PROJECT MUSE®

Spanish Conquistadores, French Explorers, and Natchez Great
Suns in Southwestern Mississippi, 1542-1729

Jayur Madhusudan Mehta

Native South, Volume 6, 2013, pp. 33-69 (Article)

Published by University of Nebraska Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/nso.2013.0002>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/519246>

Spanish Conquistadores, French Explorers, and Natchez Great Suns in Southwestern Mississippi, 1542–1729

JAYUR MADHUSUDAN MEHTA

The Natchez Indians of the late protohistoric period are frequently used as a model for the study of chiefly societies in the southern United States.¹ French accounts from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries describe in detail Natchez social organization—among many things, they portray an entrenched hierarchical political order and the distribution of Native groups in a dispersed pattern occupying the outlying fringes of the Aeolian bluffs that make up the ancestral Natchez homeland.² However, some scholars have commented that the Natchez may not be an ideal analogical model for prehistoric southern chiefdoms,³ especially given historic-period European influences in the region. In addition, although the wealth of documentary records from this time period certainly provides archaeologists with a remarkable heuristic into the social order of the historic Natchez, it has been noted they should only be used with a careful consideration of the biases and contexts pertinent to each document and its author(s).⁴ Therefore, the most difficult task facing the archaeologist is to correlate the documentary record with known archaeological cultures and sites.⁵ Interestingly, Patricia Galloway has adroitly commented, “Even if these identifications [archaeological sites correlated to the historically documented sixteenth-century villages of Quizquiz and Quigulatam] are wrong, the sequences of subsequent devolution would remain substantially the same.”⁶ In this context I believe Galloway is instructing archaeologists to move away from particularistic motives for reading ethnohistoric documents and to paint with broad strokes the effects of culture contact on the indigenous residents of the Lower Mississippi valley. This—as I see it—is a valid effort because it does not require the archaeologist to

seek particular historic places on the landscape, but rather to study the themes of culture change in the lower valley as catalyzed through events brought about by European invasions, and to bring the *longue durée* of Mississippian sociopolitical complexity into focus.⁷

This article will attempt to reach the aforementioned formulation—a broad-scale understanding of culture change in the Natchez Bluffs as precipitated by European contact—through the study of archaeological data, ethnohistoric documents, and the scholarship produced from both.⁸ Studies on the processes of ethnogenesis and the impacts of colonial shock waves inform this study.⁹ Almost 150 years transpires between Hernando de Soto (1539–1542) and René-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle (1679–1681). This 150 years is what scholars classify as the middle protohistoric period, or the “protohistoric Dark Ages,” meaning that we have little understanding of what happened in these years.¹⁰ Given the frequency of chiefly cycling and instability in the South my thesis in this article is that the historic Natchez Indians were undergoing ethnogenesis as various cultural groups of the lower valley were trickling into the bluffs.¹¹ In one sense, I am following Brain’s formulation on the development of Natchez social organization, but in another, I am explicitly proposing that the Great Suns, the leaders at the Grand Village, could not successfully unite the multiethnic communities living in the Natchez Bluffs in the early eighteenth century under a single, hierarchical chiefdom (such as those described by archaeologists and thought typical of the precontact Mississippian era) because of tenacious internal and extra-community conflicts stemming from differential French and British trade-related influences.¹² I believe it likely they coalesced during the protohistoric Dark Ages, partly as a result of efforts by the Great Sun lineage and competitors, but partly also because of multifaceted cultural disruptions caused by the de Soto entrada a century and a half earlier. English, Spanish, and French trading and colonization in the South during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries created shock waves that, exacerbated by the inherent linguistic and cultural diversity of the Natchez Bluffs at this time, prevented the reincarnation of the mighty Quigualtam from centuries past.¹³ Therefore, while the historic Natchez can be used to make analogy to prehistoric chiefdoms and societies, they are as dissimilar as they are similar to prehistoric Plaquemine chiefdoms (late prehistoric cultures of the Low-

er Mississippi valley generally located south of Greenville, Mississippi), and thus, I would suggest, scholars should exercise caution in drawing direct parallels to prehistory.¹⁴

In this article, I first present summaries of ethnohistoric descriptions of Native societies around the provinces of Quizquiz and Quigualtam, which were located in and around the modern-day Yazoo Basin and Natchez Bluffs of western Mississippi. Then I describe late prehistoric and protohistoric archaeological sites around the Natchez Bluffs that provide evidence for the influx of non-local groups into the area from outlying provinces. Their eventual incorporation into and tensions with Natchezan society are made clearer by ethnohistoric documents. Finally I discuss my findings on the difficult process of correlating and comparing ethnohistoric and archaeological data, and explain why I believe the historically known Natchez were undergoing ethnogenesis during the French colonial era. As Jeffrey P. Brain puts it,

At least four of the nine (or eleven) Natchez villages were made up of refugees from the Tioux, Koroa, and other Tunican peoples from the north. Certainly the Natchez now faced a crisis. Their territory had been diminished and their original population reduced. Now they were being augmented by the influx of new peoples who, moreover, spoke a different language (Tunican). Whatever socio-political institutions they may have had would now have become less appropriate and require functional reorganization.¹⁵

It is my assertion that as a means of integrating and remaking a unified Natchez society in the face of a new colonial world, the Sun lineage of the Grand Village of the Natchez attempted a form of functional reorganization (aka ethnogenesis) by manifestly crafting a genesis mythology that entailed their royal descent from the Sun and entitled them the right to rule. The development of this mythopraxis was a founding event for the start of the Natchez as a conceptually unified polity led by the Sun dynasty.¹⁶ However fragmented the reality of their polity, the Suns maintained their royal status to their French allies. Nevertheless, the various other villages of the bluffs maintained disparate alliances with Spanish and British factions, and after thirty-odd years of disagreements and wars the chiefs of the pro-Anglo Natchez villages held council, led by an elusive and unnamed White Apple village chief, and

decided without the support of the Sun polity that rebellion (what we now call the Natchez Revolt) was the only means to mediate conflicts in their region.¹⁷ The 1729 attack on the French, however, did not recreate a unified Natchez society, but brought swift and severe French retaliation. Ultimately the 1729 revolt, which could have been as successful as the Second Seminole War (1835–1843) in terms of creating a unified ethnic identity, could not create sufficient Native resistance to French and English influence in the Natchez Bluffs. Rather, due to its failure, it was the event that led to their scattering and eventual diaspora across the Southern United States and Caribbean.¹⁸

ETHNOGENESIS AND THE STUDY OF COALESCENT SOCIETIES

Brent Weisman has suggested the Seminole underwent ethnogenesis during the years of the Second Seminole War (1835–1843), due in large part to their organized capacity to resist Western influences.¹⁹ By persisting in the enactment of the Green Corn Ceremony, by abandoning European ceramics for Native forms, as seen at the early-nineteenth-century site of Powell's Town, and by appropriating US military uniforms from defeated foes, a unified group of Africans and Indians successfully emphasized and perpetuated a suite of symbols with meaningful value to what becomes the multiethnic Seminole people.²⁰

The archaeological findings from Pilaklikaha, a community of free Africans and Indians in Florida, provide additional evidence regarding Seminole ethnogenesis. First occupied in 1813, the site represents the creation of a novel multi-household settlement pattern distinctly dissimilar from dispersed household patterns seen at earlier sites. Although household organization changed, evidence for the continuation of the Green Corn ceremony indicates continued emphasis on indigenous cultural practices. Destroyed by US soldiers in 1836, preserved turtle shell rattles and ball sticks—objects embedded with multiple meanings—were found at Pilaklikaha. Weik suggests these items may have held syncretic value and were used for African ceremonies as well as Native ceremonies.²¹ If so, the polyvalent symbolism of turtle shell rattles, used by both African and indigenous peoples, likely did much to foster the formation of a new ethnic identity incorporating disparate peoples reacting and adapting to an aggressive US policy of removal.

To some ethnogenesis need not involve coalescence; it can simply imply adaptation. Mullins and Paynter use the nineteenth-century Haida of the Northwest coast to illustrate the processes of cultural adaptation due to cultural contact.²² They suggest the Haida discontinued the incorporation of European imagery in their argillite panel pipes and figurines as a means of reaffirming their identity. Argillite panel pipes were produced in the early 1800s for the European trade industry by the Haida (they have no prehistoric connection); these pipes first displayed images related to Haida cosmology but were soon adapted to display European designs.²³ After decimations related to disease and missionization in the late 1800s the Haida attempted to reaffirm their cultural traditions by carving nativistic images, such as miniature totem poles and ceremonial chests, on panel pipes. Although this shift in pipe carving can also be attributed to increases in tourism and the demand for Native art, it also represents how the Haida maintained their cultural heritage by continuing to make design elements such as totem poles and ceremonial chests—this is particularly powerful given that by the time anthropologist John Swanton arrived at the Queen Charlotte Islands, the Haida homeland, very few actual totem poles or longhouses were still remaining or being made. In the Haida example, ethnogenesis is suggested as the process of reformation and adaptation in light of European influences, and not to imply coalescence.

As shown in the two preceding examples, ethnogenesis has been used to connote resistance, reformation, and adaptation among coalescent societies.²⁴ In this sense, it involves the establishment of a society incorporating elements of both the old and new, of cultures both disparate and alike. In light of cultural contact in the southern United States, most indigenous societies after de Soto were in a position of adapting to a new world with increasingly unequal power dynamics. In this context ethnogenesis describes the multivariate means by which cultural groups recreate and sustain themselves and their identities in the face of colonial European powers. The Natchez, we know, met their demise after the 1729 revolt, but much happened between first contact with the Spanish and subsequent contacts with the French and British and their eventual scattering. This article explores ethnogenesis and the processes by which multiple cultural groups came together in the bluffs and came to be known as the Natchez.

