ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY IN THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI ALLUVIAL VALLEY, 1940–1947

PHILIP PHILLIPS, JAMES A. FORD, AND JAMES B. GRIFFIN

Edited and with an Introduction by STEPHEN WILLIAMS

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA PRESS
Tuscaloosa and London

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY IN THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI ALLUVIAL VALLEY, 1940–1947

PHILIP PHILLIPS, JAMES A. FORD, AND JAMES B. GRIFFIN

Edited and with an Introduction by STEPHEN WILLIAMS

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA PRESS
Tuscaloosa and London

Typeface: Janson Text

∞
The paper on which this book is printed meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Science–Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Phillips, Philip, 1900–
Archaeological survey in the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley, 1940–1947 / Philip Phillips, James A. Ford, and James B. Griffin ; edited and with an introduction by Stephen Williams.
p. cm. — (Classics in southeastern archaeology)
Originally published: Cambridge, Mass. : Peabody Museum, 1951, in series: Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University : v. 25.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-8173-1104-1 (cloth : alk. paper) —
ISBN 0-8173-5022-5 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Indians of North America—Mississippi River Valley—Antiquities. 2. Indian pottery—Mississippi River Valley. 3. Mississippi River Valley—Antiquities. I. Ford, James Alfred, 1911–1968. II. Griffin, James Bennett, 1905– III. Title, IV. Series.

E378.M75.P45 2003
976.3'301—dc21 2003047325

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data available

Publication of this work has been supported in part by donations from the following agencies, institutions, and individuals.

Mr. Albert H. Gordon
Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University
Dan Josselyn Memorial Fund

Front cover
Background: Map of the Baytown Site, Arkansas [LMS Site Files, drawn by Philip Phillips]
Left: Plane table mapping at the Menard Site, Arkansas, Spring 1841. [LMS site files, work done by Philip Phillips and Mott Davis]
Middle: Excavation unit and workers at the Rose Site, Arkansas, April, 1947. [LMS site files, photo by Philip Phillips]
Right: Mound A at the Edgefield site, Mississippi, Spring, 1940. [LMS site files, photo by Philip Phillips]

Back cover
LANDSAT 7 satellite image of LMS survey area. Georeferenced and composited by Bryan S. Haley, Center for Archaeological Research, University of Mississippi.

FOREWORD

I DID not undertake this project, the reprinting of this well-known volume, without trepidation. As series editor of the University of Alabama Press's Classics in Southeastern Archaeology, I was quite familiar with the "drill." But still, this was a volume written not by nineteenth-century notables such as Charles C. Jones or Clarence B. Moore but instead the work of three old friends with whom I had had many decades of personal interaction. Did the work qualify as a "classic?"

The volume indeed passes that test, but I hesitated for other reasons—not the least of which was finding funding for the publication of this rather large volume. But what are old friends for? Now reaching back in time, in an almost archaeological manner, I would like to acknowledge the continued support and thoughtfulness of a very old friend of Phil Phillips, Albert Hamilton Gordon. He was a member of the Harvard class of 1921 and knew Phillips in Buffalo, New York, just after they had both graduated from college. Gordon regularly went to Buffalo on business for his father's company. There in those early days he met both Phillips and his bride, Ruth, a number of times. They never forgot that early connection.

I first met Gordon in the fall of 1967, when he had just been made chairman of the Peabody Museum's visiting committee. He had also just become a member of Harvard's Board of Overseers, and the Peabody had just had its 100th anniversary. It was thus my task, as the newly appointed director of Harvard's Peabody Museum, to help Gordon understand the complexities and problems of that wonderful old anthropological treasure. He was an easy learner, and we became fast friends. I even taught some of his grandchildren and also, much later, worked with him on a maritime antiquity, the vessel *Snow Squall.*

Speaking of centenary-year anniversaries, some Harvard friends asked me to help celebrate Gordon's own 100th birthday in 2001 by handwriting a letter to be included in a small volume honoring that event. I am happy now to thank the Albert H. Gordon Foundation for its generous subvention for the reprinting of this important volume. Old friends don't forget.

It was a marvelous surprise that we could turn that fifty-some-year-old "Peabody Paper" into a great 2003 monograph, with even a readable CD of the whole volume. Deep and heartfelt thanks to all who made this volume possible.

Stephen Williams
August 28, 2002

PREFACE

THE Lower Mississippi Archaeological Survey was initiated in 1939 as a joint undertaking of three institutions: School of Geology, Louisiana State University; Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan; and Peabody Museum, Harvard University.[1] The purpose of the Survey was to investigate the northern two-thirds of the alluvial valley of the Lower Mississippi River — roughly from the mouth of the Ohio to Vicksburg, Mississippi, an area long regarded as one of the principal blind spots in the archaeology of the Southeast. This is not altogether due to lack of work in the area, or to the character of such work, but rather to the fact that it had so far failed to reveal anything concerning the earlier pre-Mississippian cultures. The need for a comprehensive survey had been repeatedly voiced at Midwestern and Southeastern conferences and various suggestions made for carrying out such a project. It was Ford, whose reconstruction of prehistory in the southern part of the Lower Valley had reached the point of need for verification farther north, who finally translated these suggestions into action. In the fall of 1939 he approached the other two of the present writers with a tentative plan, for which he had already secured the enthusiastic support of Dr. Arthur R. Kelly, then chief archaeologist of the National Park Service. The proposed collaboration appeared to offer one very considerable advantage since it combined the experience of two men whose previous activities had been centered to the north and south of the area to be investigated (Griffin and Ford) with a third (Phillips) who had done some work within it. Problems would be approached from opposed points of view, amicably it was hoped, and the resulting solutions might be the stronger for it. Such at any rate was the theory, and on the whole it worked out very well. There are difficulties inherent in a joint operation of this kind. The compensations, we hope, will appear in the pages that follow.

The first field party, in the spring of 1940, consisted of the three writers and Fisher Motz, a graduate student in the Department of Anthropology at Harvard. A shorter expedition was made in the fall by Phillips and his wife. In the spring of 1941, Griffin and Phillips were accompanied by Mott Davis and Chester Chard, graduate students at Harvard, and Mrs. Chard. Plans for a similar spring season in 1942 were canceled upon the outbreak of the war. The authors soon found themselves engaged in other activities, and it was not until 1946 that it was possible to get back into the field and then only in a rather limited manner. Short field trips were made in the spring of that year and again in the spring of 1947 by Phillips and his wife. In the first of these they were ably assisted by Paul Gebhard, then a graduate student at Harvard. Thus the present report represents a total of seven months in the field, in four of which there were two separate parties in two cars. Of this time approximately two-thirds was spent in survey work, one-third in stratigraphic excavation.

