At the point of Spanish contact in southeastern North America, there were many Native American chiefdoms throughout the American South in what Spaniards came to claim as the colonial province of La Florida (Beck 2013; Ethridge 2017; Ethridge and Mitchem 2013; Hoffman 1990, 2014; Lyon 1976; Scarry 1994b, 1996a, 1996b). The pluralistic geopolitical landscape of the Native American South encompassed many different chiefly provinces and, correspondingly, many different mound centers, which formed the towns at which chiefs resided and at which events associated with chiefly leadership took place (Map 3.1). Although these mound centers and associated chiefdoms were all associated with the broader Mississippian cultural tradition, each chiefdom had its own history, and these histories shaped the course of early encounters and entanglements with Spanish conquistadors and colonists. During the sixteenth century, indigenous groups of the Native American South conceptualized Spanish expeditions as potential enemies but also as potential allies, and chiefs and chiefdoms pursued their own interests and agendas through diplomacy, warfare, exchange, acquisition of gifts and prestige goods, and other strategies and activities. During the seventeenth century, the establishment and entrenchment of missions and mission settlements altered the cultural landscape of the Native American South, but there were aspects of Mississippian culture, chiefly leadership, and place making that persisted. This chapter considers archaeological and ethnohistoric evidence for patterns of cultural persistence, place making, pluralism, and the diverse histories of Mississippian societies that shaped the course of Spanish colonial history in the Native American South. These episodes of culture contact began not long after early Spanish exploration and settlement in the Caribbean (Deagan 1985, 1988), and several Spanish entradas in La Florida took place simultaneously with or soon after early
Spanish encounters with indigenous peoples of the American Southwest, Mesoamerica, the Andes, and Amazonia (Van Buren 2010). Differences between the cultural landscapes of the Mississippian South and those in other world areas contributed to different outcomes of the Spanish colonial enterprise and responses by indigenous groups to it.
PERSISTENCE

Of course, many aspects of Native American life in the American South changed after Spanish contact, but many characteristics of Mississippian culture endured and in some cases manifested themselves in new variations on traditional themes. The availability and acquisition of metal items created new sources of prestige goods, but those goods circulated in networks of exchange and interaction that predated Spanish contact (Smith 1987, 1994, 2002, 2006; Waselkov 1989). Some chiefdoms collapsed or were diminished in status relative to others (Smith 2000), but other chiefdoms emerged (Ethridge 2010), and many aspects of chiefly leadership persisted (King 2006), although in some cases chiefly status became manifested in part through diplomatic relations with Spanish colonists and access to Spanish goods (Worth 2002). Some mound centers that were powerful and prosperous towns before Spanish contact either were abandoned or were less powerful and less prosperous than they had been (King 1999; Regnier 2015; Smith 2000; Williams 1994; Williams and Shapiro 1996), but in many cases, the provinces of powerful chiefdoms from the early sixteenth century endured as major geopolitical centers in the late 1500s and 1600s (Beck 2013; Ewen 1996; Ewen and Hann 1998; Hann and McEwan 1998; Scarry 1994a, 1996c). There were major realignments of geopolitical relationships in the Native American South after early Spanish contact for sure, but aspects of chiefly leadership endured, and they shaped indigenous responses to contact and colonialism and its outcomes.