THE ETHNOHISTORIC DOCUMENTATION SUMMARIZED

The Hernando de Soto entrada traversed the southern United States from 1539 to 1543, although by 1542 de Soto had perished on the west bank of the Mississippi River. His second in command, Moscoso, was charged with taking the remainder of de Soto's troops back to the Gulf of Mexico. Moscoso's perambulations through Arkansas and Texas, and his harrowing flight down the Mississippi River, have been reviewed and interpreted in great detail elsewhere.²⁵ In July 1543, after having spent significant time trying to find an overland route to New Spain through present-day Louisiana and east Texas, Moscoso and his men built seven boats near the province of Aminoya. Hudson places their last winter encampment in present-day southeast Arkansas, although there remains the possibility they camped in present-day northeast Louisiana.²⁶ The important detail is that the chief of Quigualtam, a province located on the Mississippi River south of its confluence with the Arkansas River, was well aware of the Spaniards' efforts to escape the lower valley by river and that they were building boats at Aminoya, speaking to the efficiency and sophistication of communication in the province of Quigualtam.²⁷ What happens next is well known; when Moscoso and his men descended the Mississippi River, they were harassed and attacked by the warrior boatmen of Quigualtam from approximately the location of the town of Huhasene, perhaps near the confluence of the Arkansas and Mississippi rivers, to somewhere south of present-day Natchez, Mississippi. The attacks lasted well over three days as Moscoso and his men made their way downriver. They were attacked by groups allied with and under the leadership of the Quigualtam chief. Barnett rightly points out that if the documents are taken at face value, then the Quigualtam chief was powerful enough to ally smaller social groups, or lesser chiefdoms, along the entire extent of the Plaquemine cultural sphere up and down the river.²⁸ Plaquemine culture is thought to have extended as far north as Greenville, Mississippi, on the east bank of the river, and to the Arkansas River on the west bank.²⁹ Therefore, the home of the paramount chief of Quigualtam could have been located at the Lake George, Glass, Anna, or Emerald sites (fig. 1). Barnett entertains the notion that the Quigualtam paramount could have been located on the west side of the river at either the Transylvania or Fitzhugh mound sites; nevertheless, numerous scholars have identified the location of

Quigualtam on the east of the river at Lake George or in the Natchez area, or possibly either at the Glass site or at the Emerald site (see fig. 1).³⁰ Risking improvidence, I might suggest that perhaps it is not so important to know exactly where the chief's town was located; the more illuminating point here is that a very powerful and well-known chiefdom was located somewhere in the vicinity of central to southwestern Mississippi. Indeed, it was powerful enough to have drawn allegiance from far afield, and inspired awe in groups as far north as Chicaza, Guachoya, Huhasene, and Aminoya, located perhaps at the boundaries of prehistoric Plaquemine cultures.

That by Natchez times in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries no such political order existed lets us know that social systems underwent a significant decline prior to the arrival of French colonists, invaders who "found a place that was drastically different from the ostentatious world of Quigualtam, Guachoya, Aquixo, and their legions of warrior boatmen."³¹

Sustained interaction with colonial intruders resumed again in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, first with La Salle's expedition down the Mississippi, and then later with Dumont de Montigny, Saint-Cosme, Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville, Pénicaut, Le Page du Pratz, Charlevoix, and finally Bienville. Herein I focus on their descriptions of Natchez social organization. Later in the article these documents are evaluated with the archaeology of the Fatherland, Anna, and Emerald sites, among others, moving backward through time in an effort to understand changes in the social order of Indians in the loess bluffs area of the Lower Mississippi valley over the *longue durée*.

La Salle descended the length of the Mississippi River beginning in December 1681.³² Henri de Tonti, La Salle's second in command, first presented the calumet to the Natchez on March 26—Tonti found the Natchez waiting for him on the banks of the river.³³ Presumably having made peace, La Salle traveled approximately three leagues inland to meet with the chief at his home village, called either Nahy or Natché; at this first meeting, chiefs from other Natchez villages were also invited, although only the chief of the nearby Koroa attended.³⁴ Although the Frenchman thought they had achieved a peaceful relationship with the local Indians, they were later attacked near New Orleans by the Quinipissa, allies of the Natchez and Koroa.³⁵ Upon returning upriver, they were treated with hostility by the Koroa, and thus they skipped the Natchez entirely.

Fig. 1. Map of archaeological sites that may correspond with the chiefdom of Quigualtam. (1) Lake George, (2) Glass, (3) Anna, (4) Emerald, (5) Transylvania, (6) Fitzhugh.

In 1699, missionary François de Montigny, from the Séminaire des Missions Étrangères, visited with the Natchez and witnessed intergroup warfare between the Natchez and the Taensas (a group living across the river). He also observed a harvest of the chief's maize by the local inhabitants of the bluffs, whom he claimed lived in small dispersed hamlets of about four hundred houses, many of which were along St. Catherine Creek. Due to his intolerance of local lifeways, François de Montigny's stay with the Natchez was relatively brief; therefore we learn little from him of the subtleties of Natchez social structure (although he did record an alternate name for the Natchez—Theloel, or Thecloël.)³⁶

Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville, who explored the Gulf Coast and Mississippi River and who was brother to Bienville, founder of New Orleans, made multiple visits to the Natchez villages in 1699 and 1700. Although Swanton notes that Iberville was more soldier than scholar, his visits were relatively long and they provide some early glimpses into how Natchez society was changing due to French influence.³⁷ Twenty years before Iberville, Henri Tonti initiated contact with a Natchez emissary on the banks of the Mississippi by presenting the calumet as a gesture of good faith. After twenty years of intermittent contact with Europeans, it was Iberville who was *first* presented with the calumet and then given access to the Natchez villages.³⁸

Iberville's detailed descriptions of the chief's village, ostensibly located one league from the Mississippi River, have allowed archaeologists to correlate an archaeological site, the Fatherland site, with the Grand Village of the Natchez.³⁹ Iberville described the main mound at the Natchez Grand Village as ten feet tall, twenty-five feet wide, and forty-five feet long, with a structure on top.⁴⁰ Another mound, which he called the temple mound, was oval in shape and next to a stream; in the area between the two mounds were eight houses.⁴¹ Although descriptions of the Grand Village have not been correlated one hundred percent with archaeological features at the Fatherland site, it is generally well accepted that they are one and the same.⁴²

François de Montigny's departure from the Natchez left an evangelical void soon filled by Jesuit priest Jean-François Buisson de Saint-Cosme, missionary to the upriver Tamaroa, and who died unexpectedly (he was murdered by the Chitimacha) in 1706 while living in the bluffs. We learn much from Saint-Cosme about the inchoate political claims perpetuated by the Sun polity.⁴³ Some fifteen years after Saint-Cosme and André Pénicaut (discussed below), Le Page du Pratz was

firmly convinced of the Great Sun's claims to power. Du Pratz claimed the power of the Great Sun was absolute, like that of the Ottoman emperors, claiming, "[H]is will is his reason. . . . The order of the sovereign is executed on the spot and no one murmurs."⁴⁴ However, given the haphazard manner in which the many settlement districts alternately allied themselves with the English and the French, and with the disparate manner in which they followed the dictates of the Grand Village, it is reasonable to infer the Sun Polity did not have an iron grip on the people of the bluffs.

Descriptions of Natchez social order and lineal descent come from André Pénicaud, a French trader who visited the bluffs in the early 1700s.⁴⁵ He observed that the Natchez practiced a matrilineal system of descent, crudely commenting that "they [the Natchez] answered me that nobility can come only from the woman, because the woman is more certain that the man about whom the children belong to."⁴⁶ In this matrilineal system, nobles in the Sun family had to take a commoner as a marriage partner, according well with what we know about other late prehistoric indigenous groups across the southern United States.⁴⁷

Pénicaud confirms François de Montigny's description of a dispersed hamlet settlement system, claiming eight other outlying and unnamed settlements were under the authority of the chief at the Grand Village.⁴⁸ Some years later in the buildup to the 1729 revolt, the Great Sun at the Grand Village revealed to Pénicaud that he had lost the power to control all the leaders in the outlying settlements around the bluffs. Although Pénicaud (among others) would come to regard the Great Sun as a traitor for attacks made on the French during the First Natchez War (1715), it seems Pénicaud was unwilling to comprehend that the Great Sun was not all powerful. In the First Natchez War, he just had lost control over the Jenzanaque district and their leader, the Bearded.⁴⁹ When Indians from the Jenzanaque settlement captured a party of six Canadian traders, it was a council of local leaders, not a singular leader, consisting of both pro-French and pro-British factions that was able to convince the Bearded to release the Canadians. These incidents from the early eighteenth century paint a picture of Native factionalism and discord in the Natchez Bluffs, and describe a context in which a mytho-structure legitimating authority might permit an individual or family to become ascendant and powerful.⁵⁰

As it so happens, the Tattooed Arm, the mother of the Great Sun, told Saint-Cosme that the myth of Sun ancestry was devised as a means

to garner power in the bluffs.⁵¹ As written in an early eighteenth century document, the Tattooed Arm confessed to Saint-Cosme the fabrication of Natchez Sun mythology:

The missionary [Saint-Cosme] often asked this woman [the Tattooed Arm] if she really thought she descended from the Sun, and solicited her to confess to him what she believed of her religion. She agreed in the end, but only after having him promise that he would do the same for his own religion.

