisely when aboriginal Guale occupation began at the St. Catherines site, and whether or not Spanish presence at the site was initiated in the 1560s (signifying that the site was occupied contemporaneously with Santa Elena to the north), or perhaps only later in the late 1580s or early 1590s. Though Jones (1978: 203) has previously suggested that during the 1560s the town of Guale may originally have been located elsewhere, north of its St. Catherines Island location, my own research into the original records of the 1564 Manríque de Rojas expedition strongly indicates that the town of Guale was at that time located on the inland side of St. Catherines Island, accessible from a branch of a tidal river that joined the South Newport River on the northern side of Sapelo Sound, an area explored by Manríque between May 31 and June 7, 1564 (Manríque de Rojas, 1564; Bennett, 2001: 113–115; see also Worth, 2004a). While this location would correspond precisely to the site currently identified as mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainland</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego de Satuache</td>
<td>(through ca. 1663: Guale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Phelipe de Alave</td>
<td>(through ca. 1670: Guale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara de Tupiqui</td>
<td>(through ca. 1674: Guale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo de Talaje</td>
<td>(through 1661: Guale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort George Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan del Puerto</td>
<td>(through 1702: Mocama)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8.7**

**Documented Single-Ethnicity Sites at Indigenous Locations, 1661–1702**

- San Diego de Satuache (through ca. 1663: Guale)
- San Phelipe de Alave (through ca. 1670: Guale)
- Santa Clara de Tupiqui (through ca. 1674: Guale)
- Santo Domingo de Talaje (through 1661: Guale)
- San Juan del Puerto (through 1702: Mocama)
Santa Catalina de Guale, site-level precision beyond this general description is not currently possible based strictly on the documents, hence another nearby archaeological location remains possible. Unless new documentary evidence is identified in this regard, archaeological data may ultimately be the only way to clarify the precise location of the Spanish fort and mission at the town of Guale dating to the era between 1566 and 1570 (and hence permit the exploration of sealed archaeological contexts with aboriginal ceramics dating to this precise window of time).

The Altamaha phase has generally been assumed in recent archaeological literature to reflect a Spanish-era transformation of what would have been a more or less “pure” Irene assemblage at the moment of Spanish contact (DePratter, 1984: 49–54; Braley, 1990: 71–72, 98–100; South and DePratter, 1996: 45–47; Saunders, 2000a: 39–49, chap. 3, this volume). Indeed, based in part on Irene-associated radiocarbon dates from the Meeting House Field site on St. Catherines Island, extending well into the 15th century and even later, Saunders (2000a: 58–78, chap. 3, this volume) has argued convincingly for a relatively abrupt transition between Irene and Altamaha ceramic traditions. Nevertheless, there is at least some recent archaeological evidence that the initial stages of the transformation from Irene to Altamaha (as traditionally defined and distinguished) might have begun prior to Spanish contact in at least some locations. Extensive archaeological data recovery at the mainland Shell Crescent site along the May River north of Savannah has revealed several Altamaha-like characteristics (line-block and check stamping, red filming, etc.) in association with an Irene-dominated assemblage radiocarbon-dated to A.D. 1300–1400 (Mozingo et al., 2004: 54–58, 171–173). Similarly, radiocarbon dates from two sites on St. Catherines Island have produced a surprisingly early date range (cal A.D. 1310–1450) for Altamaha ceramics (Thomas, 2008: 1041), and ongoing work at several island hammocks adjacent to Sapelo Island on the Georgia coast has also revealed ceramic assemblages with Altamaha characteristics producing an array of radiocarbon dates preceding A.D. 1450, and which apparently lack any evidence of Spanish contact (Victor Thompson, personal commun., 2008). Irene and Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics were indeed so closely correlated at several Spanish-era sites on Sapelo Island itself that Crook (1984b: 60–62) proposed the term “Irene–San Marcos” for those components, and Saunders (2000a: 176–177) has noted that data from the nearby mainland Pine Harbor site may also display evidence for a “more gradual transition from Irene to Altamaha,” while still positing a postcontact date for the transition (see Saunders, 2000a: 45, 169–181). Clearly, even at this date (2008), much remains to be explored and examined in order to reconcile these diverse data and interpretations.

Although the precise timing and duration of this transition is clearly still elusive owing to gaps and contrasts in available data, and may vary somewhat by location and context, the date of 1600 nonetheless appears to represent a “watershed” after which Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics seem to have been more or less fully emplaced in the northern portion of the study area (Saunders, 2000a: 179–180). There seems little doubt that by the end of the 16th century, the previous Irene tradition of the Guale and Orista areas had been transformed into the Altamaha/San Marcos tradition, after which the style seems to have stabilized in association with both groups. And in the final analysis, the question of whether or not the early 16th-century ceramic assemblages of the Guale and Orista were “pure” Irene, or instead reflected some degree of an ongoing ceramic transformation into what would eventually be Altamaha/San Marcos, is in some ways beyond the purview of this chapter, since the fundamental assertion I would make here is simply that the Guale and Orista unquestionably bore a “Lamaroid” material culture at the moment of European contact, while their neighbors in the southern reaches of the study area did not (at least not yet).