One manifestation of persistence is the case of the Apalachee province and chiefdom in northern Florida (Hann 1988, 1994; McEwan 1991, 2001; Scarry 1992, 1994a, 1996c). One of the major Mississippian mound centers along the Florida Gulf Coast was the Lake Jackson mound site (Scarry 1990; Seinfeld et al. 2015). The Lake Jackson chiefdom may have been the point of origin for marine shell that was the raw material for the circular (and sometimes square) pendants known as gorgets. These pendants were “platforms” for elaborate engraved iconography and are found in elite burials at major mound centers in northern Georgia and eastern Tennessee. Some of the elite burials in Lake Jackson mounds are associated with copper plates that have embossed iconography comparable to that seen on Mississippian gorgets and on copper plates found
at Etowah and at prehistoric Mississippian mound sites like Cahokia (Illinois) and Spiro (Oklahoma). When the expedition led by Juan Pánfilo de Narváez marched northward from Tampa Bay and approached the Apalachee province in 1528, they were met with stiff resistance by Apalachee warriors, presumably motivated in part by conflicts that had arisen between the Narváez expedition and other native groups in Florida and that were probably motivated as well as by opportunities for Apalachee chiefs and warriors to accumulate power and prestige through encounter and engagement with Spanish conquistadors (Hoffman 1994a, 1994b). Several years later, the Hernando de Soto expedition was likewise met by hostility from Apalachee chiefs and warriors probably motivated in part by the memory of encounters with the Narváez expedition and the continuing interests of Apalachee chiefs and warriors in demonstrating prowess and success in warfare and diplomacy (Hudson 1994, 1997).

At the point of the Narváez and Soto expeditions, the Lake Jackson mounds were no longer the major geopolitical center in the Apalachee province; instead, the nearby settlement of Anhaica may have been the regional political center. The Soto expedition established its first winter encampment at Anhaica (Ewen 1996). The people of Anhaica abandoned the town in advance of Soto’s arrival in 1539, and they burned many of the structures in the town. During the winter, Apalachee warriors harassed Soto’s encampment and expedition with periodic attacks, and the Soto expedition eventually decamped and marched northward toward Ocute and Cofitachequi in 1540, after which point the Apalachee reclaimed and resettled the site. The Apalachee chiefdom endured those early Spanish entradas, and it was still present during the spread of the network of Catholic missions and Spanish colonial outposts in the Florida panhandle during the seventeenth century.

The major centers within the Apalachee chiefdom for much of the seventeenth century were Anhaica and the nearby settlement of San Luis, the latter of which was the site of both the Apalachee capital and the Spanish colonial capital of the Apalachee province from 1656 to 1704 (Hann 1994). The built environment of San Luis differed in many respects from those of Mississippian mound centers from the period before Spanish contact—most notably in the presence of the Spanish fort and town and the Catholic church and friary—but the plaza beside the church was analogous in some respects to plazas at Mississippian mound centers.
The plaza formed a middle ground of sorts—in both literal and figurative senses—in that the church was situated on one side and a monumental Apalachee council house and the house of the Apalachee chief were on the other side. The plaza was the setting for traditional Apalachee stick-ball games—an indigenous practice discouraged by Catholic priests but continued anyway by the Apalachee community—and it was the setting for the emplacement both of wooden crosses as Christian symbols and of large wooden posts that were landmarks for Mississippian towns and targets for stickball games. The Apalachee council house at San Luis was not built on an earthen mound, but it is one of the largest examples of the council houses present at several Mississippian sites in Florida and coastal Georgia (Thompson 2009), and it was an architectural symbol of the vitality of the Apalachee chiefdom and a monument of sorts to the persistence of the Apalachee chiefdom within the geopolitical landscape of the Native American South during the period of Spanish entradas and the mission period of the seventeenth century.

Other cases of persistence in Mississippian chiefdoms are those of the Taensa chiefdom in northeastern Louisiana (Ethridge 2010:136–138) and the Natchez chiefdom in southwestern Mississippi (Barnett 2007). The Soto expedition encountered powerful chiefdoms in northern Mississippi such as Quizquiz and Quigualtam, and they participated in warfare between the rival chiefdoms of Casqui and Pacaha in Arkansas. After Native American warriors from Quigualtam and other chiefdoms in neighboring areas drove surviving members of the Soto expedition—by that point led by Luis Moscoso—down to the mouth of the Mississippi and out of the American South in 1543, there were no recorded contacts between Native Americans and Europeans in the Lower Mississippi Valley until the French expedition led by Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet in 1673. The geopolitical landscape had changed dramatically, but there were still vibrant and powerful chiefdoms centered at the Grand Village of the Natchez, known to archaeologists as the Fatherland site (Brown 1990; Brown and Steponaitis 2017; Lorenz 1997; Mehta 2013; Milne 2009), and in the Taensa province of northeastern Louisiana, where settlements were situated around the edges of oxbow lakes (Swanton 1911, 1946). The Taensa lived in areas close to many sites with large platform mounds that predate the point of Spanish contact in the Southeast, and there is evidence for moundbuilding at the Jordan
site between 1540 and 1685 (Kidder 1992). During the period between Spanish and French contact in the Lower Mississippi Valley, many people moved to this area of northern Louisiana, probably in part because of the social and political upheavals associated with early Spanish contact in Arkansas and Mississippi and perhaps as far away as Alabama. This part of the Southeast was a setting for the persistence of Mississippian culture, even though specific chiefdoms collapsed and groups coalesced into new chiefdoms, like those of the Taensa and Natchez themselves.