This matter agreed on, she told him that she did not believe that the great Chief of their nation, who gave himself the name Great Sun was the brother of the Sun [the celestial body], nor herself to be part of the family of the Sun, and that it was their ancestors who had invented this idea for selling themselves as masters of their nation and to enslave the nation by these means—the Great Chief has all authority and that this authority grants him and his family the capacity to live with ease without doing anything because he uses the people of his nation at his will. Moreover, at each birth of a Sun, they attach thirty children of his [the child's] same age, who are his domestic slaves when he becomes an adult. The public still cultivates common fields for the different Suns, which it harvests for them as well. The domestic slaves also serve them in fishing, hunting, and in domestic chores, and in different cleaning activities. All these slaves are strangled at the death of the one to whom they belong [their master] at the door of the temple and buried with them.⁵²

This genesis myth does much to substantiate claims to power by the Natchez Sun polity. As Milne puts it, “The claim of direct descent from the sun formed the basis of the Natchez leader’s religious and political status”; however, that origin myth only “brought a modicum of unity.”⁵³ A fabricated myth could not overcome systemic hindrances to coalescence associated with rising population pressures, and consequently factionalism, within the bluffs. Furthermore, the influences of French traders in the region, the growing British Empire to the east, and the overall effects of colonial shock waves all likely presented an impediment to the Sun polity in the acquisition of broad-scale regional power.⁵⁴

Evidence of declining power in the hands of Suns comes from M. de Richebourg, captain to Bienville in 1715. In fact, the chiefs of the White

Apple, Jenzanaque, and Grigria settlements had obtained so much power locally so as to be “more feared and obeyed than themselves [the Suns].”⁵⁵ When the Bearded and Alahofléchia, two war chiefs primarily responsible for hostilities during the First Natchez War, were executed by Bienville, the Tattooed Serpent, brother to the Great Sun and the Natchez war chief, indicated no grievous foul was committed—rather, the French likely and unwittingly eliminated challengers to the Sun lineage as well as supporters of English hegemony.⁵⁶ These local contestations imply to a certain extent that the Sun lineage was not at all similar to the mighty chiefdom of Quigualtam. Recall the legions of warrior boatmen and sophistication of communication in Quigualtam province and the haughty accounts of the Quigualtam chief, who would leave his land for no man, demanding of de Soto that he travel across the river to meet with the chief in person.⁵⁷ If no one chief or leader or corporate body was able to bring the entire area of the bluffs under their control, then it is certainly likely they were not as powerful and expansive as the prehistoric chiefdom of Quigualtam.

A series of French and Natchez wars in the Natchez Bluffs occurred between 1715 and 1730, culminating with the 1729 revolt in late November. The multifaceted causes of the wars and rebellion were rooted in an increasingly aggressive French presence in the region, the availability of trade goods from the English, and degrading relationships with incoming colonists. The Natchez Revolt was a coordinated attack on Fort Rosalie and domestic settlements across the bluffs that resulted in the death of hundreds of the French and the burning of Fort Rosalie. A related attack was carried out at Fort St. Pierre a few weeks later by Yazoo and Koroa Indians. In retaliation, coordinated attacks by Choctaw warriors and French soldiers removed the remaining multiethnic Natchez from the bluffs, chasing them across the Mississippi into the uplands between the Ouachita and Tensas rivers. In their final battles, 387 Natchez were captured by the French, and eventually sold into slavery on the sugarcane plantations of Santo Domingo.⁵⁸ Some Natchez escaped, however, and are known to have found homes among the Chickasaw, Creeks, and Cherokees.⁵⁹

As presented by the ethnohistoric documents, we know of several dispersed areas of settlement in the Natchez Bluffs. Although they may have shifted through time, at the beginning of the eighteenth century there were likely six different settlement districts in the Bluffs:

the Grand Village, Tioux, Jenzanaque, Flour, Apple/White Earth, and Grigra. George Milne, using chiefly cycling theory, explains that the Natchez, using a solar mytho-structure, were in the process of coalescing when the French first arrived in the region.⁶⁰ He attributes European epidemics, factionalism, and slave raiding to the decline of outlying polities from the bluffs, and the relative safety and productivity of the bluffs as the reason for the centripetal pull of the Sun chiefdom at the Grand Village. That the Tioux and Grigra districts south and east of the Grand Village contained Tunican-speaking groups (as told to us from the documentary sources) confirms that the Natchez polity was composed of diverse social groups. That the Bearded, a maternal relation of the Great Sun, eventually also rebelled against the Grand Village tells us that the power accumulated by Suns eventually dissolved, leading eventually to revolt and the 1729 revolt.⁶¹ The questions we must ask ourselves are these: Do these settlement districts manifest archaeologically? Is factionalism apparent in the archaeological record? Can we determine the ancestral home(s) of the Suns? Why did the 1729 revolt fail to reunite Indian groups in the Natchez Bluffs? And is a hypothesis centered on the recent ethnogenesis of the Suns borne out archaeologically? The following section considers archaeological evidence relevant to these issues.

ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE NATCHEZ BLUFFS

Ian Brown's *Natchez Indian Archaeology* is the best synthesis on protohistoric and historic period archaeology in and around the Aeolian bluffs in the Natchez region and therefore is relied upon heavily here (fig. 2).⁶² Sites discussed in the following section from Brown's report are Lookout (22Je544), O'Quinn (22Je543), Greenfield (22Ad520), Antioch (22Ad631), and Trinity (22Ad783). Subsequently I present archaeological findings from the Fatherland, Anna and Mazique sites.⁶³ Each of these sites is presented within subheadings that describe their respective locations within regions in the Natchez Bluffs.

Fairchilds/Coles Creek Area

The Lookout site is located moderately inland away from the Mississippi River and overlooks the river floodplain. It is situated in the Fair-

Fig. 2. Map location of the sites discussed in the text. Adapted with permission from Ian W. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology: Culture Change and Stability in the Lower Mississippi Valley* (Jackson: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1985), 5.

childs/Coles Creek Area north of Natchez. The largest mound center in proximity to Lookout is the mound and plaza center Feltus, built sometime during the mid-first millennium AD by Coles Creek culture peoples. Ian Brown suspected that the occupants and residents of Lookout were descendants of Plaquemine peoples, themselves descendants of Coles Creek cultures, and that the people of Lookout in historic times became affiliated with the English due to factionalism within historic Natchez society.⁶⁴ Because Lookout is located on the northern fringes of the historic Natchez area, it might be likely that the Lookout people were also a group adopted in historic times. One of the primary goals of

the Lookout excavations was to determine the ethnicity of people who lived at the site. Surface collection and 167.5 m² excavation revealed a series of four superimposed structures at the site, indicating a multicomponent occupation ranging from the middle archaic period on. Occupations date to the Tchefuncte, Coles Creek, and Plaquemine periods (600 BC to AD 200; AD 600 to AD 1200; AD 1200 to 1600, respectively), with the Anna phase (AD 1200–1300) being the primary occupation.⁶⁵ Four structures have been excavated that are associated with the Anna phase levels. Three rectangular wall-trench buildings at a different orientation are associated with the Emerald phase (AD 1500–1680). However, there is also a strong Natchez phase (AD 1650–1750) occupation, as seen in a rectangular, single-set post structure.⁶⁶ Brown attributes all of the shell pottery at Lookout to the last phase of occupation, the Natchez phase, indicating that the final occupants at the Lookout site were likely an adopted group from the northern Yazoo Basin.

Surface ceramics from the Lookout site span the period from Tchefuncte times to the late Mississippi period. Excavations however produced in situ finds of Cracker Road Incised wares with typical Natchezan designs, making Lookout the southern extent of this shell-tempered ware. Cracker Road Incised is generally more common to the historic period in the Yazoo Bluffs and Tensas Basin. As Ian Brown puts it, “This was exactly what we were looking for as regards the adoption of Indian groups by the Natchez: a northern pottery ware combined with a southern [Natchezan] type of decoration.”

Archaeologists also examined a pothunter’s collection from the O’Quinn site, which also revealed Cracker Road Incised wares, as well as vessels designed with a stepped motif reminiscent of protohistoric/historic Ouachita Caddoan pots typically found in Louisiana. Brown does not write if the stepped motif vessels were shell or grog tempered, but at the Keno and Glendora sites (Ouichita Parish, Louisiana), stepped motifs are also found on Mississippi Plain wares. Although this is a pothunter’s collection without a solid archaeological provenance, the presence of these wares and designs at this site does mean that outside influences at the least—or outsiders at the most—were present in the area. As Ian Brown puts it, this collection is important because the wares and types represented indicate “strong interaction with areas outside the Natchez Bluffs region” and that the people who lived here most likely were a population adopted by the Natchez.⁶⁷

Grigra Area

The Greenfield site has produced late protohistoric and historic period ceramics dating to the Emerald phase (AD 1500 to 1650) made on typical late historic Addis *var. Ratcliffe* paste but decorated with Plaquemine brushed designs.⁶⁸ Ian Brown does not think it likely that the site was occupied by Natchez in historic times (given an absence of surface materials), but rather was abandoned by them at some point in the earlier Emerald phase, and then reoccupied by a colonial Frenchman. Although site function has yet to be ascertained, the ceramics from the site indicate a cultural revival among the Natchez. *Ratcliffe* paste is diagnostic to the historic period; its presence at Greenfield with prehistoric designs signifies a resurgence of older cultural elements, indicating perhaps some effort toward the revitalization of Native traditions.⁶⁹ The presence of Mazique incised and Plaquemine brushed designs on *Ratcliffe* wares suggest to Ian Brown that significant cultural revivals were occurring among the historic period Natchez, which as I suggest, might signify the means by which local elites sought to reaffirm their power and identity.⁷⁰ Through the use of older, established ceramic traditions, elites in Natchez may have been demonstrating the alliance with prehistoric cultural networks and ideological legitimization of their positions.

Based on the absence of shell tempering in the ceramics, it is likely the Antioch site dates to the early protohistoric period or the Emerald phase (AD 1500 to 1650). Therefore, it is too early to have been occupied by the Grigra or the home of any other adopted populations that moved into the area after 1680. Therefore, the inhabitants were likely Plaquemine people or ancestral Natchez. Antioch, connected to the Greenfield site by eighteenth-century roads, is most notable because it demonstrates Natchez acculturation to, and emulation of, the French. As Brown suggests, the early historic period inhabitants of Antioch wanted but could not obtain enough French trade goods, especially beads. As a solution, they manufactured their own beads in the same style as the French but from local clays. This practice of Native emulation declined through time as the Natchez developed greater access to French goods. The Trinity site, however, also located in the Grigra area, does not have any evidence of Native-made artifacts in European forms. It dates to slightly later than Antioch and consequently is assigned to the Natchez phase (AD 1650 to 1750).⁷¹ Brown places Trinity in the ear-

ly eighteenth century, and if the relative lack of lithics at the site is any indicator, it is possible that copper and iron trade goods had replaced lithics as a tool by this time. Ceramic manufacture did continue in the indigenous style, perhaps because it was associated with cooking and eating food, a domestic sphere related to the maintenance of the household, and was thus possibly a more conservative tradition. Alternatively, one can invoke Silliman's concept of covert resistance and suggest some Natchez actively chose to continue their ceramic traditions as a form of resistance to colonial hegemony, much as native Petaluma men working in Rancho and hacienda contexts made an effort to maintain Native technology—for example, knapping broken glass into expedient tools in order to materially and contextually construct and/or express their identities.⁷² In the context of these sites in the Grigra area, the differential adoption, maintenance, and hybridization of foreign and Native technologies might demonstrate the multivocal and disparate nature of settlement in the region—without a unified polity over the region, each village or area was free to engage in material practices that best reflected their own dispositions in the French/Indian colonial milieu.