The middle Georgia coastal region, immediately south of the area that has been traditionally defined as the Irene–Altamaha/San Marcos heartland, remains somewhat enigmatic in the published archaeological literature, though upon review of the available sources I am inclined simply to include it as part of the more northerly Irene–Altamaha/San Marcos area. While this region does not appear to be associated with the recently defined San Pedro region just to the south (Ashley, chap. 5, this volume), at Taylor Mound on St. Simons Island there are early Spanish contact era burials penetrating what may be an older Savannah II burial mound, as well as both Irene and Altamaha ceramics in clear association with Spanish artifacts within a subsequent mound
construction episode (Wallace, 1975; Pearson, 1977; Saunders, 2000a: 173–176). Moreover, Kent Mound on the southern end of St. Simons has also produced a lengthy prehistoric Irene ceramic evolutionary sequence that also apparently overlaps to some extent with the Spanish period (Cook and Snow, 1983; Cook, 1986; Saunders, 2000a: 44, 248–249). Although these documented associations are primarily based on burial-mound contexts (and hence might possibly relate more to mortuary assemblages than domestic utilitarian assemblages), available evidence would nonetheless seem to justify the inclusion of the whole of St. Simons Island in the Irene–Altamaha/San Marcos culture area, despite the fact that ethnohistoric evidence makes it abundantly clear that this island was inhabited during the Spanish period by Timucua speakers associated with the Guadalquini chiefdom (e.g., Worth, 2007a: 10, 195–196), apparently quite distinct in a political and linguistic sense from the Guale and Orista/ESCamaçu chiefdoms to the north. Perhaps not unimportantly, Guadalquini itself seems to have had at least some cultural connection to the deep interior coastal plain Timucuan chiefdom of Utinahica, which likewise displays an anomalous Lamaroid ceramic assemblage in apparent contrast to other Timucua speakers to the south (Snow, 1990; Worth, 1993, 1995b; Braley, 1995: 37–39). Both these Timucuan areas were located along the northern “frontier” of the Timucuan language area, possibly providing some explanation for the atypical “overlap” of ceramic material culture not normally associated with Timucua speakers. This possibility clearly deserves greater attention.

Unless future excavations or analyses reveal that the prehistoric and historic-era Irene and Altamaha/San Marcos wares in Kent and Taylor Mounds are somehow atypical for contemporaneous residential ceramic assemblages on or adjacent to St. Simons Island (as Cordell, 2005, has recently confirmed for Safety Harbor burial assemblages in association with otherwise Caloosahatchee domestic contexts at the Pineland site in southwestern Florida; but see Saunders, 2000a: 107), I would argue that the inclusion of St. Simons Island (and hence Guadalquini) within the Irene–Altamaha/San Marcos culture area may therefore represent direct and explicit demonstration of multiple languages, ethnicities, and political units within a single archaeologically defined “ceramic style zone” (as defined by ceramic types and assemblages of types). Or to express this in different terms, the late prehistoric geographical distribution of archaeological ceramics in this instance does not correlate directly either to language, ethnicity, or political integration as defined by either Native Americans themselves or Spanish observers and administrators. Indeed, multilingualism has already been demonstrated as common among documented southeastern chiefdoms during the Spanish colonial era (Booker et al., 1992); hence, it is perhaps not surprising that archaeological cultures (even on a relatively small scale) also display similar multilingualism, although it is similarly clear that archaeological culture areas (normally defined principally by ceramics) also do not always correspond directly to documented chiefdoms or other political units. Ceramic assemblages evidently varied independently of these other cultural variables, even (apparently) in a precolonial context within the present study area. This recognition may be of considerable import with respect to the evidence for increasing multiethnic ceramic homogeneity during the mission period, as will be discussed in detail below.

In stark contrast to the situation in the northern portions of the study area, sealed contexts from late 16th-century St. Augustine appear to demonstrate quite clearly that local Timucuan Indians in the southern end of the study area were still making St. Johns ceramics at this time (Deagan, 2004a: 19–22, 46, 57–58; chap. 6, this volume). St. Johns II ceramics have long been recognized to overlap with initial Spanish contact in this region, demonstrating that initial Spanish contact was with St. Johns populations (e.g., Goggin, 1952). In addition, excavations in what would eventually be known as the Mocama province north of St. Augustine during the 17th century have also clearly demonstrated the overlap between early Spanish colonial era artifacts and aboriginal Timucuan assemblages of the recently defined San Pedro series (Milanich, 1971a; Ashley and Rolland, 1997a: 52–53, 63; Ashley, chap. 5, this volume). San Pedro ceramics also appear both as minority wares in local St. Johns assemblages around St. Augustine (Deagan, 2004a: 46, 57, 65), and as a predominant ware at at least one site just north of St. Augustine that may have been occupied by visiting or immigrant Mocama groups toward the end of the 16th century (Ashley, 2001). Increasingly, it appears clear that throughout this southern half
of the study area, the concurrence of late 16th-
and early 17th-century Spanish material culture
with both St. Johns (to the south) and San Pedro
(to the north) ceramics provides clear evidence
for the persistence of these indigenous Timucuan
ceramic traditions somewhat longer than in the
northern half of the study area.

Moreover, at the opposite end of the
chronological “window” for the study period
within this southern portion of the study area,
the clear predominance of Altamaha/San
Marcos ceramics in the uppermost levels of
archaeological sites that are known to have been
inhabited only by indigenous Timucua-speaking
Mocama peoples demonstrates convincingly that
while the transformation did not occur before the
17th century, it was certainly complete by the end
of the century (e.g., Worth 1997; see also Ashley,
chap. 5, this volume). This is most obviously the
case with the archaeological site of mission San
Juan del Puerto, located at Fort George Island,
which is clearly dominated by Altamaha/San
Marcos ceramics for much of its lengthy and
continuous chronological span between 1587 and
1702 (McMurray, 1973; Deagan, 1978a: 106;
Dickinson and Wayne, 1985; Gorman, 2008).
Documentary evidence for the absence of any
large-scale migration of non-Timucua speakers
into this specific mission community throughout
this period makes any other conclusion virtually
untenable (Hann, 1996: 289–290; Worth, 1997a,
2007a: 47–50). Indeed, Altamaha/San Marcos
ceramics are so widely distributed across
northeastern Florida during the late 17th and
18th centuries that they were characterized early
on as the “St. Augustine Period” for that region,
ultimately dated to ca. A.D. 1650–1763 (Smith,
1948; Goggin, 1949: 50–52, 1953). While early
researchers tended to attribute this phenomenon to
supposed physical migration and/or intermarriage
by Guale Indians or others from the northern half
of the present study area (Smith, 1948: 314–316,
318; Goggin, 1952: 6, 9, 12, 13), it is now quite
clear that the phenomenon is too widespread
and lengthy to have been solely attributable to
the truly small number of documented migrants
into the area. In addition, the geographical
distribution of Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics
clearly includes many areas that never received
immigrant Guale or Yamasee Indians, specifically
referring to the mainland between the Altamaha
and St. Johns rivers.