It is hardly necessary to point out that this is a very small record of accomplishment in relation to the area contemplated in the original project. Less than half of that area was covered even in a preliminary way. The amount of test excavation, in proportion to surface collecting, we now feel to have been inadequate. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, we believe that the results, however fragmentary, warrant publication at this time.

Grateful acknowledgment is due the directors at that time of the three participating institutions: Mr. Donald Scott, Peabody Museum, Harvard University; Dr. Carl E. Guthe, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan; and Dr. Henry V. Howe, School of Geology, Louisiana State University. All three overcame their entirely reasonable misgivings in respect to complicated joint undertakings and gave their unstinted support and assistance. Thanks are also due Dr. Arthur R. Kelly, who

[1] In 1946, Ford joined the staff of the American Museum of Natural History, New York City, which institution then assumed co-sponsorship of the Lower Mississippi Archaeological Survey in place of the School of Geology, Louisiana State University.

secured for us not only the moral support of the National Park Service, but material assistance as well. Part of the funds for the University of Michigan's share of the work and publication was a grant from the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies. The President of the Mississippi River Commission, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, was most generous in furnishing maps and other indispensable publications of the Commission, and remarkably forebearing in respect to the little received from us in return. To him also and to Dr. Harold N. Fisk particular thanks are due for permission to quote freely from the latter's monumental report on the geology of the Alluvial Valley of the Lower Mississippi River, published by the Commission.[2]

To the sometimes puzzled, but always good-natured, planters we tender thanks *en bloc*. Of the several hundred owners and managers approached, very few failed to understand the general objects of the Survey, and almost none withheld their co-operation. We regret that the large number of such friendly persons makes it impossible to mention them individually.

It remains to speak of assistance freely given by local archaeologists and collectors, among whom it is a pleasure to record names. Professor S. C. Dellinger of the University of Arkansas put the University Museum's large collections at our disposal and furnished valuable information out of his extensive knowledge of the area. The late Professor Calvin S. Brown permitted us to photograph the fine collection of pottery at the University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi. Dr. and Mrs. Hodges of Bismark, Arkansas, put their collection at our disposal, as did the Honorable Harry J. Lemley of Hope, Arkansas; Dr. James K. Hampson of Nodena, Arkansas; and Mr. Charles Clark of Clarksdale, Mississippi.

A great many people have assisted in the rather considerable drudgery that takes place in what is generally referred to as the "laboratory." In particular, we have to mention the admirable work of analysis and classification performed by Mrs. Mary Slusser in 1946–47 at the Peabody Museum, without which the publication of this work would have been still further delayed. The seriation analysis and the resultant graphs were prepared at the American Museum of Natural History in 1948. In this work able assistance was rendered by Mr. Gary Vesalius and Miss Charlotte Fitzpatrick.

The three authors must jointly assume responsibility for the preparation of this report and the conclusions — except where it is made clear that some one of the three does not concur in a majority opinion. When we began the work we did not expect that complete unanimity would be reached on all points, particularly in view of the fact that the analysis and writing had to be done at our respective institutions and the opportunities for discussion would be few. We shall not attempt to minimize such differences of opinion, for to us they have been one of the most stimulating aspects of the collaboration. As the discerning reader will perceive, they derive principally from the differing degrees of caution used by the three of us in drawing conclusions from the same data.

The fact that this report had to be prepared while the writers were widely separated made it necessary for each to take the responsibility for doing the work and writing the first draft of various sections. In some cases these sections stand substantially as originally written; in others they have been considerably amended by criticisms and suggestions of the other two authors. For purposes of fixing ultimate responsibility, the authorship of the various sections is as follows:

I. The Geographic Setting. Phillips.

II. The Archaeological Field Work. Phillips.

III. Pottery Typology and Classification. Section on typology originally written by Ford, revised by Phillips, with many suggestions by Griffin. The pottery classification represents a joint effort extending over several years. Pottery descriptions written by Griffin.

IV. Distribution of Some Mississippi Period Vessel Shapes and Features. Griffin.

V. Seriation Analysis of Pottery Collections. Ford.

VI. Stratigraphy. Phillips.

VII. Correlation of Pottery Sequence with Recent Drainage History. Phillips.

VIII. Analysis of Occupation Site Plans. Ford.

IX. Identification of Sites from Documentary Sources. Phillips.

X. Summary and Conclusions. Various sections written by all three authors and patched together in consultation.

PHILIP PHILLIPS, JAMES B. GRIFFIN,
AND JAMES A. FORD

[2] Fisk, 1944.

INTRODUCTION TO 2003 EDITION

Phillips, Ford, and Griffin's Lower Valley Survey

Stephen Williams

PREAMBLE

In writing the introduction for this reprinting of the Lower Mississippi valley classic by Phillips, Ford, and Griffin, I must make clear my own prejudices as well as my strengths and weaknesses in taking on this effort. I knew all three authors well over a period of many decades; I worked with and was taught by two of them (Griffin and Phillips) and spent quite a bit of time both in museums and touring with the other (Ford). All have now passed away. But they are not forgotten, as this newly reprinted volume surely demonstrates.

I have also presented public eulogies for and published pieces about Phillips and Griffin (Williams 1995, 1999; Williams and Brain 1970). I created a timeline and bibliography for a Ford obituary (Willey 1969) and aided a colleague in another volume on Ford (Brown 1978). In addition, I put together with the help of Bill Haag a Southeastern Archaeological Conference (SEAC) resolution to honor Ford in November 1967, before Ford's death (Williams and Haag 1968). I put together a lengthy collection—more than 200 pages—of much of Ford's writings, including his little-known 1938 master's thesis on ceramic analysis for the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (Williams 1970). I cared a lot about them all.