Grand Village Area

Fatherland, also known as the Grand Village of the Natchez, is the type site for the Natchez Indians, well preserved both by flooding (which is thought to have preserved some of the mounds), and by the documentary writings of primarily Le Page du Pratz and Dumont de Montigny.⁷³ Although the Fatherland site had some previous occupation by Coles Creek peoples, the site dates primarily to the Mississippi and historic periods (AD 1200 to 1650 and AD 1650 to 1750, respectively).⁷⁴ Anna phase structures recovered below Mound B might suggest a terminal Coles Creek occupation was present, but it is unlikely that there are any Coles Creek mound stages present at the site.⁷⁵ Ian Brown argues, based on a chronological gap in the transition from circular to square structures, that during the Coles Creek to Plaquemine transition, there was a break in continuity at the site and that the site was abandoned and then reoccupied.⁷⁶ When the site was resettled in Plaquemine times, it was by an indigenous local group who were likely ancestors to *some* of the later-day historic period Natchez Indians who made the Grand Village the seat of their paramount.⁷⁷

Jenzenaque Area

Archaeological data and settlement pattern research demonstrate the Emerald site was preeminent in the bluffs before the Grand Village developed into the regional paramount center.⁷⁸ It is unknown why the site was abandoned for the Grand Village, although I think it could be related to a need for easy access to St. Catherine Creek and transportation to the Mississippi River, or alternatively, as George Milne has suggested, the capital could have been moved farther westward to escape Chickasaw slave raiders backed by the English.⁷⁹ In Ian Brown's formulation of political complexity in the bluffs, Emerald, in conjunction with sites like Anna, Glass, Fatherland, Foster, Gordon, Feltus, and Bayou Pierre, was always in competition with other mound centers for control of the political order and region-wide consolidation.⁸⁰ The site itself comprises an enormous earthen mound built over a hill, making it the second largest earthen mound in North America. The base of the mound is 770 feet long by 435 feet wide, and almost 40 feet tall.⁸¹ On the summit of the truncated pyramidal mound are two truncated pyramids, one at the west end that is 30 feet tall, and another at the east end that is 5 feet tall. According to Cotter, Emerald shows greater affinity to the Grand Village, and thus to the historic Natchez, than to the Anna site because of greater quantities of Fatherland Incised and Manchac Incised sherds, two types prominent at Fatherland, but not at Anna. The primary construction phases date to the Foster (AD 1350–1500) and Emerald (AD 1500–1650) phases and postdate the apogee of the Anna mounds.

Recent research at the Anna site characterizes it as a Plaquemine period archaeological site that reached its cultural apogee when construction first began at Emerald around 1350.⁸² Beasley suggests that the residents of the Anna site were the likely predecessors "to the famed historic Natchez."⁸³ The site has a total of eight earthen substructural pyramidal mounds from 2 to 16.5 meters in height.⁸⁴ They were likely taller in prehistory, before the use of iron plows in the eighteenth century led to erosion and degradation of the landscape. Little has been found of a Coles Creek period occupation, the site largely dating to the Plaquemine period. Ian Brown suggests that Anna, as well as Emerald, likely hosted one or another Great Sun as they engaged in contestations of power over the Natchez Bluffs. However, Beasley could not determine conclusively whether large-scale feasting as described by Le Page du Pratz and Du-

mont de Montigny among the historic Natchez can also be attributed to feasting activities at Anna, since relevant finds appear too small in scale to equate directly with the historic Natchez tribute-related feasts. As Ian Brown notes, Anna and Emerald likely hosted one or another Great Sun as they engaged in contestations of power over the Natchez Bluffs.⁸⁵ Although evidence for large-scale competitive feasting is lacking at Anna, should future excavations uncover such data, they would represent a longstanding cultural practice of tributary feasting.

The Mazique site has often been equated with the historic White Apple Village of the Natchez.⁸⁶ Described as having a few mounds covered with stone tools and ceramics, the site was thought to be located on the road from Natchez to Woodville.⁸⁷ Although historic descriptions of the site in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries continued to expound the myth that Mazique was the White Apple Village, recent excavations at the site demonstrate it was primarily a Coles Creek mound center with minimal Plaquemine and historic period occupations.⁸⁸

Overall the archaeology presents significant data evoking migration and continuity. Foreign shell-tempered ceramics incised with both local and non-local design elements lends credence to foreign migrations during the Emerald phase. Additional evidence can be found in Caddoan design elements on Ratcliffe pastes, a paste indicative of the historic period Natchez phase. But not only were elements being introduced from the outside, they were also being reinvigorated from prehistoric times. The assemblage from the Greenfield site produced significant amounts of Ratcliffe wares with prehistoric designs. The archaeology demonstrates both continuity and change in the Natchez Bluffs, and although the archaeology might be sufficient to allow an understanding of population movements and technological changes in the past, the advantage to utilizing the ethnohistoric record and firsthand accounts lies in the greater nuance it adds to our understanding of material culture histories, the formation of communities, and the political process.

DISCUSSION: ARCHAEOLOGICAL CULTURES AND ETHNICITY

What follows is largely inspired by these questions: Are the historically known Natchez an appropriate ethnohistoric model for the study of prehistoric chiefdoms? Does their relatively recent ethnogenesis pre-

vent analogy to prehistory? I think not, but there are some complicating factors to discuss. First, although the people at the Fatherland site were likely partially descended from ancestors at Emerald, and thus similar to a degree, there were also numerous movements of immigrants into the bluffs during the protohistoric and historic periods, making the Fatherland Natchez different from the Emerald Natchez. Second, it is likely the de Soto entrada created significant and longlasting impacts on the cultural landscape of Native groups in the Lower Mississippi valley. Many of those repercussions probably had far-reaching impacts on the formation of the Suns and their polity in the bluffs. Although the physical presence of the de Soto entrada in the Natchez settlement districts was limited, they are known to have cut a swath of destruction on their largely north-northwest trajectory through the South.⁸⁹ One irreconcilable factor to which the Natives had no resistance was European-borne diseases. Some scholarship suggests Old World endemic diseases caused some population disruptions in the greater South among smaller social units—especially those in coastal areas—but that epidemic diseases were not as severe for larger, coalescent tribal groups such as the Chickasaws, Creeks, and Cherokees until the late 1600s and 1700s.⁹⁰ Other scholars suggest that lower and central Mississippi valley Native groups had sufficient contacts with groups to the north, west, and east, permitting the means by which European diseases could have entered the Bluffs. Nevertheless, as Ethridge notes, “scholars now agree that any loss of life from disease was not a sudden collapse but rather a continuous drain of population over 100 or more years through serial episodes.”⁹¹ With continued immigration into the bluffs during the protohistoric period, as demonstrated by the multiethnic character of the historic Natchez, it may have given the appearance that a flourishing population was somehow disease resistant when in fact diseases were indeed taking a steady and subtle toll.⁹²

Given the intensity of immigration into the Natchez Bluffs (as seen both archaeologically and in the documents), the filtering westward of colonial shock waves from the Eastern Seaboard, the inherent instability of chiefly power structures, and the steady effects of European diseases, I think it is likely that competition and factionalism increased significantly in the protohistoric period in the Natchez Bluffs.⁹³ Furthermore, de Soto and his men are known to have swept across the South stealing stores of food from every village they encountered. Given the agri-

cultural foundations of Mississippian chiefdoms, it is highly likely that stealing an entire year's worth of corn was sufficient to destabilize and collapse many localized chiefly societies.⁹⁴ Therefore, a more thorough explanation for social and political reorganization after the entrada might emphasize political factionalism, immigration, the role of competition for leadership positions and chiefly cycling, the depletion of food stores, and the effects of colonial shock waves—as well as disease.⁹⁵ These multicausal factors caused the decline of the Quigualtam chiefdom once powerful in the area of southwest Mississippi from Vicksburg south to the Homochitto River. As Ian Brown suggests, the people of Quigualtam were ancestors to some of the historic Natchez Indians, and by historic times their territory had become significantly smaller, encircling only the immediate area around modern-day Natchez.⁹⁶ In this scenario, some of the Natchez certainly had Plaquemine ancestry, but as the archaeology tells us, the Natchez also incorporated Mississippian groups from the northern Yazoo and Tensas river basins.

The broader archaeological cultures of concern in this article are Plaquemine and Mississippian. These are typological classes developed from sets of material practices such as ceramic manufacture, house types, mound construction, and agricultural potential. Within these broad cultural groupings, scholars have developed phase names, which for some period of time were thought to stand in for ethnic groups.⁹⁷ The problem, of course, entails resolving how localized material cultures are related to actual people and ethnicities on the ground. For the purposes of this article, the task is simply to identify with archaeology the presence of foreign and introduced elements into the Natchez Bluffs sometime after contact with de Soto—keeping in mind that although pots do not necessarily equal people, in this case, they certainly might.