Though relevant archaeological evidence
from the southeastern Georgia coastline is
somewhat scarce compared to barrier-island
locales (but see Ashley, chap. 5, this volume), at
King’s Bay on the mainland opposite Cumberland
Island, Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics appeared
in association with Spanish artifacts predating
1650, and a very similar situation was observed
inland at the Martha Dowling North site, a
likely Mocama mission that also contained
San Pedro ceramics (Saunders et al. 1985;
Weisman et al. 1998). The identification of an
Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic assemblage at
the recently identified Mocama community of
Santa Cruz y San Buenaventura de Guadalquini
might also demonstrate the completion of this
transformation in Mocama material culture by
the 1680s. The community moved in 1685
from its original location on the southern tip
of St. Simons Island along the central Georgia
cost to Black Hammock Island within sight of
mission San Juan above near the mouth of the
St. Johns River in northeast Florida (Thunen
and Whitehurst, 2005). However, the fact that
Guadalquini may already have been part of the
Irene–Altamaha/San Marcos culture area during
the 16th and early 17th centuries makes this
migration perhaps less relevant to the discussion
of change among San Pedro and St. Johns II
populations south of Guadalquini.

Another archaeological site that may
encompass the Mocama transition from San
Pedro to Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics is the
Harrison Homestead site, which includes not
one but two Spanish mission church compounds,
both dominated by Altamaha/San Marcos
assemblages (e.g., Saunders, 1993, 2000a). The
latter and more intensively excavated mission
was identified as that of the immigrant Guale
community of Santa Catalina, postdating 1684,
while the earlier mission church to the south was
tentatively identified as the immigrant Yamasee
community of Santa María, dating from roughly
1667 through 1683 (Saunders, 1993: 56).
Subsequent detailed review of archival evidence
indicates that the short-lived Yamasee village at
Santa María possessed neither a church nor a
resident missionary, and had been exempted from
the requirement to become Christians or pay
tribute to the Mocama chief in exchange for their
voluntary contributions to the annual Spanish
labor draft (Worth, 2004b: 251; 2007a: 30, 35).
This fact, combined with the presence of San
Pedro ceramics at this site (Ashley and Rolland,
1997a: 63), and the aforementioned independent evidence for the widespread early 17th-century Mocama transformation from San Pedro to Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics, makes it possible (if not probable) that the Santa María mission structure uncovered at Harrison Homestead is in fact identical with the indigenous Mocama mission by this same name, which documentary evidence suggests was abandoned in or shortly after 1665 (Worth, 2007a: 20, 70–71, 197–198; see also Saunders, chap. 3, this volume). The intervening Yamasee occupation (between the pre-1665 Mocama and post-1684 Guale occupations) is probably also evident at the site, though unlikely to be associated directly with any formal Spanish mission structures, except perhaps as intrusive or overlying contexts. For this reason, the aboriginal ceramics at the Santa María mission site may encapsulate the entirety of the Mocama transition from San Pedro to Altamaha/San Marcos prior to 1665, particularly if subsequent and overlying Yamasee ceramics can be excluded from the analysis.

Based on the sum total of evidence in this regard, available data suggest that the transition of the Mocama from San Pedro and San Juan ceramics to Altamaha/San Marcos occurred during the first half of the 17th century, probably in the 1620s–1640s (see also Ashley, chap. 5, this volume, who posits a ca. 1625 for the transition). Importantly, the archaeological record of Spanish-identified urban households in St. Augustine itself reflects and confirms this pattern of ceramic transformation, though in the past it has likewise been thought principally to reflect immigration and eventual intermarriage by Guale Indians into the Spanish community (Deagan, 1990: 303–309; 1993: 95–101; Hoffman, 1993: 76–79; see also Smith, 1948: 314–316, 318; Goggin, 1952: 6, 9, 12, 13). As it turns out, given the regionwide transformation in material culture from indigenous St. Johns and San Pedro ceramic traditions to that of Altamaha/San Marcos, the fact that these ceramics turn up increasingly in post-1650 archaeological assemblages in St. Augustine seems only logical, and presumably (as argued by Waters, 2005: 151; chap. 7, this volume) Timucua speakers (principally Mocama Indians) as well as Guale Indians contribute to the presence of these aboriginal ceramics in Spanish contexts (by a variety of means ranging from trade to cohabitation).

Nevertheless, since St. Augustine represented an urban hub of the Spanish colonial endeavor in Florida, aboriginal ceramics inside the city itself might be expected to reflect not only the influence of indigenous Timucuans from the immediate vicinity, but also extralocal pottery resulting from frequent direct contact with other areas. This fact may in part explain the very early presence of Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics from Menéndez-era contexts at the Fountain of Youth Park site (Deagan, 2004: 57, 65), which are most likely trade wares from St. Augustine’s twin port of Santa Elena to the north. The appearance of such wares in late 16th- and early 17th-century contexts at the same site, however, may provide some hint that the local Timucuan transformation from St. Johns to Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics may have begun prior to 1600, though it clearly did not become complete until decades later. Additional work is clearly needed to sort out the extent to which Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics began to appear in local Timucuan contexts around the turn of the 17th century. It should be noted, however, that despite a significant rise in the relative proportion of Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics with respect to that of the local indigenous St. Johns ceramic wares, evidence from the Fountain of Youth site and nearby Mission Nombre de Dios suggests that St. Johns wares may not have been wholly abandoned even as late as the 18th century, continuing to appear alongside predominant Altamaha/San Marcos wares (Deagan, 2004, chap. 6, this volume; Waters, 2005, chap. 7, this volume). This evidence suggests that for the St. Augustine-area Timucuan populations, the process of ceramic transformation may best be described as incremental rather than wholly transformative (Kathleen Deagan, personal commun., 2008). It is also possible that some of these late St. Johns wares in St. Augustine may be related to the persistence of that ceramic tradition among more southerly groups such as the Mayaca, Jororo, or Ais, many of whom fled northward to the St. Augustine vicinity in the early 18th century. This possibility must remain speculative at present, however.