The persistence of Mississippian chiefdoms—altered in some ways, resilient in others—is evident as well in the continuing significance of prestige goods as symbols of chiefly status. Before Spanish contact, manifestations of such statuses included copper plates, copper armbands, marine shell pins and pendants, and undoubtedly perishable materials and markings that are not preserved at archaeological sites. After Spanish contact, metal goods such as axes, knives, chisels, and celts became material symbols of status as well. Such items have been found in burials at several sites within the territory of the powerful paramount chiefdom of Coosa, encompassing much of northern Georgia and adjacent areas of eastern Alabama and eastern Tennessee (Smith 1987, 2000) and including the mid-sixteenth-century town at the King site (Hally 2004, 2008). The acquisition of such material wealth and the prospect of alliances with Spanish conquistadors such as Hernando de Soto (1539–1543; Hudson 1997) and Juan Pardo (1566–1568; Hudson 2005) were probably significant motivations for Mississippian chiefs in pursuing trade relations or warfare or both with Spanish explorers and colonists.

From the macroscalar perspective of the Mississippian Southeast as a whole, the Mississippian world was indeed dramatically altered in the aftermath of Spanish contact (Ethridge 2006, 2009, 2010), and some areas were abandoned (Williams 1994), but some aspects of chiefly leadership and landscape persisted or were re-created. Before Spanish contact, there were cycles in the emergence and collapse of Mississippian chiefdoms and shifts of the focal points of Mississippian chiefdoms across the landscape (Anderson 1994, 1996a, 1996b; Beck 2013; King 2003). These patterns in the history of Mississippian chiefdoms differed in some respects from those set in motion by Spanish contact (Hally 2006), but there had long been some instability in the Mississippian geopolitical landscape. Eventually, the Mississippian world did collapse, leading to the dramatic
transformations and coalescences of communities that took shape during periods of French and English colonialism in the South during the late 1600s and 1700s, but there were aspects of Mississippian culture that endured, and there were echoes of Mississippian culture in the postcontact Native American South. Meanwhile, the course of Spanish colonialism led to diverse outcomes within different areas of the Southeast, and those differences were related in part to local histories and the strategies adopted by different communities to respond to the events and developments of the contact period.

PLURALISM

Spanish contact had diverse impacts on indigenous groups across the American South, and, similarly, different groups engaged with Spanish expeditions in different ways. After prolonged interactions with the Soto expedition in 1540 and the geopolitical instability created by it, the paramount chiefdom of Coosa was greatly diminished, and it was not as powerful or prosperous in 1560, when a contingent of men from the Tristán de Luna expedition made a foray from its colony in Pensacola inland toward Coosa in search of food (Hally 1994; Hudson et al. 1989; Hudson et al. 1985). Contact with the Soto expedition had similar effects on the chiefdom of Cofitachequi, in central South Carolina, although it was still significant in the geopolitical landscape of the Native American South in the seventeenth century (Beck 2013; DePratter 1989, 1994; Hudson et al. 2008). On the other hand, in the northern borderlands of La Florida, the people of Joara and other provinces of eastern Tennessee and the western Carolinas resisted attempts at Spanish colonization and erased several Spanish colonial towns and forts established during the period of the Juan Pardo expeditions from 1566 to 1568 (Beck and Moore 2002; Beck et al. 2016; Beck et al. 2017; Beck et al. 2010; Beck, Rodning, and Moore 2016; Moore 2002; Rodning et al. 2013). At the southern edge of La Florida, the Calusa of southwestern Florida were resistant to Spanish colonialism and attempts at converting them to Christianity for much of the 1500s and 1600s (Marquardt 2001, 2014; Widmer 1988).