For the archeologist, the difficulty lies in defining archaeological cultures, which can appear both discrete and nebulous depending on context and material culture. Plaquemine unfortunately is not easily categorized, and as Jeter indicates, it mirrors other ephemeral and amorphous cultural cousins of Mississippian like Fort Ancient and Oneonta.⁹⁸ The single clearest material manifestation of Plaquemine culture is the continuation of fine grog- and ash-tempered ceramics from the Coles Creek period. Mississippian, however, is broadly characterized by shell-tempered pottery, complex social organization, and rectangular wattle-and-daub houses. Brain refers to the Plaquemine phenomenon as “Mis-

Mississippianized” Coles Creek, made further evident by the supposed introduction or outburst of building of flat-topped pyramidal earthen mounds around AD 1200.⁹⁹ Although recent excavations by the University of North Carolina at the Feltus Mounds site have demonstrated that flat-top earthen mound construction (a characteristic once thought exclusive to the Mississippi period) began in the preceding Coles Creek period in the LMV, there is a clear trend for northern Mississippian traits such as shell tempering to make their way slowly southward from the CMV.¹⁰⁰ Originally delimited around the middle of the Yazoo Basin at or near the Winterville site, Plaquemine contracts around AD 1300, and by AD 1400 the far northern frontier had become Mississippian in character. In the Natchez Bluffs, settlement patterns reorient away from the great river and moved inland—and, taking into account the meandering Mississippi River, this trend continued long into the protohistoric period.¹⁰¹ In the southern Mississippian frontier of southern Arkansas and Louisiana, rural homesteads and villages less compact than seen farther north are present. Similarly, no large villages like those seen farther north are present in the Natchez Bluffs. Thus, although the ceramics made their way down, very little else did.

During the Protohistoric (ca. AD 1540 to 1650) and Historic periods (ca. AD 1650 to 1750), however, both the Lookout and O’Quinn sites provide substantial evidence for the influx on non-local ceramic manufacturing techniques. The preponderance of Cracker Road Incised wares at both sites, which are basically shell-tempered Fatherland Incised pots, indicates non-local people were making their pots using local design elements—likely to signify their affiliation with a localized polity. That the Suns were based out of the Grand Village, the site with the largest known assemblage of Fatherland Incised pottery, is strong evidence for the affiliation of the Fatherland Incised motif with the Sun polity. Significant quantities of shell-tempered pottery in the Fairchilds/Coles Creek area indicate at least one group was adopted by the Natchez late in the seventeenth century. Furthermore, six pots from O’Quinn have stepped-design “cloud” elements similar to Ouachita Caddoan ceramics. As Ian Brown notes, not only did non-local groups bring their ceramic manufacturing recipes with them, they also adopted local design elements.¹⁰² This ceramic evidence from the Lookout and O’Quinn sites indicates that non-local groups were moving into the Natchez Bluffs area during the late 1600s and early 1700s, probably because of the col-

lapse of organized societies to the north. As Quapaw groups started moving into the Arkansas River valley in the mid-seventeenth century, they displaced local Tunica Indians, who—as a result of losing their ancestral territories—began moving south into the bluffs.¹⁰³ In addition, by the 1690s pressures from Chickasaw slave-raiding groups in the east likely created the ideal conditions for an influx of easterners into the bluffs. Evidence for the influx of non-local peoples from the east come from the White Apple area and the Thoroughbred site, where Ian Brown suggests the presence of Chickachee Combed sherds at the site indicates either the influx of or contact with historic Indian groups farther east—likely the Choctaws.¹⁰⁴

Marvin Jeter has considered the difficulty of unifying ethnohistoric data with archaeology and historical linguistics. His careful consideration of ethnicity posits several hypotheses on population migrations during the protohistoric Dark Ages. Although his work is too detailed to present herein, it is important I review his “New Tunican and Northern Natchezan” scenario, which is somewhat contrary to the scenario I present above. Jeter suggests, based on archaeological and documentary evidence, that the spread of shell tempering southward is more an artifact of technological shift than of a population shift.¹⁰⁵ However, the manufacture of very fine shell-tempered wares—still with large amounts of grog as in Cracker Road Incised, and with localized designs defined by type to the Grand Village—may indicate that a non-local group attempted to ally themselves with the Suns. The problem, of course, is equating pots with people; but given what the ethnohistoric documents tell us of Tunican-speaking Koroas living among the Natchez, as well as other non-local groups, the likelihood is high they brought their methods of ceramic manufacture with them.¹⁰⁶ This cultural diversity—evident in pottery and in documentary sources—led to the development of the historically known Natchez community of the early eighteenth century.

Theories of ethnogenesis posit heterogeneity as the norm and emphasize diachronic processes of change as opposed to synchronic, static concepts of the culture.¹⁰⁷ As Weisman states, “Ethnogenesis is a cultural process in which sets of people create a new, shared group identity, distinct from other self-defined groups.”¹⁰⁸ Weisman’s definition might perhaps be a bit strict for the Natchez case because of the loose affiliation between the various groups who made up the Natchez. My review of

ethnohistory and archaeology presents a polysemic picture of Natchez society. As recent scholarship has emphasized, the Natchez were not a homogenous social group.¹⁰⁹ It would be simplistic to assume any social group is a unified entity, but like the eighteenth-century Catawba and the eighteenth-century Creek and Choctaw confederacies, the Natchez represent a coalescent community in which people affiliated themselves with a Natchez identity centered at the Fatherland site while also maintaining their own respective cultural identities.¹¹⁰ Although archaeological data are relatively limited, I believe the influx of shell-tempered ceramics into the Natchez Bluffs area during the Emerald phase likely took place after contact with de Soto and is associated with Tunican immigrants. Ian Brown has written extensively on the Natchez Bluffs, and has written specifically about Natchez archaeology that “history has told us this, and now, has archaeology.”¹¹¹ Although chronology is not well understood during the Emerald phase, social upheavals related to either de Soto or chiefly cycling or both potentially may have had some effect leading to Tunican migrations south. Although we cannot definitively state that Tunican migrations to the south are related to their encounters with de Soto, the coincidence of a game-changing *event* like the entrada and subsequent migrations is too much to discount.¹¹²

Unfortunately for the Natchez, influxes of peoples from other parts of the Lower Mississippi valley did not result in a more powerful and unified nation. Unlike the Florida Seminoles, the historic Natchez Indians were more clearly defined by factionalism than Nativistic group cohesion.¹¹³ Although the Natchez may have coalesced because of Spanish, French, and English imperialism, the Natchez Suns did not have sufficient power to unite all the settlement districts. Even the defining event of the 1729 revolt was largely coordinated by the chief of the White Apple Village, not the Great Sun at the Grand Village. As Barnett tells us, historic Natchez conflicts stemmed from the Jenzanaque, White Earth, and Grigra villages trading and siding disparately with the English.¹¹⁴ That the Suns at the Grand Village could not maintain a strong hold over all the settlement districts led to conflicts with Bienville. It was not until the 1729 revolt that the Natchez had a cause to unite them, much as the Florida Seminole had to unite for the Second Seminole War (1835–1842). However, the Natchez Revolt destroyed the Natchez as a localized unit, whereas the Second Seminole War actually led to Seminole ethnogenesis. As Weisman writes, “Seminole ethnogenesis . . . is seen largely

as a nativistic phenomenon influenced strongly by resistance to American domination.”¹¹⁵ By the 1840s, a unilateral American governmental force was responsible for creating pressure on Seminole groups in Florida, attempting their removal to create space for American settlers. In contrast, multilateral pressures at the end to the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century from Chickasaw slave raiders, French explorers, and British traders were largely responsible for the material and social preconditions for the Natchez Wars and revolt. With no singular enemy to look to, the multiethnic Natchez sought differential solutions to problems stemming from culture contact, the source of trade goods being one such problem. By the first decade of the eighteenth century, the Indians of the Natchez Bluffs found themselves increasingly dependent on trade goods for the items and tools of their daily lives; disagreements among the Natchez from whom to obtain those goods led to internal conflicts and factionalism.¹¹⁶ Attempts to legitimate the Suns’ authority and to revitalize connections to their Plaquemine ancestors by adopting prehistoric ceramic designs on historic wares, as seen at the Greenfield site, were not successful. In addition, the White Apple chief’s efforts to unite the Natchez-area communities to expel the French could have served to unite the bluffs under his rule had the 1729 revolt been successful; it was, however, not.

CONCLUSION

Game-changing events at first contact and subsequently during the historic period did much to defragment Native societies in the Lower Mississippi valley. Yet Spanish conquistadores and French explorers were not solely responsible for the dissolution of Quigualtam and subsequent Natchez ethnogenesis. Native societies were privy to their own internal conflicts and the long-standing *conjuncture* of chiefly competition, cycling, and factionalism. Within the *longue durée* of Lower Mississippi valley prehistory, complex societies periodically developed and collapsed, as evident from the continuity of monumental earthworks from the Archaic period onwards.¹¹⁷ But contact in the Lower Mississippi valley with de Soto was surely significant and unprecedented, with unparalleled and unprecedented outcomes. Whereas the de Soto entrada had to battle for three days with the warrior boatmen of Quigualtam, the French documents are absent even a mention of the powerful chief.

What happened? I think it likely that large-scale social disruptions were largely precipitated by the presence of the de Soto expedition in the Mississippi valley, and subsequent to this event, other processes such as chiefly cycling, immigration of different ethnic groups, shock waves from the eastern front, and—on a lesser scale—endemic diseases, took over. In the absence of documents, only more archaeology at sites dating to these protohistoric Dark Ages will allow scholars to understand what factors led to Quigualtam's decline.

For the late Emerald and Natchez phases, archaeologists note the influx of outsiders into the bluffs—Native groups perhaps looking to ally themselves to the embryonic polity created by the Suns. It is likely the processes at play were as similar for the historic Natchez as they were for the pre-contact chiefs at Feltus, Mazique, and Anna. Where were the historic Natchez sites? Iberville's descriptions of the Fatherland site helped archaeologists identify the historic location of the Grand Village of the Natchez.¹¹⁸ The same is true for Emerald Mound and the words of Father Davion.¹¹⁹ But there were others as well, and these as of yet have not been identified. The dictum, more archaeology is needed, ever stands true.