One of the most intriguing aspects of this regionwide homogenization of indigenous ceramic traditions during the Spanish colonial era is the case of the Yamasee Indians. They not only took up the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic assemblage not long their arrival in the coastal
study area during the late 1660s as refugees from the interior, but subsequently maintained that ceramic tradition during the three decades of living separately in lower South Carolina between 1685 and 1715, even as they participated in slave raids against some of the very mission populations they would later settle among and intermarry with after the 1715 Yamasee War (Worth, 2004b). At present there is little reason to doubt that the early to mid 17th-century material culture of several of the most important Yamasee antecedent communities in central Georgia (Altamaha and Ocute, characterized at that time by Bell Phase Lamar ceramics; see Williams and Shapiro, 1990; Worth, 1993; Hally, 1994; Williams, chap. 4, this volume) was essentially unrelated to and uninfluenced by the coastal Altamaha/San Marcos transformation that had been largely completed before 1600. The precise date at which the first Yamasee towns relocated into or along the margins of the old Escamaçu province, broadly conceived, is not absolutely certain, but the earliest Spanish documentary references to the Yamasee imply that their arrival was quite recent as of 1663, and consisted of at least five and probably more distinct communities said to be from two to eight days’ travel from the Guale province (probably between 32 and 126 mi using six leagues or nearly 16 mi as a daily average; see Worth, 2003). Given these broad distances, however, which encompass nearly the entire eastern coastal plain of Georgia and southern coastal plain of South Carolina, it remains possible that Bell Phase populations of the Piedmont Oconee might instead have begun relocating toward coastal Escamaçu or Guale several decades prior to the arrival of the Chichimeco-Westco raiders in the period 1659–1661. This might have given them an expanded chronological “window” of exposure to Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics, even before they moved into the mission territory. The possibility of an earlier exodus out of the Piedmont Oconee valley might indeed explain Marvin Smith’s (1992: 31–32) suggestion that the Bell Phase showed little or no evidence for occupation before the first third of the 17th century, except along the Fall Line.

Regardless of the precise timing, the Yamasee appear to have either adopted the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic series during their stay in Mocama as immigrants during the 1660s and 1670s, or were already making it by the time they began living in Mocama territory (in the latter case presuming that there was an intermediate migration stage away from the Piedmont Oconee during the mid-17th century). Moreover, as noted above, by this date, the Mocama were also making this ceramic series, like their northern neighbors the Guale, who (together with the Oriesta/Escamaçu) seem to have been the earliest to adopt the Altamaha/San Marcos material culture. By no later than the 1680s, Altamaha/San Marcos had become the predominant ceramic series in use among all “Mission Indians” living along the Atlantic coast north of St. Augustine, regardless of their geographic or ethnic origin, and regardless of their linguistic identity or local political affiliation at the time. By the last quarter of the 17th century, the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic series was common to all three major ethnic groups living in the study area: Guale, Mocama, and Yamasee. On a strictly typological basis, therefore, rosters of archaeological ceramic types cannot currently be used to determine or distinguish aboriginal identity within the study area during this period. This being said, however, meaningful patterns of interassemblage variability may well exist with respect to relative proportions of individual types, or other characteristics such as microstylistic decorative variability, vessel form, ceramic paste, or other features, any or all of which may be associated with (and hence distinguish) specific ethnic groups (see, for example, Waters, chap. 7, this volume, and Saunders, chap. 3, this volume, regarding the higher proportion of stamped ceramics at the Mocama mission Santa María). At this point, however, the only categorical statement that can be made unequivocally using the roster of aboriginal ceramic types associated with Altamaha/San Marcos is that they signify production by “Atlantic Coastal Mission Indians” as broadly conceived, suggesting that from a ceramic point of view, all disparate groups within that broad category were typologically the same. Despite the presence of multiple ethnic groups speaking mutually unintelligible languages and considering themselves within differing ethnopolitical groupings, all seem to have made the same suite of ceramic types.

This evidently remained unchanged following the turbulent period from 1683 to 1685, when a series of pirate raids provoked not only the flight of the Yamasee away from the mission provinces but also the wholesale abandonment of the entire Georgia coastline and the relocation of Guale and Mocama missions to two localized clusters...
on Amelia Island and the mouth of the St. Johns River, respectively. Not only did the relocated Guale and Mocama mission communities each continue to make Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics at those two locations (Saunders, 2000a: 136–153, chap. 3, this volume; Thunen and Whitehurst, 2005) and through their subsequent relocation south of the St. Johns River in 1702 (at Pilijiriba), and adjacent to St. Augustine proper by 1704; but so also did their (then) English-allied enemies the Yamasees, whose stay in lower South Carolina was not apparently marked by any significant innovation in ceramic typology through their 1715 return to Spanish Florida (Green and DePratter, 2000; Southerlin et al., 2001; Worth, 2004b), when all three groups once again became neighbors in the outskirts of the city of St. Augustine. Archaeological work at several 18th-century refugee missions around St. Augustine has confirmed that Altamaha/San Marcos continued to be the defining material culture for remaining Guale, Mocama, and Yamasee communities well into the 1730s and later (White, 2002; Waters, 2005, chap. 5, this volume; Boyer, 2005). Though all these refugee communities show clear evidence of increasing ethnic mixing and intermarriage before their final departure for Cuba in 1763 (Hann, 1996: 296–325; Worth, 1998b: 140–158; 2007a: xiii–xiv), records from the evacuation and postevacuation era in Cuba still commonly indicate “tribal” origin for each individual transported and resettled. The Cuban documents suggest that not only had aboriginal ethnicity not disappeared during this traumatic era, it was one of the most persistent facets of individual identity among the remaining Indians of Spanish Florida, regardless of nearly complete homogeneity of Native American ceramic styles during this same period.