The case of the Calusa is interesting in part because southern Florida is the point of first contact between Spanish colonists and indigenous peoples of the Native American South (Bushnell 2006, 2014;
Fowler Williams 1991; MacMahon and Marquardt 2004; Milanich 2014; Thompson, Marquardt, Walker, et al. 2018; Worth 2013, 2014). The first recorded encounters took place during the voyage led by Juan Ponce de León in 1513, although the hostile reception that Ponce de León received when he periodically landed to take on food and water hints at the possibility of violent encounters before that point, and he and his men took several Calusa captives when skirmishes arose near the mouth of the Caloosahatchee River along the Florida Gulf Coast. The Calusa attacked an expedition by Francisco Hernández de Córdoba in 1517, they attacked Ponce de León during his effort to colonize Florida in 1521, they resisted Dominican attempts to establish a mission in 1547, and they periodically mobilized large numbers of warriors in seaworthy canoes in response to the approach of Spanish ships. The Narváez and Soto expeditions bypassed Calusa territory, but in 1566 the aspiring colonial governor of La Florida, Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, established a garrison and Jesuit mission at the Calusa capital of Calos, on an anthropogenic island known as Mound Key (Thompson, Marquardt, Cherkinsky, et al. 2016). Calos was the residence of the most powerful Calusa chief (known as Carlos), and Menéndez married the sister of the chief as part of his effort at making an enduring alliance with the Calusa. Violent encounters between 1566 and 1569 led to the abandonment of the Spanish outpost at Calos. During the seventeenth century, several efforts by Spaniards to conquer the Calusa or negotiate with them proved unsuccessful, and so also did an effort by Franciscans to missionize the Calusa.

Despite intermittent direct contacts between Spanish colonists and the Calusa during the 1500s and 1600s, indirect contacts and the circulation of Spanish goods within southern Florida had important impacts on the Calusa chiefdom. Throughout this period, native people salvaged material items—including gold and silver—from Spanish shipwrecks along the eastern and western coasts of Florida (McGuire 2014). Like metal goods introduced directly from Spanish entradas farther north, items salvaged from Spanish shipwrecks—and in some cases shipwreck survivors—became material symbols of wealth and status within the Calusa chiefdom.

The Calusa did not really seek out interactions with Spanish colonists, but they did respond strategically to the Spanish colonial presence in Florida, and so did the community of Joara, in western North Carolina.
Soto traversed the province of Xuala in 1540 en route between the province of Cofitachequi and eastern Tennessee (Beck 1997; Hudson 1997). Pardo and his men marched inland from the Spanish colonial capital of Santa Elena in 1566, they founded Fort San Juan and the colonial town of Cuenca adjacent to the main town of Joara, and they established five other outposts in the Carolinas and eastern Tennessee in 1567 and early 1568 (Beck 2009; Hudson 2005). Pardo often asked Native American community leaders to build houses for him and his men and to set aside stores of food for them, and he inserted himself into diplomatic relations and tributary networks encompassing diverse communities and speakers of diverse languages (Booker et al. 1992). Documentary sources and archaeological evidence from the Berry site in western North Carolina, the location of Joara, Cuenca, and Fort San Juan, illustrate outcomes of these forms of interaction and engagement (Beck et al. 2016; Beck et al. 2017; Beck, Rodning, and Moore 2016). Relations between Pardo and the people of Joara began favorably, but during the spring of 1568, news reached Santa Elena that Fort San Juan had been attacked and abandoned, as had Pardo’s five other outposts (Beck et al. 2018). The alliance that formed at the outset contributed to the ascendancy of Joara relative to other chiefdoms such as Cofitachequi and Coosa (Beck et al. 2010), and the conquest of Fort San Juan probably also enhanced Joara’s geopolitical status (Rodning et al. 2013).