Patricia Galloway is right: although the places where history happened are important, it is better to understand the processes that influenced social change. The bluffs have more than their fair share of monumental sites, as does most of the Lower Mississippi valley. Battles for power and the complexities of chiefly succession have likely left their material remains at many of these mounded settlements. With careful archaeology and improved chronological frameworks, archaeologists can learn more about how the fortunes of chiefs and chiefdoms in the Lower Mississippi valley waxed and waned in the long term of Lower Mississippi valley prehistory, and in the shorter term of European contact and colonialism. In the Natchez case, the power of the Great Suns was never sufficient to give them power over an entire region. Perhaps this was due to the disparate cultural groups living in the area, or the ease with which any lesser chief or Indian could obtain European goods without resorting to trading with the Sun. Despite attempts to reinvigorate prehistoric material styles and ally themselves with ancestral powers, the Suns could not maintain hegemony in the Natchez Bluffs region. French, English, and other Indian contestations over the Lower Mississippi valley put the Natchez squarely in the middle, and unfor-

tunately, they could only unite for one purpose—war. The 1729 revolt, however, did not have its intended effect, and the bluffs were forever lost to the Suns, their allies, and their foes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article came to fruition through an Archaeology of Colonialism seminar led by Chris Rodning, and I sincerely thank him not only for the invaluable guidance and kind support in writing this article, but also for always being an amazing adviser. I also recognize my peers in the seminar, Haley Holt, Bryan Haley, Erlend Johnson, and Alan Rutherford, for the stimulating discussions on colonialism and identity. Thanks go out to Robbie Ethridge for emboldening me to move forward with this article, and to an anonymous reviewer for their constructive and congenial comments. Bob Hill deserves recognition for his adroit instruction in ethnohistory, which proved quite invaluable to my own work. In addition, my gratitude goes to George Milne, who has kindly fielded my incessant questions about document sources and given me inestimable input on Natchez theology and the colonial history of the Gulf South. Finally, I thank Ian Brown not only for his valuable comments on this article, but also for introducing me to the Natchez Bluffs and teaching me Lower Valley ceramics—among many other life lessons never to be forgotten. I am also grateful to Tulane University, the Department of Anthropology, the New Orleans Center for the Gulf South, the Louisiana Board of Regents, and—of course, Mom and Dad—for all their support.

NOTES

1. For a thorough review of the analogical model for prehistoric chiefdoms and Natchez polities, see Karl G. Lorenz, “A Re-Examination of Natchez Socio-political Complexity: A View from the Grand Village and Beyond,” *Southeastern Archaeology* 16, no. 2 (1997): 97–112.

On Natchez archeology see Jeffrey P. Brain, “Late Prehistoric Settlement Patterning in the Yazoo Basin and the Natchez Bluffs Regions of the Lower Mississippi Valley,” in *Mississippian Settlement Patterns*, ed. Bruce Smith (New York: Academic Press, 1978), 331–68; Jeffrey P. Brain, “La Salle at the Natchez: An Archaeological and Historical Perspective,” in *La Salle and His Legacy: Frenchman and Indians in the Lower Mississippi Valley*, ed. Patricia K. Galloway (Jackson:

University Press of Mississippi, 1982), 49–59; Ian W. Brown, “An Archaeological Study of Culture Contact and Change in the Natchez Bluffs Region,” in Galloway, *La Salle and his Legacy*, 176–93; Ian W. Brown, “Certain Aspects of French-Indian Interaction in Lower Louisiane,” in *Calumet and Fleur-de-Lys: Archaeology of Indian and French Contact in the Midcontinent*, ed. John A. Walthall and Thomas E. Emerson (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992), 17–34; James A. Brown, “Archaeology Confronts History at the Natchez Temple,” *Southeastern Archaeology* 9:1 (1990):1–10; J. L. Fisher, “Solutions for the Natchez Paradox,” *Ethnology* 3 (1964): 53–66; Karl G. Lorenz, “The Natchez of Southwest Mississippi,” in *Indians of the Greater Southeast: Historical Archaeology and Ethnohistory*, ed. Bonnie McEwan (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2000), 142–77; Vincas P. Steponaitis, “Location Theory and Complex Chiefdoms: A Mississippian Example,” in Smith, *Mississippian Settlement Patterns*, 417–53; Vincas P. Steponaitis, “Prehistoric Archaeology of the Southeastern United States,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15 (1986): 363–404; and Vincas P. Steponaitis, “American Cultures in the Precolonial South,” in *The Natchez District in the Old, Old South*, ed. Vincas P. Steponaitis (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 1–22.

The Natchez social structure presents a particular riddle and therefore has been the object of scholarly scrutiny. See especially Jeffrey P. Brain, “The Natchez ‘Paradox,’” *Ethnology* 10 (1971): 215–22; C. W. M. Hart, “A Reconsideration of the Natchez Social Structure,” *American Anthropologist* 45 (1943): 374–86; Vernon J. Knight, “Social Organization and the Evolution of Hierarchy in Southeastern Chiefdoms,” *Journal of Anthropological Research* 46, no. 1 (1990): 1–23; Carl Mason, “Natchez Class Structure,” *Ethnohistory* 11, no. 2 (1964): 120–33; George I. Quimby, “Natchez Social Structure as an Instrument of Assimilation,” *American Anthropologist* 48, no. 1 (1946): 134–37; William H. Sears, “The Sociopolitical Organization of Pre-Columbian Cultures on the Gulf Coastal Plain,” *American Anthropologist* 56, no. 3 (1954): 339–46; Elizabeth Tooker, “Natchez Social Organization: Fact or Anthropological?” *Ethnohistory* 10, no. 4 (1963): 358–72; and Robert J. Widmer, “The Social Organization of the Natchez Indians,” *Southern Anthropologist* 5 (1975): 1–7.

For an earlier synthesis of the Natchez through documentary sources, see John R. Swanton, *Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley*, Bureau of American Ethnology 43 (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1911).

2. Early explorers like La Salle, de Montigny, Penicaut, and Le Page de Pratz are but a few who have described the Natchez Indians—herein, I reference them through James F. Barnett Jr., *The Natchez Indians* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2007); Swanton’s *Indian Tribes*; Richebourg Gaillard McWilliams’s translations of d’Iberville’s journals, *Iberville’s Gulf Journals* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1981) and Pénicaut’s narratives, *Fleur de Lys and Calumet*:

Being the Pénicaut Narrative of French Adventure in Louisiana (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1953); Melville B. Anderson's *Relation of the Discoveries and Voyages of Cavalier de La Salle from 1679 to 1681: the Official Narrative* (Chicago: Caxton Club, 1901); and Robert S. Weddle's translation of LaSalle's narrative, *LaSalle, the Mississippi, and the Gulf* (College Station: Texas A&M Press, 1987); and George E. Milne's extensive documentary and archival research, including "Rising Suns, Fallen Forts, and Impudent Immigrants: Race, Power, and War in the Lower Mississippi Valley" (PhD diss., University of Oklahoma, 2006).

3. Lorenz, "A Re-Examination"; Timothy R. Pauketat, *Chiefdoms and Other Archaeological Delusions* (Lanham MD: Altamira Press, 2007), 57.

4. Patricia Galloway has even commented *Annales* historians would, out of technical considerations, disregard the use of records and documents stemming from the early southern explorations. See Patricia Kay Galloway, "Colonial Period Transformations in the Mississippi Valley: Disintegration, Alliance, Confederation, Playoff," in *The Transformation of the Southeastern Indians, 1540–1760*, ed. Robbie Ethridge and Charles Hudson (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2002), 225–48.

For additional considerations, see Patricia Kay Galloway, "The Direct Historical Approach and Early Historical Documents: The Ethnohistorian's View," in *The Protohistoric Period in the Mid-South: 1500–1700*, ed. David H. Dye and Ronald C. Brister, Archaeological Report no. 18 (Jackson: Mississippi Department of Archives and History), 14–23; Charles M. Hudson, "Folk History and Ethnohistory," *Ethnohistory* 13, nos. 1/2 (1966): 52–70; Nancy Oestreich Lurie, "Ethnohistory: An Ethnological Point of View," *Ethnohistory* 8, no. 1 (1961): 78–92; William C. Sturtevant, "Anthropology, History, and Ethnohistory," *Ethnohistory* 13, nos. 1/2 (1966): 1–51.

5. Ian W. Brown, "Culture Contact along the I-69 Corridor: Protohistoric and Historic Use of the Northern Yazoo Basin, Mississippi," in *Time's River: Archaeological Syntheses from the Lower Mississippi River Alluvial Valley*, ed. Janet Rafferty and Evan Peacock (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008), 145–60; J. Brown, "Archaeology Confronts History"; Marvin Jeter, "Shatter Zone Shock Waves along the Lower Mississippi," in *Mapping the Mississippian Shatter Zone: The Colonial Indian Slave Trade and Regional Instability in the American South*, ed. Robbie Ethridge and Sheri M. Shuck-Hall (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 365–87.

6. Galloway, "Colonial Period Transformations."

7. Fernand Braudel, *On History*, trans. Sarah Matthews (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Philip Duke, "Braudel and North American Archaeology: An Example from the Northern Plains," in *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader*, ed. Robert W. Preucel and Ian Hodder (Cambridge and Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 240–57; Charles C. Hudson, *Knights of Spain, Warriors*

of the Sun: Hernando de Soto and the South's Ancient Chiefdoms (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997); Charles C. Hudson, *The Juan Pardo Expeditions* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2005).

8. For a critique of this method, see J. Brown, "Archaeology Confronts History," 3.

9. On ethnogenesis, see Charles R. Ewen, "From Colonist to Creole: Archaeological Patterns of Spanish Colonization in the New World," *Historical Archaeology* 34, no. 3 (2000): 36–45; Christopher C. Fennel, *Crossroads and Cosmologies: Diasporas and Ethnogenesis in the New World* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007); Patricia Galloway, *Choctaw Genesis: 1500–1700* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998); Robb Mann, "True Portraits of the Indians, and of Their Own Peculiar Conceits of Dress: Discourses of Dress and Identity in the Great Lakes, 1830–1850," *Historical Archaeology* 41, no. 1 (2007): 37–52; Barbara Voss, "Gender, Race, and Labor in the Archaeology of the Spanish Colonial Americas," *Current Anthropology*, 49, no. 5 (2008): 861–93; Terrence Weik, "The Role of Ethnogenesis and Organization in the Development of African-Native American Settlements: An African Seminole Model," *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 13 (2009): 206–38; Brent R. Weisman, "Nativism, Resistance, and Ethnogenesis of the Florida Seminole Indian Identity," *Historical Archaeology*, 41, no. 4 (2007): 198–212.