In sum, what had evidently begun at some point prior to the end of the 16th century as a localized transformation from Irene to Altamaha/San Marcos material culture among the Guale and Orista/Escamaçu (and perhaps Guadaluquini as well) of the northern coastal margins of Spanish Florida, then expanded, incorporating the surviving remnants of all major Native American ethnic groups in this region within two centuries, including (1) all coastal Guale and Mocama Indians who retreated to St. Augustine between 1661 and 1704, (2) remaining unmissionized Escamaçu Indians north of the mission chain, (3) immigrant Yamasee Indians who joined the coastal missions both in the 1660s and again after 1715, and (4) Apalachee and Timucua Indians who retreated to St. Augustine between 1704 and 1706. Following the completion of this in situ transformation among the Guale and Orista/Escamaçu by 1600, the next phase of the ceramic transformation involved its spread southward to St. Augustine by 1650, evidently resulting not from the migration of people, but rather the in situ transformation in material culture among disparate ethnic groups. The subsequent phase of transformation involved the adoption of the newly established coastal “monoculture” (as defined strictly within the realm of ceramics) by all subsequent Native American immigrants into St. Augustine. The first instance was the Yamasee during the late 1660s, and the second instance was the Timucua and Apalachee after 1706. What began as an in situ transformation of the material culture of several local groups in the northern half of the study area before 1600, became a wholesale transformation of all other local groups in the southern half of the study area by 1650, although there was some minority persistence of local traditions (such as St. Johns) alongside the newly predominant Altamaha/San Marcos. All subsequent immigrants to any part of this coastal region (from Port Royal to St. Augustine) through the early 18th century almost immediately became part of this regional phenomenon. Whatever cause can be posited for the southward spread of this transformation among residentially stable Mocama populations in the southern half of the study area before 1650 seems likewise to have influenced all future immigrants into the area, despite the explicit and persistent maintenance of distinctive ethnic identities for villages, families, and individuals as these very same populations retreated southward and intermixed as refugees from English-sponsored slave-raiding.

THE ALTAMAH/A/SAN MARCOS TRANSFORMATION IN BROADER PERSPECTIVE

Curiously, and not insignificantly, the multiregional and multietnic homogenization of aboriginal ceramics during the mission period within the study area along the Atlantic coastal zone does not seem to have spread westward and inland along the western Spanish mission chain extending from St. Augustine through the Apalachee mission province, traversing several
indigenous Timucuan districts including Potano, Timucua, and Yustaga. Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics appear to have remained extreme minorities at Apalachee and Timucua mission sites even through their final abandonment between 1704 and 1706 (Bonnie McEwan, Gifford Waters, personal commun., 2007), clearly indicating that whatever was going on in the northern Spanish mission chain along the Atlantic coastline during the late 16th and 17th centuries did not spread westward into the interior during this same period. Importantly, however, the homogenization of ceramics witnessed along the northern mission chain was almost precisely mirrored by a parallel transformation in ceramic material culture along the western mission chain, though in this case the “Western Interior Mission Indian” ceramic identity appears to have centered on the Jefferson ceramic series, another Lamar-related complex also known as Leon-Jefferson (Smith, 1948: 316–318; Willey, 1949: 488–495; Scarry, 1985; Worth, 1993, 1998b: 36–37; 2006a: 204–205). Lamaroid Jefferson ceramics, like Altamaha/San Marcos, seem to have spread from the farthest province inward toward St. Augustine, and apparently in roughly the same time period and at about the same pace. Here, local indigenous ceramic traditions (Suwannee Valley and Alachua; e.g., Milanich, 1971b; Rolland, 2007; Worth, 2007b) were also eventually dominated and largely replaced by the Jefferson series, a transformation that was essentially complete before 1650.

Though the Jefferson series appears to have been still dominant in the western Florida mission chain through the early 18th century, the rapid withdrawal of the remnants of these predominantly Timucua and Apalachee mission communities to the vicinity of St. Augustine, and apparently in roughly the same time period and at about the same pace. Here, local indigenous ceramic traditions (Suwannee Valley and Alachua; e.g., Milanich, 1971b; Rolland, 2007; Worth, 2007b) were also eventually dominated and largely replaced by the Jefferson series, a transformation that was essentially complete before 1650.

Taken in broader context, therefore, the Altamaha/San Marcos transformation may be viewed as half of a two-part transformation in aboriginal ceramic material culture that ultimately affected all Native Americans living within the expansive Franciscan mission system of greater Spanish Florida. At some point during the period between roughly 1600 and 1650, Lamaroid ceramic assemblages from two widely disparate regional manifestations of the broader Lamar culture area (Altamaha/San Marcos among the Guale and Ortista/Escamaçu, and Jefferson among the Apalachee) spread from the most distant Florida mission provinces back along the primary mission corridor toward the colonial administrative center at St. Augustine.
overwhelming and ultimately replacing the local Timucuan ceramic traditions that had previously existed in between (San Pedro and St. Johns for the Mocama, and Suwannee Valley and Alachua for the Timucua and Potano). Curiously, St. Augustine itself, as the central “hub” of the Florida colonial system, was not influenced by this transformation in a balanced or proportional manner as might be expected, especially given the overwhelming demographic dominance of the western interior mission populations (especially Apalache) over that of the northern coastal missions. Current evidence indicates that Altamaha/San Marcos predominated there throughout the 17th century, even as Jefferson ceramics spread eastward. Even when many of the last remaining makers of Jefferson ceramics finally migrated to St. Augustine after 1704, their material culture seems to have been absorbed and replaced by the pancoastal Altamaha/San Marcos series examined in this chapter. For whatever reason, Altamaha/San Marcos seems to have become the de facto dominant ceramic material culture of all remaining Florida “mission Indians” living in and around St. Augustine after the first decade of the 18th century. Though Altamaha/San Marcos apparently did not spread into the western interior provinces, once it had been emplaced in the environs of St. Augustine by the late 17th century, it seemed to be characterized by considerable durability.