Thus, I am hardly a person writing about these individuals of the Lower Mississippi survey (LMS) from an unbiased point of view. I have also provided similar materials on two others of what I like to call the "LMS gang": William G. Haag (Williams 2001, 2002) and Robert S. Neitzel (Williams 1986). Both of this latter cohort participated directly in LMS field activities, Haag at Jaketown, and Neitzel at Menard, Lake George, and Natchez. Now none of them survives to argue with me on this personal view of "who, what, when, and how" things happened. I will try to be fair and straightforward about how I know what went on in both the fieldwork and the writing that provided the archaeological results and the text of the volume that is being reprinted herein. However, I must also mention that I have not used all the available archival data: Phillips's field notebooks and those of some of his field assistants do exist in the LMS Archives at the Peabody Museum.

There have also been many discussions of this volume both as book reviews and citations in everything from textbooks to monographs. I have investigated the later sources only briefly. Haag wrote several early positive book reviews (1953a and 1953b), and I must confess that even I wrote one early in my career (Williams 1952). It was the first thing I ever had published, and it is not significant. Many years later, Robert Dunnell (1985:297–300) wrote a short piece specifically on the importance of this survey as a "landmark study." For the most recent careful review of this volume, see Mark A. Rees's "Mississippian Culture History: The Contribution of Phillips, Ford and Griffin" in *Historical Perspectives on Midsouth Archaeology* (M. A. Rolingson, ed. 2001. Arkansas Archaeological Survey Research Series, no. 58: 85–92).

I must further confess that I do not have, and never did have, a great interest in convoluted philosophical controversies. Thus, when Michael O'Brien and Lee Lyman (1998:181–231) discuss at length the volume that is being republished herein, I will take the easy way out and decline to enter into the controversy over what they suggest these three archaeologists thought, meant, or intimated. When one must use terms like "essentialists" in one's exegesis of this trio's actions and intents, I must beg off completely. So be it.

INTRODUCTION

The year was 1939 and the Great Depression was finally beginning to ease in America, partially because of the military buildup due to the war in Europe that was about to break out that autumn. While there is little good that can be said about the suffering caused by the stock-market crash on Wall Street and the following difficult depression years, one benefit accrued to the field of archae-

ology. A long somnolent period of modest action in the field of archaeology in the eastern United States (1900–1930) ended with a series of depression-relief programs in archaeological fieldwork that changed the face and facts of the archaeology of that region.

Of course, this eastern part of America had produced the first significant research on the ancient Indian monuments (the Moundbuilders) as early as the 1780s. Dozens of books and articles had been written on the subject of eastern North American archaeology by the 1880s, with workers including everyone from American presidents (Thomas Jefferson) to local antiquarians. Throughout the East these individuals gathered together in early local museums of science or major institutions such as the Smithsonian Institution in 1846 or the Peabody Museum at Harvard, founded in 1867 (Williams 1991:28–76).

However, it was about this time (1860s–1870s) that Americans, with the opening of the West following the gold rush of 1849, discovered the wonders of southwestern archaeology. This region began to gain in importance as a new field of research, with intriguing discoveries of Cliff Dweller ruins and wonderfully preserved baskets and burials unlike anything ever found in the East. The Southwest caught the attention of newly trained scholars at the Peabody, which was matriculating the first Ph.D.'s in archaeology. The archaeology of the eastern United States in the post–World War I period was carried out in a much less exciting manner and with attention still focused mainly, but not exclusively, on the Moundbuilders (Willey and Sabloff 1993:38–64; Williams 1994:9–14).

The need for employment in the eastern United States during the depression shifted focus away from the Southwest. Roosevelt's make-work projects (e.g., WPA, CWA) included roads, soil-conservation projects, and, in 1934, archaeological projects. Those later projects started with site surveys followed by excavations in many regions especially at new dam sites on many southeastern rivers such as the Tennessee.

These major WPA excavation programs were the underpinnings for a revolution in the archaeology of the eastern United States. Armies of workers attacked large sites and their deep deposits in a manner never before seen. Mounds were excavated, too, and manpower resources allowed the mounds to be sectioned for stratigraphy rather than being attacked only with a few modest pits and trenches.

Of course, the workers made mistakes; nevertheless, new data swamped the burgeoning field of eastern archaeology and seemed to make it a worthwhile field of academic research. There had also been a series of regional archaeological conferences that were organized by the anthropological wing of the National Research Council in 1929, 1932, and 1935 (O'Brien and Lyman 2001). Reacting to the torrent of new WPA data, a series of annual Southeastern Archaeological Conferences was launched to help bring order to the mass of new data. These SEAC meetings began in 1937 at Ann Arbor, Michigan. Griffin and Ford were the first leaders of that still long-running series of conferences (Williams 1960).

FORD, GRIFFIN, AND PHILLIPS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

For the first time in half a century, eastern archaeology was now active on a broad scale, and new scholars were being trained to tackle the questions raised by the data being brought to light by these relief programs. Among this group were the three authors of this volume. James A. Ford was the youngest (1911–1968), next was James B. Griffin (1905–1997), and finally the oldest, Philip Phillips (1900–1994). Despite some disparity in their ages, they started tackling archaeology as a field of research around the beginning of the 1930s. They all received strong academic training in the field as well, a background not common to many eastern archaeologists in the early twentieth century.

In the fall of 1939 the three met in Baton Rouge at Louisiana State University (LSU) to put together research plans to study the archaeology of the Lower Mississippi River, that region south of the Ohio River confluence. Ford and Griffin had known each other for some time, and Phillips and Griffin were well acquainted too. However, I cannot now cite an earlier meeting of Ford and Phillips, although the latter did thank Ford for unpublished data he used in his Harvard dissertation (Phillips 1939:ii).

It was Ford who first advanced the idea for an archaeological survey of part of the Lower Mississippi valley in that fall of 1939, first getting in contact with the National Park Service group that was doing archaeological work nearby. Then Ford gathered the other two, Griffin and Phillips, together in Baton Rouge. An unknown LSU photographer took three "mug shots" at that time. One can rightly ask what real experience prepared

these men, all in their 30s, for such a large undertaking as a survey of part of the Lower Mississippi valley, which they believed ran from the mouth of the Ohio River to the Gulf of Mexico (see Figure 1).