On shock waves, see Robbie Ethridge and Sheri M. Shuck-Hall, *Mapping the Mississippian Shatter Zone: the Colonial Indian Slave Trade and Regional Instability in the American South*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); Robbie Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw: The European Invasion and the Transformation of the Mississippian World, 1540–1715*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); Jeter, "Shatter Zone," 365–87.

10. David H. Dye and Ronald C. Brister, eds., *The Protohistoric Period in the Mid-South: 1500–1700*, Archaeological Report no. 18 (Jackson: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1986); Marvin Jeter, "From Prehistory through Protohistory to Ethnohistory in and near the Northern Lower Mississippi Valley," in Ethridge and Hudson, *The Transformation of the Southeastern Indians*, 183.

11. On cycling and instability, see David G. Anderson, *The Savannah River Chiefdoms: Political Change in the Late Prehistoric Southeast* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1994); Ian W. Brown, "Plaquemine Culture in the Natchez Bluffs Region of Mississippi," in *Plaquemine Archaeology*, ed. Mark Rees and Patrick Livingood, (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2007), 145–60. As has been demonstrated in a variety of first contacts, Spanish contact was often a game-changing and major *event*, in the history of indigenous North and South American communities (see for example Orellana in the Amazon, Pizarro in the Andes, de Soto in the South, and Coronado in the Southwest (Christopher B. Rodning, personal communication, 2011)).

12. Brain, "The Natchez Paradox," 221.
13. Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw*, 148; Jeter, "Shatter Zone"; Brain, "The Natchez Paradox," 222.
14. Brain, "The Natchez Paradox," 219.
15. Brain, "The Natchez Paradox," 220.
16. Milne, "Rising Suns," 50.
17. But compare to Gordon Sayre, "Plotting the Natchez Massacre, Le Page du Pratz, Dumont de Montigny, Chateaubriand," *Early American Literature* 37, no. 3 (2002): 381–413.
18. Weisman, "Nativism, Resistance," 208.
19. Weisman, "Nativism, Resistance."
20. Ralph Linton, "Nativistic Movements," *American Anthropologist* 45, no. 2 (1943): 231; Weisman, "Nativism, Resistance," 203.
21. Weik, "Role of Ethnogenesis," 232.
22. Paul R. Mullins and Robert Paynter, "Representing Colonizers: An Archaeology of Creolization, Ethnogenesis, and Indigenous Material Culture among the Haida," *Historical Archaeology* 34, no. 3 (2000): 73–84.
23. Mullins and Paynter, "Representing Colonizers," 77.
24. For an excellent review of coalescent societies, see Stephen A. Kowalewski, "Coalescent Societies," in *Light on the Path: The Anthropology and History of the Southeastern Indians*, ed. Thomas J. Pluckhahn and Robbie Ethridge (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006), 94–122.
25. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*; Jeffrey P. Brain, Alan Toth, and Antonio Rodriguez-Buckingham, "Ethnohistoric Archaeology and the De Soto Entrada into the Lower Mississippi Valley," in *The Conference on Historic Sites Archaeology Papers for 1972*, vol. 7, ed. Stanley South, SCIAA (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1974), 232–89; Lawrence A. Clayton, Vernon James Knight Jr., and Edward C. Moore, *The De Soto Chronicles: The Expedition of Hernando De Soto to North America in 1539–1543* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press); Galloway, "Direct Historical Approach"; Patricia K. Galloway, "Conjuncture and *Longue Durée*: History, Anthropology, and the Hernando de Soto Expedition," in *The Hernando de Soto Expedition, History, Historiography, and "Discovery" in the Southeast*, ed. Patricia K. Galloway (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 283–94; Hudson, *Knights of Spain*.
26. Brain et al., "Ethnohistoric Archaeology"; Hudson, *Knights of Spain*.
27. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 6; Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw*, 120; John R. Swanton, *Final Report of the United States DeSoto Expedition Commission* (Washington DC: Classics of Smithsonian Anthropology, 1985 [1939]), 272.
28. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 14–16.
29. Rees and Livingood, *Plaquemine Archaeology*; Jeter, "From Prehistory through Protohistory," 165.

30. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 13; Brain, "Late Prehistoric Settlement"; Jeffrey P. Brain, *Winterville: Late Prehistoric Culture Contact in the Lower Mississippi Valley*, Archaeological Report no. 23, (Jackson: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1989); Hudson, *Knights of Spain*, 345; Stephen Williams and Jeffrey P. Brain, *Excavations at the Lake George Site, Yazoo County, Mississippi, 1958–1960*, Peabody Museum Papers no. 74, (Cambridge MA: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 1983); Ian W. Brown, "The Eighteenth-Century Natchez Chiefdom," in *The Natchez District in the Old, Old South*, ed. Vincas P. Steponaitis, Southern Research Report no. 11 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1998), 57.

31. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 20.

32. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 23.

33. Ian W. Brown, "The Calumet Ceremony in the Southeast as Observed Archaeologically," *American Antiquity* 54 (1989): 311–31; Brown, "Certain Aspects"; Ian W. Brown, "The Calumet Ceremony in the Southeast as Observed Archaeologically," in *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast*, rev. ed., ed. Gregory A. Waselkov, Peter H. Wood, and Tom Hatley (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 371–419; Swanton, *Indian Tribes*, 187–89.

34. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 25; Swanton, *Indian Tribes*, 188; Robert S. Weddle, "Soto's Problems of Orientation: Maps, Navigation, and Instruments in the Florida Expedition," in *The Hernando de Soto Expedition: History, Historiography, and "Discovery" in the Southeast*, ed. Patricia Galloway, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 219–33.

35. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 25; Weddle, "Soto's Problems."

36. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 37.

37. Swanton, *Indian Tribes*, 49, 190–91; McWilliams, *Iberville's Gulf Journals*, 123–27.

38. Brown, "Certain Aspects"; Brown, "The Calumet Ceremony."

39. For the Iberville accounts see McWilliams, *Fleur de Lys and Calumet*, 83; McWilliams, *Iberville's Gulf Journals*, 125.

On the location of the Fatherland site see Andrew C. Albrecht, "The Location of the Historic Natchez Villages," *Journal of Mississippi History*, 6, no. 2 (1944): 67–88; Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 39; James A. Ford, *Analysis of Indian Village Site Collections From Louisiana and Mississippi*, Anthropological Study no. 2 (New Orleans: State of Louisiana Department of Conservation, 1936); J. Brown, "Archaeology Confronts History"; Robert S. Neitzel, *Archaeology of the Fatherland Site: The Grand Village of the Natchez*, Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 51, no. 1 (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1965); Robert S. Neitzel, *The Grand Village of the Natchez Revisited*, Archaeological Report no. 12 (Jackson: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1983); Quimby, "Natchez Social Structure."

40. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 39; McWilliams, *Iberville's Gulf Journals*, 125.

41. In McWilliams's translation of Iberville's journals, this stream is not named. McWilliams, among others, attribute this stream to Saint Catherine's Creek.

42. J. Brown, "Archaeology Confronts History," 8; Neitzel, *Archaeology of the Fatherland Site*, 91.

43. Milne, "Rising Suns," 49–50.

44. Le Page as cited in Swanton, *Indian Tribes*, 106; Milne, "Rising Suns," 40.

45. However, Pénicaut is known to have embellished freely—a notable excerpt, likely fabricated or misinterpreted, positively correlates the social status of Natchez women in the afterlife directly with frequent promiscuity (see McWilliams, *Fleur de Lys and Calumet*, 87).

46. McWilliams, *Fleur de Lys and Calumet*, 90.

47. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 53; Brain, "The Natchez 'Paradox'"; Brown, "Eighteenth-century Natchez Chiefdom," 52; Swanton, *Indian Tribes*; Brown, "Eighteenth-century Natchez Chiefdom," 52; Knight, "Social Organization."

48. Brown identifies seven districts: Fairchilds Creek/Coles Creek, Jenzaque, White Apple, Grigra, Grand Village, Flour, and Tioux, refer to Ian W. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology: Culture Change and Stability in the Lower Mississippi Valley*, Archaeological Report no. 15, (Jackson: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1985); see also McWilliams, *Fleur de Lys and Calumet*, 84.

49. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 64; McWilliams, *Fleur de Lys and Calumet*, 167.

50. Myths, in general, have been used numerous times throughout history to legitimate political consolidation and bolster divine claims to power. For examples, see Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane, the Nature of Religion*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York, Harcourt Press, 1959); Timothy Pugh, *Remembering Mayapan: Kowoj Domestic Architecture as Social Metaphor and Power*, ed. M. O'Donovan, Center for Archaeological Investigations (Carbondale, Southern Illinois Press, 2002), 301–23; Prudence Rice, "Time, Power, and the Maya," *American Antiquity* 19, no. 3 (2008): 275–98. Louis XIV, also a Sun King, was a strong proponent of the Divine Right of Kings.

51. Milne, "Rising Suns," 49–50.

52. The following translation by Maxime Lamoureux St-Hilaire (Tulane University) comes from a document at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, *Grand soleil, Fies d'un Francois en 1728*, NAF 2550, F115–116.

53. Milne, "Rising Suns," 49–50.

54. Ethridge and Shuck-Hall, *Mississippian Shatter Zone*; Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw*, 194; Jeter, "Shatter Zone," 380.

55. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 71; Swanton, *Indian Tribes*, 196–204.
56. Swanton, *Indian Tribes*, 199–203.
57. Swanton, “Final Report,” 272.
58. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 104, 102–103, 126–27.
59. Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw*; Jay K. Johnson, John W. O’Hear, Robbie Ethridge, Brad R. Lieb, Susan L. Scott, and H. Edwin Jackson, “Measuring Chickasaw Adaptation on the Western Frontier of the Colonial South: A Correlation of Documentary and Archaeological Data,” *Southeastern Archaeology* 27 (2008): 1–30; Bradley Raymond Lieb, “The Natchez Indian Diaspora: Ethnohistoric Archaeology of the Eighteenth-Century Natchez Refuge among the Chickasaws,” (PhD diss., University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, 2008).
60. Milne, “Rising Suns,” 43.
61. Galloway, *Choctaw Genesis*, 27–73; Milne, “Rising Suns,” 44.
62. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*.
63. Virgil Roy Beasley III, “Feasting on the Bluffs: Anna Site Excavations in the Natchez Bluffs of Mississippi,” in Rees and Livingood, *Plaquemine Archaeology*, 127–44; Daniel Anderson LaDu, “An Exploration of the Age of Mound Construction at Mazique (22AD502), A Late Prehistoric Mound Center in Adams County, Mississippi” (MA thesis, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, 2009); and Neitzel, *Archaeology of the Fatherland Site, The Grand Village*.
64. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 12.
65. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 7; Ian W. Brown, *Decorated Pottery of the Lower Mississippi Valley: a Sorting Manual*, Archaeological Report no. 28 (Jackson: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1998), 7; Beasley, “Feasting on the Bluffs,” 135.
66. Beasley, “Feasting on the Bluffs,” 135.
67. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 56, 16, 70, 73.
68. Brown, “Decorated Pottery,” 7.
69. Ashley A. Dumas and Gregory A. Waselkov, “Protohistoric Pan-Southeastern Revitalization: Rethinking Material Culture” (paper presented at the 67th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Lexington KY, October 27–30, 2010); Gregory A. Waselkov and Ashley A. Dumas, “Archaeological Clues to a Seventeenth-Century Pan-Southeastern Revitalization Movement” (paper presented at the 66th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Mobile AL, November 4–7, 2009).
70. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 110; Dumas and Waselkov, “Rethinking Material Culture”; Waselkov and Dumas, “Archaeological Clues.”
71. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 176.
72. Stephen W. Silliman, *Lost Laborers in Colonial California: Native Americans and the Archaeology of Rancho Petaluma* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press), 68.

73. Brown, "Plaquemine Culture," 148.
74. Brown, "Decorated Pottery," 7.
75. Brown, "Plaquemine Culture," 157; Neitzel, *Archaeology of the Fatherland Site, The Grand Village*.
76. Brown, "Plaquemine Culture," 158; see also Lauren E. Downs, *Plaquemine Culture Structures in the Natchez Bluffs: Architectural Grammar at the Mound 3 Summit Locale, the Anna site, Adams County, Mississippi* (MA thesis, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, 2004).
77. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 191.
78. Brain, "Late Prehistoric Settlement"; John L. Cotter, "Stratigraphic and Area Tests at the Emerald and Anna Mound Sites," *American Antiquity* 17, no. 1 (1951): 18–32; John L. Cotter, "Archaeological Memoir of the Natchez Trace," *Mississippi Archaeology* 29, no. 1 (1994): 1–16.
79. Milne, "Rising Suns," 44.
80. Brown, "Plaquemine Culture," 150. This process is quite similar to how T. R. Kidder conceived of *primus inter pares* (first among equals) communities in the southern Yazoo Basin during the Mississippi period. If site size is an indicator of power, then while the Lake George site is big, so are the many other Mississippian sites, such as the nearby Aden or Crippen Point; please refer to Tristram R. Kidder, "Mississippi Period Mound Groups and Communities in the Lower Mississippi Valley," in *Mississippian Towns and Sacred Spaces: Searching for an Architectural Grammar*, ed. R. Barry Lewis and C. Stout (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press), 123–50.
81. Cotter, "Stratigraphic and Area Tests"; Cotter, "Archaeological Memoir."
82. Brown, "Plaquemine Culture," 149; Downs, "Plaquemine Culture Structures."
83. Beasley, "Feasting on the Bluffs," 131; Brain, "Prehistoric Settlement Patterns"; Brown, "The Eighteenth-Century Natchez," 57.
84. Beasley, "Feasting on the Bluffs," 131.
85. Brown, "Plaquemine Culture," 143.
86. Albrecht, "Location of the Historic Natchez"; Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 130–31; LaDu, "An Exploration of the Age."
87. Joseph Ingraham and B. L. C. Wailes as cited in LaDu, "An Exploration of the Age."
88. LaDu, "An Exploration of the Age," 156.
89. For a cogent review of the de Soto route, see Hudson, *Knights of Spain*.
90. Paul Kelton, "The Great Southeastern Smallpox Epidemic, 1696–1700: The Region's First Major Epidemic?" in Ethridge and Hudson, *The Transformation of the Southeastern Indians, 1540–1760*, 21–38; Paul Kelton, "Avoiding the Smallpox Spirits: Colonial Epidemics and Southeastern Indian Survival," *Ethnohistory* 51, no. 1 (2004): 45–71; Paul Kelton, *Epidemics and Enslavement: Biologi-*

cal Catastrophe in the Native Southeast, 1492–1715 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007).

91. Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw*, 117.

92. Kelton, “The Great Southeastern Smallpox,” 30.

93. Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw*, 194; Jeter, “Shatter Zone,” 380.

94. Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw*, 66; Hudson, *Knights of Spain*, 386.

95. Marvin T. Smith, “Aboriginal Movements in the Postcontact Southeast,” in Ethridge and Hudson, *The Transformation of the Southeastern Indians*, 3–20.

96. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 2.

97. Refer to the seminal publications of James A. Ford, Philip Phillips, and James B. Griffin: Philip Phillips, James A. Ford, and James B. Griffin, *Archaeological Survey in the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley, 1940–1947*, Papers of the Peabody Museum, vol. 25 (Cambridge MA: Harvard University, 1951; reprint, Tuscaloosa, University of Alabama Press, 2003); and Philip Phillips, *Archaeological Survey in the Lower Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, 1949–1955*, Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 60 (Cambridge MA: Harvard University, 1970).

98. Jeter, “Prehistory through Protohistory,” 186.

99. Brain, “Prehistoric Settlement Patterns”; Brain, *Winterville*; Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*.

100. John W. O’Hear, Vincas P. Steponaitis, and Megan C. Kassabaum, “Early Coles Creek Ceremonialism at the Feltus Mounds, Jefferson County, Mississippi” (paper presented at the 66th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Mobile AL, November 4–7, 2009).

101. Jeter, “Prehistory through Protohistory,” 187; Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*.

102. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 190; see Van Gijseghem for a discussion on transitional ceramics in Nasca society, Hendrik Van Gijseghem, “A Frontier Perspective on Paracas Society and Nasca Ethnogenesis,” *Latin American Antiquity* 17, no. 4(2006): 419–44.

103. Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw*, 129.

104. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 79.

105. Jeter, “Prehistory through Protohistory,” 210.

106. David P. Braun, “Why Decorate a Pot? Midwestern Household Pottery, 200 BC–AD 600,” *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 10 (1991): 360–97; Warren De Boer, “The Ucayali Experience,” in *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*, ed. Meg Conkey and C. Hastoff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 82–104; Steven Plog, “Sociopolitical Implications of Stylistic Variation in the American Southwest,” in Conkey and Hastoff, *The Uses of Style in Archaeology*, 61–72. Just as non-local ceramics are used to argue for the influx of non-local peoples into the Natchez homeland, so too are Natchez sherds like

Fatherland Incised used to argue for the influx of Natchezean peoples into the Chickasaw homeland in northeastern Mississippi after 1731; see Jay K. Johnson, John W. O'Hear, Robbie Ethridge, Brad R. Lieb, Susan L. Scott, and H. Edwin Jackson, "Measuring Chickasaw Adaptation on the Western Frontier of the Colonial South: A Correlation of Documentary and Archaeological Data," *South-eastern Archaeology* 27 (2008): 1–30.

107. Geoff Emberling, "Ethnicity in Complex Societies: Archaeological Perspectives," *Journal of Archaeological Research* 5, no. 4 (1997): 295–345; Siân Jones, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present* (New York: Routledge, 1997); Kowalewski, "Coalescent Societies"; Rob Mann, "True Portraiture"; Van Gijseghem, "Frontier Perspective"; Weik, "Role of Ethnogenesis," 210.

108. Weisman, "Nativism, Resistance," 198.

109. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*; Milne, "Rising Suns."

110. David G. Moore, *Catawba Valley Mississippian: Ceramics, Chronology, and Catawba Indians*, (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002); Galloway, *Choctaw Genesis*; Vernon J. Knight, "The Formation of the Creeks," in *The Forgotten Centuries: Indians and Europeans in the American South, 1521–1704*, eds. Charles Hudson and Carmen Chaves Tesser (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), 373–92.

111. Brown, *Natchez Indian Archaeology*, 196.

112. Jeffery P. Brain, *Tunica Archaeology*, Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 78 (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1988); Ethridge, *From Chicaza to Chickasaw*, 133; Jeter, "Shatter Zone," 372–73.

113. Weisman, "Nativism, Resistance."

114. Barnett, *The Natchez Indians*, 70.

115. Weisman, "Nativism, Resistance," 198.

116. In other words, French, Spanish, and English trade goods rapidly become embedded wholesale, part and parcel, into the many disparate elements of Natchez habitus.

117. Jon L. Gibson, "Navels of the Earth: Sedentism in Early Mound-Building Cultures in the Lower Mississippi Valley," *World Archaeology* 38, no. 2 (2006): 311–29; Tritram R. Kidder, "Woodland Period Archaeology in the Lower Mississippi Valley," in *The Woodland Southeast*, ed. David G. Anderson and Robert C. Mainfort Jr. (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2002), 77–80.

118. Neitzel, *Archaeology of the Fatherland Site, The Grand Village*.

119. Brain, "Late Prehistoric Settlement."