EXPLAINING THE TRANSFORMATION

In this chapter, I have concentrated my efforts on providing a detailed description of the exact chronological and geographical parameters of the ceramic transformation that was experienced by essentially all Native American residents of the Atlantic coastal study area during the Spanish colonial period. I have also placed this more detailed overview in the broader context of similar changes that can be documented for the western interior provinces of greater Spanish Florida at the same time. What remains to be addressed at least in part is the question of exactly why and how these transformations occurred, and what they imply about the oft-assumed relationship between archaeological ceramics and ethnicity.

With regard to the latter question, even if the concept of ethnicity is expanded to include virtually any form of “social group identity” (whether ethnic or linguistic or political), certain logical inferences must be established if a linkage is to be posited between ceramic style zones (established archaeologically, using assemblages of types) and at least some form of distinguishable social grouping (established ethnohistorically). Regardless of whether ceramic style zones are interpreted to reflect conscious behaviors of potters in communicating symbolic markers of group affiliation (sensu Wobst, 1977), or whether they are simply a by-product of social interaction zones that themselves are reflections of group boundaries (sensu Friedrich, 1970), perhaps the most fundamental association that must be established is that there actually is some sort of direct correspondence between archaeological ceramic style zones and the type of social grouping that is asserted to be coincident with it. This is particularly important if an argument is to be made that pottery style or decoration possesses symbolic content that is specifically and intentionally designed to transmit social identity or group affiliation.

With respect to the Guale transition from Irene to Altamaha/San Marcos, and its continuous use among the Guale Indians through the early 18th century, Rebecca Saunders (1992, 2000a) has approached the question of ceramic change and continuity using a robust dataset incorporating many dimensions of ceramic variability, ranging from paste and form to decoration and style. Relying in part on stylistic analysis emphasizing the information content of decorative symbols as markers of social identity or group affiliation, Saunders has explored the persistence of inferred symbolic content in the form of the widespread Southeastern Indian “world symbol” as a central component of stamped pottery decoration in both precontact Irene assemblages and mission-era Altamaha/San Marcos assemblages (Saunders, 1992; 2000a: 49–51, 169–170, 180–181). The continued use of this cosmological symbol across the transition between the earlier Irene “filfot cross” motif and the subsequent Altamaha/San Marcos “line block” design was interpreted as possible evidence of conscious cultural perseverance, or even a form of passive resistance, during the period prior to 1680, and a subsequent decline in the use of this symbol in assemblages dating between 1684 and 1702 was similarly interpreted as potential evidence for the beginnings of the adoption of a different colonial worldview following the Guale evacuation from their Georgia homeland (Saunders, 2000a: 101,
180–181). In both cases, however, the primary decorative motif in stamped Irene and Altamaha/San Marcos pottery (the world symbol) was interpreted to reflect an implicit communication of Guale “social identity,” with the continuation, alteration, or diminishment of this symbol during the colonial era serving as a corollary or gauge of concurrent transformations in this same sense of group identity (Saunders, 1992: 145; 2000a: 181). Viewed within the context of the Guale themselves, who were indeed among the first to adopt the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic series, the overall degree of continuity through the 16th and 17th centuries is indeed remarkable, and clearly implies that the core decorative element making up the stamped decoration throughout this period must have been both persistent and meaningful.

In broader context, however, the fact that the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic series can now be demonstrated to have spread southward along the Atlantic coastline to St. Augustine, and by the last half of the 17th century had been adopted by the inhabitants of several local Mocama chiefdoms that had previously been characterized by San Pedro and St. Johns ceramic series, indicates clearly that while continuity may have been the rule among the Guale, it was instead change that characterized their Timucua-speaking neighbors to the south. Similarly, ceramic continuity seems to have been abandoned by Yamasee immigrants to the Georgia and Florida coastal islands in the 1660s, and also by Timucua and Apalachee immigrants to St. Augustine a generation later (not discounting the fact that the Timucua had themselves experienced a prior ceramic change with the Jefferson transformation three-quarters of a century earlier). What represented a substantial degree of ceramic continuity for the Guale and their 18th-century descendants in St. Augustine, was in fact a reflection of substantial ceramic change for virtually all other Native American inhabitants of greater Spanish Florida during the 17th and 18th centuries.

Given all the data and analyses above, the conclusion seems inescapable that even if the symbolic and stylistic content of the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic series was in fact a conscious communication of social identity, it was not a communication of uniquely Guale ethnicity. If virtually every living Native American resident of the entire Atlantic coastal zone within the study area ultimately abandoned or minimized their own indigenous ceramic tradition in favor of that of the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic series, while simultaneously maintaining clear and persistent ethnic distinctions based on traditional political, linguistic, or regional subdivisions within that same broader population, then it seems impossible to conclude otherwise than that ceramic material culture was not a direct reflection of aboriginal ethnicity in the traditional sense. The ceramic style zone represented by the maximal distribution of Altamaha/San Marcos clearly crosscut and transcended all ethnic boundaries at the time. If the symbolic or stylistic content of Altamaha/San Marcos communicated or reflected some form of social identity, it was clearly multiethnic.