The cases of Joara and the Calusa demonstrate different outcomes from the effects of Spanish contact on other groups in the Native American South, including the chiefdoms of Coosa and Cofitachequi, which were greatly altered by contacts with the Soto expedition. For the Calusa, managing and containing the Spanish colonial presence and access to Spanish goods became closely associated with chiefly leadership. In the case of Joara, an alliance with Pardo was favorable at first, and both that alliance and the successful attack on Fort San Juan had implications for the relative statuses of Joara and other polities and communities.

PLACE MAKING

During the 1500s and for much of the 1600s, most Spanish encampments or towns in the American South were relatively ephemeral, with the significant exceptions of more enduring settlements at coastal towns like
Santa Elena, in South Carolina (South 1988), and St. Augustine, Florida (Deagan 1982, 1983, 2010a, 2010b). The Soto expedition wintered at abandoned indigenous settlements in the provinces of Apalachee and Chicaza. The Pardo expedition established colonial towns at Native American settlements. By contrast, aboriginal settlements were relatively permanent, and many had long histories, especially those sites with earthen mounds and plazas that were political capitals and ceremonial centers.

One architectural manifestation of Spanish contact in the Southeast is the emplacement of crosses at Mississippian sites. For example, written accounts refer to crosses emplaced around the plaza at San Luis during the seventeenth century (Hann and McEwan 1998). During the sixteenth century, Soto and his men placed a wooden cross on the summit of a platform mound in the capital town of Casqui, which is associated with the Parkin site in Arkansas (Ethridge 2017:xviii; Mitchem 1996). It is hard to know precisely how indigenous people interpreted these symbols, although they probably did so differently from the Spaniards, and, notably, crosses and cross-in-circle motifs were present in Mississippian iconography before and after Spanish contact (Saunders 2000). It is not hard to imagine that crosses emplaced on mounds and plazas added layers of religious and political significance to those places in the Mississippian landscape.

Other architectural manifestations of the Spanish colonial presence in the Southeast are the forts the Spaniards built (Deagan 2016), including those at Santa Elena (Thompson, DePratter, and Roberts Thompson 2016; Thompson, Marquardt, Walker, et al. 2018) and at the town of Joara (Beck et al. 2006; Beck et al. 2018). Of course, these forts were built as places of refuge and as settings for military activity, but they were also monuments of sorts to Spanish colonial hegemony and landmarks of the Spanish colonial presence in the Southeast. The visibility of these landmarks may have made them targets as well, as in the case of Native American attacks on Fort San Juan. In some ways, log stockades enclosing Spanish forts may have resembled, in a very general sense, the log stockades that enclosed major Mississippian towns (Steinen 1992) as described for the case of Mabila, the site of an epic battle between members of the Soto expedition and Native American warriors in Alabama (Knight 2009), and as known archaeologically from sites like Parkin, in Arkansas (Mitchem 2011), and the King site, in Georgia (Hally 2008).
Within the Mississippian Southeast, log stockades enclosed settlements with earthen mounds and plazas, residential neighborhoods, and the dwellings of chiefs, and although Spanish colonial forts were not residential spaces in the same sense, they were enclosures for important geopolitical centers in the colonial landscape of La Florida.

Spanish forts created divisions between Spanish colonial spaces and native settlements nearby both in the literal sense that log stockades formed the edges of them and in the more metaphorical sense that they created distance between newcomers and natives in the landscape. On the other hand, forts (and, later, missions) were places that drew in diverse groups and created settings for pluralistic colonial encounters. Leaders from diverse and in some cases distant communities traveled to Fort San Juan to meet with Juan Pardo, for example; the mission and fort at San Luis became a focal point for the main Apalachee town within the Apalachee province of Florida, and several different groups came to live in proximity to Spanish mission settlements along the Atlantic coast of Florida and Georgia (McEwan 1993; Milanich 1994, 2006; Stojanowski 2005, 2010; Thomas 1988).