Ford was by far the most experienced fieldworker, beginning at the age of 15 to work with Moreau Chambers on a survey of sites in Mississippi (Chambers 1976:26; Collins 1932; Ford 1936:1). Ford was born in Water Valley, Mississippi, but moved as a teenager to Clinton, Mississippi, with his mother and brother, David (Willey 1969). Chambers and Ford had gotten some excavation experience in Mississippi with Henry B. Collins of the Smithsonian. However, their earliest techniques seem to have been pretty much self-taught. Chambers had first met Collins on June 23, 1926, at the office of Dunbar Rowland, who was head of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History in Jackson (Chambers 1976:24). Chambers had made an appointment to show Rowland some artifacts that he had uncovered. Contrary to much-published documentation including some from Ford himself, the leader of this duo of young men (Chambers, 17, and Ford, 15) was Chambers, who had long been interested in archaeology and had also written school papers on the subject (Chambers 1976:11–44). However, one author, Pat Galloway (2000:25), has just recently written about Chambers's contribution as being "vastly underrated."

Thus Chambers and Ford really had gotten their hands dirty in excavations and surveys well before 1930. Chambers continued to work in archaeology in Mississippi until the beginning of World War II (Chambers 1976:332). Later Ford carried out, on his own, a number of test excavations at other sites in Mississippi and Louisiana, such as the Peck village (Ford 1933). He also was exposed to other regions and techniques through time spent both in Macon, Georgia, (1934) and in the Southwest (Ford 1935), learning archaeological methods there as well. Therefore by 1939 he had had considerable, good field experience across the United States with a number of trained archaeologists.

Ford's academic background at this time included a bachelor of arts from Louisiana State University (1936). He had been urged by friends to go to the University of Michigan for a graduate degree and did so in the fall of 1937, according to Griffin (1999:638). It was there Ford first met Griffin, founded a lifelong friendship, and earned a master's degree. He soon became deeply involved in WPA-sponsored excavations in Louisiana (1938), but these other activities did not keep him from proposing the Lower Mississippi survey to his two friends.

Contrary to popular belief, Griffin had more field experience by 1939 than most have thought. As I have detailed elsewhere (Williams 1999:453–455), Griffin had begun his contact with archaeological digs in the late 1920s, as had Ford. He was a graduate student at the University of Chicago in 1928, and the next year, he began a three-year period of summer excavations that culminated in him leading a dig in Pennsylvania in 1931 (Griffin 1991). He was, therefore, not just an armchair archaeologist, as he has often been characterized. He cared about sites, excavations, and provenience, and well into his 90s, Griffin still enjoyed visiting sites and inspecting the excavations of others.

In the spring of 1933, Griffin left the University of Chicago and went to the University of Michigan to begin a three-year graduate fellowship in American archaeology sponsored by Eli Lilly. He completed his doctoral dissertation in 1936 under the mentorship of Carl Guthe, a Harvard Ph.D. Its topic was the Norris Basin ceramics, excavated under the direction of Major Webb. These materials were in the University of Michigan's ceramic repository, headed by Guthe. Early in 1936 he began a study on the "Fort Ancient Aspect" of the Ohio valley. The research for this study took him to many venues including Harvard's Peabody Museum, where a large collection of these materials (e.g., the Madisonville site) was located (Griffin 1985:6). While there he met Philip Phillips, who was finishing his own doctoral dissertation on Mississippian ceramics from the Mississippi valley (Phillips 1939). This meeting blossomed into a close and lifelong friendship that ended only with Phil's death in 1994. By 1939, Griffin thus had had both considerable archaeological field experience and a lot of hands-on work with ceramics from all over the eastern United States.

The field experience that Phillips had had prior to 1939 is a bit more difficult to document. His own published statement is laconic at best: "with a third [Phillips] who had done *some* work within it [the lower valley]" (this volume, 5, emphasis added). I know of only one piece of real fieldwork that applies to Phillips's statement. This was some rather extensive archaeological research in the Ouachita River valley, just west of Hot Springs,

Figure I-1. James A. Ford, fall 1939. (Museum of Natural Science, Louisiana State University)

Figure I-2. James B. Griffin, fall 1939. (Museum of Natural Science, Louisiana State University)

Arkansas, carried out from February to May 1939. These retrieved materials were never completely analyzed or published by Phillips; this failure was most likely due to his own decision to join the lower valley survey later that same year.

Many years later, in 1966, one of my own graduate students, Frank Schambach, did further research in the Ouachita valley region and wrote his dissertation on his own work and that of Phillips, as well as WPA excavations run by the University of Arkansas. This more recent Harvard project (1966–1970) had Phillips's complete support. This Harvard dissertation has now finally been published and therein Schambach (1998:2) indicates that Phillips recorded and collected from 59 sites and made important test excavations at several of them. Phillips was headquartered in Hot Springs, Arkansas. He and his wife, Ruth, and their three children lived in a hotel "apartment," where much of the "lab" work was carried out ("Saki" Phillips Sheldon, personal communication, 2002). Once reminiscing about this project, Phillips told me that one of his hired dig hands stole his lunch out in those boondocks—I wish I had taped his conversation then.

However, long before this Ouachita fieldwork, Phillips had also spent some months with Harvard-trained Frank H. H. Roberts Jr. (Ph.D., 1927) in 1934 at the Shiloh site in Tennessee. This was a government-run relief operation (CWA), and Phillips spent January through March at that site helping in that excavation (Phillips personal communication, n.d.; Chambers 1976:333–335). It was his first involvement with a professional dig. Paul Welch is currently (2002) carrying on research at the Shiloh site and has identified pictures of both Phillips and Chambers at work at the site (Welch personal communication, 2002).

Chambers described Phillips's arrival at Shiloh as follows: "I first met Phillips when he came down at his own expense, driving an old gas-thirsty Lincoln car, all the way from up in the Boston area down to Shiloh National Military, in the winter of '33–'34" (Chambers 1976:335). It is wonderful confirmation of a little-known part of Phillips's early exposure to field archaeology. I know there are some of Phillips's own photographs of this Shiloh experience, but I have not yet been able to recover them.

Finally, I can also report one other bit of south-

Figure I-3. Philip Phillips, fall 1939. (Museum of Natural Science, Louisiana State University)

eastern traveling by Phillips for added firsthand knowledge of research and specimens in the period prior to 1939. Thanks to research by John Walker we know that Phillips visited the Ocmulgee, Georgia, research operations in January of both 1936 and 1937. There in Macon, Georgia, he met Arthur Kelly and Gordon Willey for the first time and even visited Preston Holder's coastal excavations (Walker 1994:20, 23).