One possible explanation that might be inferred from the analysis above is that Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics instead communicated a new type of social identity, one specifically deriving from or suited to the Spanish colonial era. The one thing that united all groups within the study area during the study period was some form of involvement with the broader colonial system of greater Spanish Florida. Indeed, in larger perspective, there is little doubt that the spread of Altamaha/San Marcos material culture was either instigated or conditioned by the involvement of participating groups with the Florida mission system. The question, however, is precisely how that involvement may have influenced the spread of this ceramic series among such a diversity of aboriginal ethnic groups. An immediate question would be whether or not Altamaha/San Marcos might communicate or reflect a new panregional “Mission Indian” social identity, as argued for the St. Augustine area by Waters (2005: 149–151). In other words, did all “missionized” Native Americans within the study area adopt the symbolic and stylistic content of Altamaha/San Marcos as an expression of that new social grouping, unified under Spanish administration? The answer to that specific question is yes, but it also begs another question: was Altamaha/San Marcos similarly common to all missionized groups throughout all of greater Spanish Florida? And the answer to that question is a resounding no. As discussed above, the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic series did not extend westward into the interior of greater Spanish Florida, along the western mission chain that included the Timucua and Apalachee provinces. If this new ceramic “monoculture” that emplaced itself along the
Atlantic coastal region within the study area was in fact a manifestation of a new pan-Indian social identity reflecting “Mission Indians” in general, or simply “Spanish-allied Indians,” it would probably have incorporated not just the northern mission chain, but instead all missionized groups throughout Florida.

Given available data, then, would it be possible to infer instead that not one, but two colonial Indian “identities” were forged within greater Spanish Florida during the 17th century, one extending west from St. Augustine and the other extending north from the same city? While there is no documentary evidence to support such a bipartite division of aboriginal social identity among the mission provinces, the maximal geographic distribution of Altamaha/San Marcos and Jefferson ceramic series might still tend to imply such an interpretation. Nevertheless, if we are to posit a correspondence between an inferred “Atlantic Coastal Mission Indian” identity and the presumed conscious manifestation of that social identity through ceramic style, then another corresponding question must be posed: did unmissionized and/or antagonistic groups living outside the Spanish mission provinces similarly reject that the ceramic material culture of those missionized groups as a conscious communication of their “separateness”? The answer to that question is of course no, since it is clear that both the unmissionized Escamaçu living north of Guale, and their successors the Yamasee, who spent more than a generation slave-raiding the mission Indians on behalf of the English, were both characterized by an almost identical ceramic material culture to that of the missionized groups to the south. Logically, then, since Altamaha/San Marcos transcended the boundaries of both spatial and political affiliation with the mission system of Spanish Florida, and hence was not contiguous with the geographic distribution of “Atlantic Coastal Mission Indians,” then it seems highly unlikely to have represented a conscious communication of that broader social identity.

If Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics did not represent a conscious communication of ethnicity or any other clearly identifiable colonial-era aboriginal social grouping, then might they have instead reflected a technological or stylistic transformation that occurred at least in part upon Spanish instigation, or under Spanish guidance, as Saunders (2000a: 108–110, 172) has suggested as an explanation for the Guale transformation from Irene to Altamaha/San Marcos? For the same reasons that eliminated a pan-“Florida Mission Indian” identity as discussed above, this seems unlikely, even beyond the fact that there seem to be no direct European influences embodied within the overall transformation to the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic series. Indeed, both the Altamaha/San Marcos and the Jefferson ceramic series appear to be almost wholly aboriginal in nature, even if they may simply represent aboriginal solutions to new challenges or problems that arose only within the context of the European presence. Either or both of the Altamaha/San Marcos or Jefferson ceramic transformations may well have encompassed new technological or stylistic modifications designed as an adaptation to new foodways or new social or demographic contexts within Florida’s 17th-century colonial system, but in my opinion they nonetheless still represented aboriginal solutions that needed neither Spanish instigation nor guidance in their implementation. Both of these mission-era ceramic series were made and used principally by and for Native Americans within and adjacent to greater Spanish Florida, and the fact that their continued production throughout the colonial era was so robust that these same vessels were apparently also used in Spanish households in St. Augustine (and even passed down in a few documented estate inventories) does not detract from their originally aboriginal character.

This is not to say that Native American potters did not simultaneously employ their skills to generate European-style wares for use by resident soldiers and missionaries, and perhaps also to a much lesser extent for barter or sale to the residents of St. Augustine. The production and use of these colonowares in Florida seems largely to have been governed by extreme limitations in the routine supply of European-style tablewares for Spaniards living in the remote mission frontier, and it was in fact this very supply limitation that prompted aboriginal reproductions for Spanish consumption, apparently most commonly in association with garrisoned soldiers (Deagan, 1993: 101–102; Worth, 1998a: 169–170; 2006a: 201; 2007a: 114, 125; Melcher, 2008). Nevertheless, the very fact that these colonowares were apparently produced in such limited numbers, and were dwarfed by the continuing production of purely aboriginal wares such as Altamaha/San Marcos and Jefferson, tends to reinforce the
interpretation that the development and spread of these new ceramic series were not by-products of conscious Spanish agency.

What, then, is the most likely explanation for the emergence and spread of two new aboriginal ceramic style zones within and adjacent to Spanish Florida during the colonial era? Using all the data discussed above, as well as the logical inferences derived from this data, I would argue that the maximal spatial distribution of these two new multiregional and multiethnic ceramic style zones—Altamaha/San Marcos and Jefferson—represented a manifestation of new regional interaction networks reflecting a combination of two governing influences: geographic location (particularly with respect to coastal vs. interior regions), and overarching integration into the evolving colonial system of greater Spanish Florida (incorporating all aspects of integration, from sociopolitical to economic). In the absence of one or the other of these two factors, the resultant distribution would likely have been different. In the absence of the multifaceted Spanish colonial system that developed and expanded precisely during the period in question (the terminal 16th and early 17th centuries; see Worth, 1998a: 126–214), it seems highly unlikely that the more localized ceramic style zones that were the hallmark of the late prehistoric era across what would become Spanish Florida (including the study area here) would ever have spread so rapidly and become so uniform across so expansive a pair of regions (and almost certainly not in the precise configuration that ultimately resulted by 1650).