These and other manifestations of the Spanish colonial presence in the Southeast, including ephemeral and seasonal encampments and colonial towns and forts, formed new layers within an aboriginal landscape of large towns, earthen mounds, and farmlands surrounding large towns and rural farmsteads. The colonial town at Santa Elena lasted for 21 years, although it was renovated and rebuilt considerably during that period (Thompson, DePratter, and Roberts Thompson 2016; Thompson, Marquardt, Walker, et al. 2018), and while of course St. Augustine has persisted as a major town and city since 1565, it too was rebuilt and even moved periodically in its early history. By the mid- to late seventeenth century, Spanish mission settlements like San Luis and others had become relatively permanent, but before that point, Spanish settlements were relatively impermanent and in many cases were short-lived.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Thinking about Spanish colonialisms in global and comparative perspective, the Spanish colonial enterprise in La Florida was never complete and never decisive, and while the imprints of Spanish colonialism on the
American South were profound, the Spanish colonial presence itself was not very permanent in the landscape in most areas, at least in terms of permanent settlements, during the 1500s and much of the 1600s. The Spanish colonial presence at any particular place did have effects that reverberated across the Native American South as a whole (Rodning et al. 2018), but the local outcomes of Spanish colonialism were shaped by local conditions and local community history. There were many different chiefdoms and chiefly provinces in the Native American South at the point of Spanish contact, and while many communities moved or coalesced with other groups (Ethridge 2009) and many regional polities collapsed (Hally 2006), there were elements of Mississippian culture and Mississippian chiefdoms that endured Spanish entradas and early stages in the Spanish mission system in the 1500s and 1600s.

Some places in the landscape persisted as important political centers, even as the nature of those political centers changed. Within the Apalachee province, major towns from the Mississippi period, the sixteenth century, and the seventeenth century were all located in close proximity to each other. Even the setting for the town of Cofitachequi, which did diminish in significance between the eras of the Soto and Pardo entradas, was still an important place in the landscape in the late seventeenth century.

Some new settlements and perhaps even some new mound centers were founded, often reflecting major principles of Mississippian architecture and settlement plans. One example is the Jordan site in Louisiana, where there is evidence of moundbuilding during the interval between Spanish and French contact in the Lower Mississippi Valley (Kidder 1992). Another example is the King site, in Georgia, where a Mississippian town reflecting major principles of Mississippian town layout, including a log stockade, a zone of residential structures around a plaza, and a community structure, was built soon after encounters between towns within the Coosa chiefdom and the members of either the Soto or Luna expedition (Hally 2008).

New forms of prestige goods and material wealth were introduced to the Native American South, but they were circulated and managed within networks that predated Spanish contact. Developing and maintaining access to such goods, and the alliances manifested in them, be-
came important considerations for community leaders and community leadership. So also did opportunities to advance community interests and agendas through warfare, as evident in the attack in 1568 on Fort San Juan by warriors from Joara (Hudson 2005) and the epic battle in 1540 between members of the Soto expedition and Mississippian warriors at the town of Mabila, in southern Alabama (Knight 2009). Spanish colonialism posed new challenges and created new conditions different from those that had been present before, but native peoples of the Southeast responded to them following cultural practices and geopolitical strategies that had deep roots in the Mississippian world. Those strategies and responses sometimes favored accommodation and alliance and sometimes favored warfare and avoidance.

Archaeology has taught and can teach us much about the history of Spanish colonialism in the Native American South. One important direction for us to take is to consider further the effects of long-term patterns of environmental changes and Native American cultural history on the relatively abrupt and short-term effects of early encounters and entanglements with Spanish colonists on indigenous peoples of La Florida. Documentary evidence is rich, but there were long-term diachronic processes and historical forces that must have shaped the ways in which colonial encounters were conceptualized, experienced, negotiated, and remembered. Another important direction for us to take is to develop interpretive frameworks that emphasize indigenous viewpoints rather than those of European explorers and colonists. From an indigenous perspective, Spaniards were another group in an already pluralistic cultural landscape, and native groups adopted and adapted traditional cultural practices to engage with them through diplomacy, warfare, trade, and other forms of interaction.
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