PHILLIPS, FORD, AND GRIFFIN: PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Before turning directly to the Lower Mississippi survey activities themselves, it is important to understand the personal backgrounds of these three archaeologists who were about to make eastern North American archaeological history with their broad survey of a major part of the Lower Mississippi valley. They were a mixed bag of characters, three vastly different individuals who separately decided to devote their lives to the field of American archaeology.

Phillips was born August 11, 1900, in Buffalo, New York. His mother had just returned from the Hawaiian Islands, where his father, a lawyer for the U.S. government, was working on the legal problems of the island's changeover to American territorial status. They wanted Phillips to be born in the United States. He was educated at private schools in Buffalo and went to Williams College, graduating in 1922. He had some military training while at college, but World War I was over before he could be taken into service. Upon graduation, Phillips married Ruth Schoellkopf, also from Buffalo, and then went to Harvard's School of Design for a graduate degree in architecture. As a young married couple, an exception for graduate school students at that time, they met a number of other students including a fellow architectural student, Singleton Moorehead. He was the son of Warren K. Moorehead, the archaeologist at the R. S. Peabody Foundation at Andover Academy, at whose home the Phillipses enjoyed occasional Sunday dinners.

More important to his study of archaeology, Phillips also met George Vaillant, a charismatic graduate student in Mesoamerican archaeology at Harvard, whom he got to know much better later on. With his architectural diploma in hand in 1927, Phillips then headed back to Buffalo, where he and Ruth built a fine home to Phillips's own design and entered practice in the field of domestic architecture. However, by the early thirties, seeing a slim economic future in that enterprise, he decided to turn to another field altogether: archaeology. He had had an interest in the history of the Buffalo region and indeed at one time or another briefly wrote about a nearby Indian burial site.

Phillips and Ruth returned to the Cambridge area in the fall of 1932 and remained there, or close by, for the rest of his long life. Phillips met Vaillant again and plunged into American archaeology as well as many other aspects of the broad field of anthropology. His first graduate mentor was Roland B. Dixon, one of the famous trio of Hooton, Tozzer, and Dixon, who created at Harvard one of the outstanding graduate programs in the field. In consultation with Dixon, Phillips had decided to work in North American archaeology, a field that his mentor had both taught and written about. However, Dixon died in 1934, and Alfred Tozzer became his mentor and later a good friend (Phillips 1955). Tozzer, a Middle American specialist, hoped to no avail that Phillips would change his mind and work in Tozzer's own field.

It was eastern North American archaeology, especially that of the Mississippi valley, that captured Phillips's interest. There is only a modicum of information concerning this choice, but it is specific: "To the late Professor R. B. Dixon I am indebted for the original impetus that led to its inception [the undertaking of his dissertation]" (Phillips 1939:i). Phillips then continues by thanking Professors Tozzer and Hooton for their guidance in the dissertation's continuation. Not terribly enlightening, but it is all we have.

At the time, the Peabody Museum had an expansive but little-noticed collection of ceramics from the Mississippi valley. Anyone reading the literature of North American archaeology in the 1930s would be impressed by the many mysteries of that region. Also, through Dixon, there was still a direct connection to Frederic W. Putnam. In the late nineteenth century, Putnam had seen to it that the Peabody's shelves were loaded with these Lower Mississippi vessels, especially those from southeastern Missouri and Arkansas, and the excavated collections from the Oliver site in Mississippi.

Apparently—and that is all one can honestly assert at this time—Phillips took his mentor's advice and plunged into the Mississippi valley collections that were readily accessible at the Peabody. As with all his later work, nothing was done in haste or without an amazing thoroughness. Indeed, there were a number of Mississippi valley pots at the Peabody, but so too were there Putnam-collected and -purchased Mississippian vessels at Putman's other "sometime" museum, the anthropological collections at the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH). Putnam served as curator there, too, in a period from 1894 to 1903. So, undaunted, Phillips traveled to AMNH and photographed its many Mississippian vessels during the late 1930s. The LMS Archives now holds more than 4,000 of Phillips's vessel photographs, though not all are from that New York museum, as Phillips lists four collections besides the Peabody.

Other things were going on in Phillips's academic life as well; besides Vaillant, he was also a friend of Clyde Kluckhohn, Douglas Oliver, and his mentor, Alfred Tozzer. Indeed, on December 7, 1941, Tozzer and Phillips were on a trip together in Mexico. Other close academic friends at Harvard were Carl Coon, A. V. "Alfie" Kidder Jr., and Hallam Movius.

Phillips was a private person, perhaps even a bit shy. He rarely went to professional meetings; however, he was greatly admired by his old archaeological friends Griffin, Haag, and Neitzel (Williams and Brain 1990). He had a wide range of concerns far from archaeology, including music, poetry, and literature; he studied Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* with great care. He was also widely traveled and was well versed in at least three foreign languages, German, French, and Spanish. This was the intellectual and personal background that Phillips brought to Baton Rouge when the team met in 1939. I have spent a bit more space on this view of Phillips, as both Griffin and Ford have quite lengthy and recently published biographical sketches (Williams 1991; Griffin 1991).

Griffin's own personal background is much better known as a result of some recent articles he and others have published (Williams 1999; Griffin 1991). He was born in Kansas in 1905, spent two years in Denver, Colorado, and then grew up in Oak Park, Illinois. Illinois was then his home and Chicago the place of his education until well into graduate school. While in graduate school in anthropology at the University of Chicago, Griffin, who earned his master's degree in 1930, was offered a special graduate fellowship at the University of Michigan. He accepted the offer in 1933. Griffin remained in Ann Arbor until 1984, when he moved to the National Museum of Natural History in Washington, D.C. He was a teacher par excellence; he studied the field of North American archaeology with great care and dedicatedly taught the subject until his retirement in 1976.

Such a description suggests a rather narrow and tightly focused individual; however, he enjoyed life with gusto and verve. His interests ranged from good food and fine wines to politics and history. He loved to drive cross-country at high speeds, and a roadside stop for a well-crafted maple-and-walnut ice cream cone gave him as much pleasure as a fine soufflé. Phillips's field notes indicate Griffin's similar enjoyment of doing survey work in the lower valley, especially the interesting encounters with the local populations. Griffin liked finding new ceramic data in the plowed fields of the Delta. He was no armchair archaeologist in those days (1939–1947); he did both quite a lot of surface surveying and oversaw the digging of a number of test pits as well.