And on the other hand, if simple geographic location had not played a role in the ultimate distribution of these two homogenized ceramic style zones, it seems far more likely that one, not two, style zones would have evolved within the context of the newly unified mission provinces of greater Spanish Florida, even if only as an indirect reflection of the broader patterns of social interaction within this new macropolity. Why is it that the Guale and Mocama ultimately adopted a single ceramic style, while the Apalachee and Timucua/Potano adopted an entirely different (though similarly uniform) ceramic style? There is no documentary evidence for any sort of long-term cultural disunity or rivalry between the inhabitants of the northern and western Florida mission provinces; far to the contrary, all these provinces shared something fundamental during the Spanish colonial era, forming independent but integrally linked parts of a greater whole under the military and ecclesiastical administration of St. Augustine. Indeed, on a yearly basis, several hundred unmarried male repartimiento workers from all these provinces gathered in and around St. Augustine for farming and other tasks, at the very least providing an annual context for interaction between some of the residents of both branches of the Florida mission system.

If anything, I would say that the most surprising facet of this overall transformation in ceramic material culture in colonial Spanish Florida is the fact that it did not result in a single aboriginal ceramic style zone corresponding directly to the fact that all of Florida’s “Mission Indians” had been forcibly assimilated into a new and more strongly centralized paramountcy with its administrative hub at St. Augustine. Instead, the two observed colonial ceramic style zones might best be characterized as “Atlantic Coastal Mission Indians” and “Western Interior Mission Indians” from the perspective of St. Augustine as colonial capital. And even this characterization is incomplete, given that unmissionized residents of Escamaçu, as well as their short-lived neighbors and successors, the Yamasee, carried on largely independent existences in lower coastal South Carolina, just to the north of the farthest extent of Spanish control (though proximity and trade clearly linked the Escamaçu into the overall economic and social milieu of the northern mission chain; see Worth, 2007a: 24–26). Moreover, why was St. Augustine, as the central hub of the entire colonial system, not equally influenced by the concurrent aboriginal ceramic transformations to the north (Altamaha/San Marcos) and west (Jefferson), if not for the fact that its coastal location may have promoted greater north-south interaction than east-west across the transpeninsular interior? Clearly, geography played just as important a role as Spanish colonial integration, though it seems to have been both factors operating together that exerted the strongest influence on the ultimate distribution of both Altamaha/San Marcos and Jefferson ceramic style zones.

In the final analysis, change in the degree of aboriginal ceramic variability displayed within the study area from ca. 1514 to 1763 is hypothesized here to be a result of concurrent changes in the social geography of this and surrounding regions in the context of the
growth and expansion of the colonial system of Spanish Florida. Specifically, the assimilation of previously independent local aboriginal chiefdoms within a predominantly north-south coastal corridor of travel inside an integrated multiregional colonial society centered at St. Augustine resulted in new patterns of aboriginal social interaction throughout greater Spanish Florida and beyond. The primary catalyst for such changes was the structure of the colonial system itself, which integrated missionized aboriginal populations (the “Republic of Indians”) as a vast labor pool capable of providing stable supplies of staple food crops and other resources to the colonial garrison town of St. Augustine (the “Republic of Spaniards”). Although the initial expansion of this colonial system was largely governed by the preexisting distribution of aboriginal populations and associated arable land, its final geographic configuration and maximal extent were products of the evolutionary trajectory of the broader colonial system, which exerted its influences on previously autonomous chiefdoms within the system. The colonial system of Spanish Florida ultimately facilitated new intraregional and interregional social interactions, including short- and long-distance forms of interaction and exchange, both terrestrial and maritime, among and between Native Americans and Spaniards living within and adjacent to the formal boundaries of the system. While the details and nuances of these new patterns of social interaction are still poorly understood apart from the broad outlines as interpreted from available ethnohistorical and archaeological data, one result of the new social geography of greater Spanish Florida was, I would argue, the creation of the ceramic style zone characterized by Altamaha/San Marcos pottery.

In addition, what this case study appears to demonstrate is that at least in the case of the Altamaha/San Marcos ceramic series after ca. 1650, there appears to be no direct relationship between assemblages of archaeological ceramic types and aboriginal ethnicity. While the long-term persistence of aboriginal ceramic production itself, as well as the iconographic and symbolic content of its decorative and other stylistic elements, clearly reflects a remarkable degree of general cultural resilience among the Native American inhabitants of Spanish Florida throughout the colonial era, the final geographic distribution of Altamaha/San Marcos ceramics does not correspond to any particular aboriginal ethnic group or indigenous political unit, nor to Florida’s “Mission Indians” in general, nor to any other clearly defined colonial-era social grouping. Instead, the geographic distribution of this particular ceramic assemblage appears to transcend certain ethnic, political, and other social groupings, and to subdivide others. Apart from the very existence of this multiregional ceramic “monoculture” as half of a two-part transformation resulting from the assimilation of these regions into the colonial system of greater Spanish Florida, the strongest association appears to be geographic, most notably with respect to coastal vs. interior locations. For these reasons, the most likely explanation for ceramic variation in this case appears to be tied to broadscale changes in patterns of regional social interaction during the Spanish colonial era. Importantly, this interaction was not specifically limited or constricted by either Native American or Spanish boundaries. Indeed, the style zone of maximal distribution of Altamaha/San Marcos pottery might imply otherwise invisible undercurrents of interregional social interaction that are largely undocumented in the ethnohistorical record, and that might instead provide new anthropological insights into the nature of human social interactions that transcend explicit political and social units. Whether or not this proves to be the case, it seems clear that the archaeological analysis of ceramic variability during the historic period holds great potential for understanding the nature of material culture and its relationship to other facets of human cultural variability, especially when fundamental presuppositions (such as equating ceramic assemblages with aboriginal ethnicity) are actually tested empirically using detailed evaluation and comparison of archaeological and ethnohistorical evidence in tandem.