Ford is the most written about of three, though he never wrote much about himself. He died at

57; both Phillips and Griffin lived into their 90s (Brown 1978; Griffin 1990). Ford has also recently been the focus of the Missouri duo of O'Brien and Lyman (1998, 1999). My own contact with him began early at the Southeastern Archaeological Conferences in the 1950s and lasted until his death in the spring of 1968, when Phillips and I had plane reservations to visit Ford's bedside in Florida. He died just before we left to see him. Phillips and I had also visited Ford in the field in Arkansas, and he had visited us at the Peabody Museum. I later made a return visit to AMNH to see the Marksville site collection that Ford was then working on. I traveled with him and Stu Neitzel several times across the country, returning from archaeological conferences, so our times together were quite informal. Naturally many of our conversations were about archaeology—Ford was not one for mere pleasantries—even most of his widely acclaimed jokes on colleagues were anthropological in nature as Griffin pointed out (1990:649); I can affirm that from my own experience with him. For yet another insightful view on Ford and his personality by someone who had worked closely with him for a number of years, I suggest a careful reading of Gordon Willey's foreword to O'Brien and Lyman's volume on Ford (O'Brien and Lyman 1998:vii–xiv).

Ford cared enormously about archaeology, especially that of the Lower Mississippi valley where he was born and raised. He had been working at the craft since age 15, when he started to work with his friend, Chambers, in Clinton, Mississippi. These teenagers became involved in local Mississippi archaeology for a number of years. They also worked some summers in the Arctic under the direction of Henry B. Collins. The trio, Collins, Chambers, and Ford, also undertook Christmas-holiday digs at the Deasonville site in 1929 and 1930 in Mississippi (Collins 1932; Chambers 1976:267–268; 295–296). Chambers had actual field training at the University of Chicago summer program in Fulton County, Illinois, in the summer of 1933. Later that same year and continuing into the next spring he worked with Frank H. H. Roberts at Shiloh, Tennessee, on a CWA project (Chambers 1976:278).

Chambers continued in Mississippi archaeology and history under the auspices of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History in a full-time capacity from the summer of 1934 until World War II (Chambers 1976:105). In the postwar period, following service in the navy (1942–1945), Chambers entered historical and archival work outside of Mississippi, which he continued for the rest of his professional career (Chambers 1976:106–110).

Ford on the other hand went to Mississippi College (1927–1930) in Clinton, Mississippi, where Chambers had also matriculated, and then he headed south to Louisiana for the last of his undergraduate education at LSU in 1934. The in-between years were significant as he pulled together the earlier Mississippi survey data and added some specific test excavations (Ford 1936). In contrast to Phillips, Ford was a regular attendant at Southeastern Archaeological Conferences throughout his life. He and Griffin put together the first conference in 1937 at Ann Arbor (Williams 1969). Ford's last SEAC meeting was at Avery Island, Louisiana, in 1966, when the then-unrecognized signs of cancer were troubling his ability to get around easily.

It was an interesting and diverse trio. Phillips was the oldest, a tall, quiet gentleman, who brought both Harvard graduate students and his wife into this field experience, but he had the least experience. Ford was even taller and much more self-assured about his experience for such an enterprise. Seemingly, he was the instigator of the operation. Yet Ford spent the least time involved in the field operations. Finally, there was Griffin, smaller and energetic but with well-deserved confidence in handling the results of the whole operation. Fate and history put Phillips in the position of ultimately running most of the field research and writing most of the final report. This structure was probably not at all what they had in mind that fall day in Baton Rouge in 1939 when they came together to plan this project. Unfortunately, I know of no documents that concern the details of that first meeting.

FIELDWORK OF THE SURVEY

The work of the survey in the field was confined to five field seasons. Each season seems to have encompassed at most two months in the valley. In retrospect this schedule seems like a rather small amount of time: the spring and fall of 1940, the spring of 1941, an interruption by World War II, then the springs of 1946 and 1947. (See Table 1.)

During the war, Phillips, the eldest of the trio, spent considerable time in the Pacific theater, with the rank of an army major, in a special-service

operation run by his Harvard friend, the anthropologist Douglas Oliver. Phillips's mission, which took him to the islands of the western Pacific, was to find opportunities to provide foodstuffs for the armed forces in that region that did not have to be shipped in from great distances. It was not a great success, but Phillips did have some good tales to tell about it. Griffin spent the war years teaching special courses at the University of Michigan, a number of which were focused on economic and political geography in the university's military program (Williams 1999:455). Ford was taken into the army as "a senior design specialist for arctic and winter warfare" (Griffin 1999:643), and he went to the Arctic a number of times during the war to test those materials.

When everyone was back in the United States, the well-known trio split up the actual fieldwork. Ford, who by all measures was the most experienced in field archaeology, ended up with the least amount of time in the field—a single season in the spring of 1940 when all three of the group worked primarily in northeastern Arkansas, the northern-most part of the survey quadrants. Later, other important issues pulled at Ford. He was a well-known specialist in lower-valley archaeology but lacked a doctorate in the field. (He had earned a master's degree at Michigan in the academic year 1937–1938.) Ford left the survey to pursue his doctoral degree at Columbia University in the fall of 1940, and he did no more fieldwork on this lower-valley program. Instead, he went to Peru in 1946 for an important role in the Viru valley project; his report on that work was the basis for his doctoral dissertation.

Griffin worked with Phillips and Ford in that kickoff session during the spring of 1940. Much later, he wrote briefly about the experience with Ford (Griffin 1999:649). Griffin was also an important part of the second major season in the spring of 1941, with Phillips and two Harvard graduate students, when most of the test pitting was done. In the postwar period (1946–1947), Phillips was assisted again by some Harvard students and, especially, by his wife.

By far, Phillips directed the majority of the field explorations and excavations. He participated in two seasons with Ford, Griffin, or both, and three short seasons with his wife, one of those with a graduate student. Three other graduate students took part in two of the seasons. While it was not a large field crew, there was quite a number of locally hired crew members who did all of the actual test pit digging.

The area covered, the number of sites recorded, and the amount of data recovered is impressive (Figure 2 and Table 1). A total of 382 sites was recorded by the survey (pp. 47–58) (Phillips incorrectly gives the number as 385 [p. 41].) Of these, only 60 had been documented in the archaeological literature prior to their work. Twenty stratigraphic test pits were undertaken on 11 sites, and 17 were of sufficient value to be reported therein (p. 41). The amount of "hard" data included only the 346,099 potsherds that were later analyzed. A great number of plain body sherds were thrown away during the early fieldwork, as they were thought to be rather useless (p. 43). Much later, Phillips (1970:247) had some strong second thoughts on how the potsherds had been treated in this 1951 volume. Phillips, with Ford no longer looking over his shoulder, felt that he had thus handled these new collections from the Yazoo Basin and elsewhere in a much more coherent manner.

As the reader will soon find out, this monograph, with all its 457 pages, is of truly gigantic proportions. I will now consider the 10 major sections (or chapters) and their general import. The specific authors are not shown directly in the text, but are instead "listed" quite carefully at the very end of the preface on page vi herein. A number of readers seem to have missed this, so I have

Table I-1
Staffing of the Field Programs of the Lower Mississippi Survey, 1940–1947

Spring 1940	Fall 1940	Spring 1941	Spring 1946	Spring 1947
Philip Phillips	Philip Phillips	Philip Phillips	Philip Phillips	Philip Phillips
James A. Ford	Ruth Phillips	James B. Griffin	Ruth Phillips	Ruth Phillips
James B. Griffin		Mott Davis	Paul Gebhard	
Fisher Motz		Chester Chard and his wife		

added them in parenthesis in the sections below.

Section I: The Geographic Setting (Phillips)

Phillips starts his presentation with characteristic modesty and an apology for its length—little did he know that 50 years later there still would not be a more detailed discussion of this important topic. As archaeologists learn more about the impact and changes to this landscape, and to much of our nation, we are now showing much more concern for this topic. Phillips made good use of historic data and geological information as well. As Phillips well knew, there is a lot more to learn: "The student of prehistory in the Lower Mississippi Valley must in fact do more. He must attempt to reconstruct cultures that no longer exist in an environment that exists only in a profoundly modified state" (p. 36). So many years later the topic of "landscape archaeology" is still understudied in the lower valley. However, the late Roger T. Saucier of Vicksburg, Mississippi, an LMS friend of long standing, presented a masterful view of the geomorphology and Quaternary geology of the lower valley (Saucier 1994). There is also an excellent physiographic map of the survey area (Figure 1, this volume).

Section II: The Archaeological Field Work (Phillips)

This section briefly describes both the reasoning behind the survey and the program of operations, illustrated with two interesting maps of the project scope (Figures 2 and 4). The stated purpose was to discover the relationship between the earlier "Hopewell-Marksville affinity" and the later Middle Mississippian (p. 40). Of course, much more data than that were discovered.

The details of the field operations were specific, and there is even a list of "shortcomings"—not a common revelation in such monographs (p. 45). The section concludes with a listing of the 382 sites that were encountered by the program. Further details of the project's "hows and whys" are briefly covered in the preface (p. iv–v). The project's actual scope is quite amazing both in square miles and the number of sites and collections made; I do not know of any comparable survey in the southeastern United States until many decades later.

Phillips also drafted a rough map of the region, using dots to mark all of the sites visited, quadrangle by quadrangle. He color-coded the dots to show which sites had been visited season by season, but that map was not included in the published version (LMS Archives, Peabody Museum). However, thanks to great help from my LMS colleague, Vin Steponaitis—who does not suffer the color blindness of this author—we are able to separate out the four main survey seasons (1940–1946) and the sites located therein.

Thus we see that spring of 1940 covered mainly the sites on the west side of the Mississippi from northeastern Arkansas to just below the Arkansas River entrance. They visited only about ten sites in the Upper Yazoo Basin. In all, they located a relatively large number of sites that season, as this was the only time in which all three—Phillips, Ford, and Griffin—worked in the field together. The fall season of 1940 covered the Upper Yazoo intensively, mainly along the Mississippi, with considerable success. The spring season of 1941 continued the site survey in the Upper Yazoo—as far south as the 20 tier—with a large number of sites located, almost equaling the scale of the first season. The final season of surveying in the spring of 1946 collected a modest 24 sites.

The 1951 PFG volume does not sufficiently emphasize the fact that Phillips did most of the work that brought the project to full fruition. That's because Phillips, who helped get the volume published, genuinely lacked an ego. Table I-1 details the actual amount of time put in the field: Phillips, seven months; Griffin, four months; and Ford, two months.

There were also four field assistants during the various seasons, as indicated in Figure 1. All were Harvard graduate students whom Phillips brought down from Cambridge. They have received little notice in any of the later literature, and credit goes to one of my own field students, John Belmont, for pointing out this omission in an early draft of this paper. The only field assistant in the spring of 1940 was John Christian "Fisher" Motz (1909–1991), who had already done a fair amount of archaeological fieldwork. In 1935 Motz worked under the direction of Emil Haury at the Snaketown site in Arizona (Elliot 1995:142) and later a season at the Peabody southwestern excavation at Awatovi in Arizona. He completely dropped out of the field after World War II (Davis 2002).

The important third season in the spring of 1941 saw Phillips and Griffin assisted by two more Harvard graduate students, Mott Davis and Chester Chard. E. Mott Davis (1918–1998) later

continued graduate training at Harvard and completed his doctorate in the field in 1954; his dissertation was on Paleoindian sites in the Great Plains. He had also been an undergraduate honors student in archaeology, graduating Magna Cum Laude from Harvard (1937–1940), and his senior honors thesis won a campus-wide prize. He went on to work primarily in the archaeology of the Great Plains and taught successfully for 32 years at the University of Texas, Austin. Davis later remembered, with great pleasure, his fieldwork with Phillips at the Menard site where they had camped out (Davis 2002).

Chester Chard, another Harvard College student, later completed his graduate training at the University of California, Berkeley. He was apparently one of Robert H. Lowie's last students. His dissertation focused on the Kamchadal tribe of eastern Siberia. After earning his doctorate at Berkeley, he taught, beginning in 1958, at the University of Wisconsin for his entire career. His interests rested mainly in the northern climes; he helped found *Arctic Anthropology*. He retired in 1974. Perhaps his lower-valley experience drove him to like cooler climes. He now resides comfortably in Vancouver, British Columbia.

In the only postwar session in 1946, another Harvard graduate student, Paul H. Gebhard, assisted Phillips. Gebhard had received his college education mainly at Harvard (class of 1940). He had also done some wide-ranging archaeological fieldwork in different areas, mainly in the West, prior to his arrival at Harvard. Even at Harvard he continued more fieldwork prior to his one season in the lower valley. His 1947 doctoral dissertation was on North American stone artifacts. He easily had the most prior field experience of any of the LMS graduate students, and Gebhard (2002) considered Phillips the best boss he ever had.

However, Gebhard soon took up the rather different field of anthropology, with a career at the University of Indiana where he joined the Alfred Kinsey project of sexual research. He had been encouraged by Clyde Kluckhohn in 1946 to have a look at this interesting new research project and decided to give it a try. After Kinsey's death in 1956, Gebhard continued to run the Kinsey Institute in this special area of anthropology. He is now a professor emeritus at that university (Gebhard 2002).

I might note that Phillips went back into the field in the Yazoo Basin, even as this report was going to press (1949–1951). In 1949 and 1950, he also had Harvard graduate students as assistants, E. N. Zeigler in 1949 and Warren Eames in 1950. In 1951, he was at Jaketown with Ford, again with Warren Eames. Later in 1954, he went again into the field for his last time with Robert Greengo, whose dissertation covered that year's work and another season as well (Phillips 1970:vii–viii).

Thus, the popular perception of Phillips as a solitary worker and even more as a theorist and ceramic typologist than a field person just does not fit the available data. He was instead a well-rounded archaeologist; he did both fieldwork and analysis.

Also listed in Table I-1 is Phillips's wife, Ruth. As a well-read woman of grace and charm, she was in some ways the least likely field companion imaginable. But as the table clearly shows, she was also Phillips's faithful companion in the field for three seasons. She later joined directly in the Jaketown excavations in 1951 as well, and she worked tirelessly in the LMS makeshift lab in Belzoni (Ford et al 1955:5).

Section III: Classification of the Pottery (cited as "Pottery Typology and Classification")

This section on typology was originally written by Ford and was revised by Phillips with many suggestions by Griffin. "The pottery classification represents a joint effort extending over several years. Pottery descriptions by Griffin" (p. vi).

This important section was the most problematic for the three authors. Ford had already been setting up pottery types for some years. Griffin had been instrumental, from his days at the University of Michigan ceramic repository, in creating types, too. By 1940, Phillips had handled a great number of whole vessels in his just-completed dissertation, and he had set up some ceramic wares with simple names used therein. As a joint-effort among the three, it wasn't a picnic.

The materials collected in the spring of 1940 were sorted in Baton Rouge by the trio as described herein. It was not an easy task, as these archaeologists carefully considered each sherd. This trio had three very different temperaments. Ford was forceful and quite adamant as to his own views. Griffin was more knowledgeable in a breadth of materials. Phillips was quiet but soon

was familiar with all the sherds that they had collected.

Nonetheless the trio was able to make a preliminary sorting of the 1940 materials in Baton Rouge. They sorted the sherds by temper and decoration into 47 types and indicated that all these types were not "new" (p. 66). Ultimately Griffin and Phillips had the most direct command of the raw data; Griffin logged the type descriptions with Phillips's help. There is a short typewritten draft of the types in the LMS archives at the Peabody that has Griffin's easily recognizable handwriting penciling in corrections. Later on, all the "saved" sherds (many plain ware sherds were "tossed" without sorting in the first few seasons) were finally moved to the Peabody Museum, where Phillips, with the aid of Mary Slusher, did the rest of the analysis and counting. Thus, all the final sherd counts were his.

Although most readers will find the nearly 100 pages of pottery type descriptions rather laborious, Phillips was not without a sense of humor, and there is indeed a joke hidden in the description of one type. Long ago he told me about it but not where it was buried. Some years later, I found it on page 146, at the bottom of the first column: "three lugs (Ford, Phillips, and Griffin)." That discovery won me a beautiful leather-bound copy of this volume, which I still cherish. I also have Phillips's "working copy," which contains some minor text corrections.

The immense amount of labor that Phillips had put into the classification of the ceramics and their meaning was not soon forgotten. In his next great synthesis of lower-valley archaeology, the 1970 two-volume treatise focusing on the Lower Yazoo area, he also tackled a great number of sherds. This task reminded him of the LMS sherd-sorting experience two decades before. In these books, he makes it clear that he was disappointed with the treatment of the earlier sherds.

Phillips and his helper produced the sherd counts at the Peabody, and then Ford turned them into seriation charts at the American Museum of Natural History in New York. For Ford the counts were everything: "don't bother to look at the sherds again." Phillips, working in the late 1960s, felt much more comfortable to keep looking over the sherd data at hand, repeatedly if necessary: "The results [of the ceramic analysis] will, I hope come somewhat closer than did those in 1950 to reflecting cultural and chronological relationships in a world as real, if not as complex, as our own" (Phillips 1970:247). I think he was right.

Section IV: Distribution of Some Mississippi Period Vessel Shapes and Features (Griffin)

This chapter was primarily based on a 1930s survey of major eastern museums that Phillips created of more than 2,000 vessels from the survey area. Phillips actually photographed more than 4,000 vessels during this research project at a number of museums (listed on page 180). All the documentation resides in the LMS archives at the Harvard Peabody Museum.

Griffin's careful contribution discusses the major vessel shapes and their distribution and significance. The chapter is full of detailed analysis and comparisons that have been perhaps passed over by most readers. There is, for instance, an important and data-rich paragraph (pp. 177–179) on engraved pottery and the design distributions that bears rereading for evidence of Southern Cult connections across the Southeast. There is also a useful digression (pp. 173–177) on "Negative Painting in the Eastern United States" that has been cited more often. Tables 2 through 10 are also data rich for the inquiring researcher.

Section V: Seriation Analysis of Pottery Collections (Ford)

This chapter is Ford's gut-wrenching construction, and it was his greatest contribution to the project. Interestingly, O'Brien and Lyman (1998:194–197) have discussed this chapter, but they do not stress Ford's authorship of this segment, using the plurals "they" and "their" instead of "he" and "his." Most past readers have known for certain whose intellectual property the seriation charts were. As already noted, Ford actually did little of the fieldwork. It was also the most controversial part of the whole operation for the three scholars involved (see p. 219, paragraphs 1 and 2). There were serious and contentious arguments between them, some of which "bubble up" in the text. The section was just 17 pages in length, with a map of the area and the five seriation graphs set in. There exists a good picture of Ford's actual method of operation in creating these seriation tables; it is a piece of artwork executed by Ford himself showing the strips of paper held in place by numerous paper clips (Ford 1962).