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Introduction

The route of the Hernando de Soto expedition through the state of Mississippi has been an issue of enduring interest to laymen and scholars alike for well over two hundred years. In this century investigations of Soto's route across the Southeast have been initiated at several junctures, the best known study being the federally commissioned project headed by Dr. John R. Swanton, which was scheduled to coincide with the quadricentennial of the entrada. The official report on this research, entitled Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission, was published in 1939. In the ensuing half century considerable additional research has been undertaken. In particular, archaeological evidence has evolved to the point that it is now possible to make a better informed assessment of Soto's route based on a much improved knowledge of which aboriginal sites were and were not occupied at the time of the incursion.

In 1987, with the rapidly approaching 450th anniversary of the Hernando de Soto expedition, the National Park Service initiated a reassessment of the route with the intention of establishing an official De Soto Trail across the southeastern United States. Existing roadways approximating the route were to be marked to assist those interested in tracing the path of this earliest of European campaigns across the region.

After marshalling the available data, however, the Park Service deemed these inadequate for the establishment of a federally sanctioned parkway and discontinued their participation in the project in 1989. Considering the amount of time and effort already expended upon the investigation and the public interest in Soto's exploits, several of the southeastern states resolved to pursue the project. To this end the Mississippi legislature established the Mississippi De Soto Trail Commission and mandated it to research De Soto's route across the state and establish a route utilizing presently existing roadways which generally parallel that of the conquistador and his entourage.

As official keeper of the state's archaeological site files, the Mississippi Department of Archives and History was directly involved in this endeavor from its onset. A major responsibility of this Department has been the generation of a map indicating the location of aboriginal sites within the state which were occupied at the time of the Soto entrada. This report will present the results of this investigation, dubbed “The De Soto Trail Mapping Project,” and discuss its overall relevance to the determination of the Spaniards' route and the establishment of a commemorative roadway across the state.

Project Overview

As previously noted, Archives and History involvement in the state-mandated De Soto Trail study is directly related to this Department's function as keeper of the state's official archaeological site files. These files, which are maintained by the Historic Preservation Division, include an inventory of all known aboriginal (i.e. Native American) sites in the state with
information concerning temporal placement, cultural affiliation, topographic setting, and geographical location recorded for each. The “site files” which were begun in the mid-1960s have undergone numerous alterations through the years. Current guidelines for site reporting require considerably more detailed information than did earlier ones, and as a result the site file data have improved significantly over time. In a recent upgrading effort, the site file has been computerized, allowing for easier access and manipulation of the information contained therein and aiding immeasurably in the carrying out of this project. It is primarily from this database that information for the De Soto Trail Mapping Project was drawn.

Research Universe

The investigation was restricted to two sections of the state, based upon information contained in translations of the narratives of the several sixteenth-century historians of the expedition (cf. Robertson 1933, Varner and Varner 1951, and Bourne 1904). While these accounts do not always agree on particulars, there is a general consensus that the expedition traversed the state in a west-northwesterly direction, entering in the vicinity of Columbus and exiting somewhere between De Soto Lake (Coahoma County) and Lake Cormorant (De Soto County). Thus, an expansive east-west transect was demarcated and all counties intersected by this corridor were considered. In addition, in order to evaluate aboriginal populations in the area adjacent to the path of the final retreat of the expedition (i.e. the Mississippi River), those counties falling completely or partially within the Yazoo Basin and/or Mississippi River floodplain were also considered. In total, these areas encompass 40 counties and approximately one-third of the state (see Figure 1).

Site Selection and Plotting Procedures

Procedures utilized in site selection were similar to those which had previously been employed by researchers in a similar Alabama project (cf. Knight 1988). Based upon the reality that the route of the expedition was in large part determined by the Spaniards’ need to exploit native food supplies, the identification and location of contemporary aboriginal occupations is vital.

Toward this end a selection procedure was employed by which three classes of sites were retrieved from the site files. The broadest category, labeled Late Prehistoric-to-Protohistoric, reports all sites falling within a twelfth- through seventeenth-century timeframe, including Mississippi, Plaquemine, and Protohistoric cultural manifestations. A total of 895 sites fell into this category.

Excluded from this initial grouping were those sites attributable to the Late Mississippi/Early Protohistoric period (ca. A.D. 1450-1600). This determination was initially based upon the reporting of diagnostic ceramic types for individual sites in the state site files. (see Appendix 1 for listing of relevant ceramics) Considering the variability in quantity and quality of information available for sites in these files, an extensive literature review was also undertaken to identify sites which might otherwise have been overlooked. In this selection process a concerted effort was made to include only those sites from which irrefutable diagnostics had been reported. In some cases, however, it has been necessary to include sites based simply upon the reporters’ statement that a Late Mississippi and/or Early Protohistoric component is present.

Due to these selection procedures it is likely that some of those sites omitted from this grouping yet included in the more generalized Late Prehistoric-to-Protohistoric category may in fact contain unrecognized Late Mississippi/Early Protohistoric occupations. This situation is particularly relevant to the prairie regions of northeast Mississippi, where site collections are
characteristically small and lacking in the decorated ceramic types commonly relied upon for
determining chronology and cultural affiliation.

In total, 127 sites have been included within the Late Mississippi/Early Protohistoric
category. Appendix III provides pertinent information for each of these sites. While it had
initially been planned to reexamine the actual collections from all of the Late Prehistoric-to-Pro­
tohistoric sites in order to identify additional Late Mississippi/Early Protohistoric sites, this was
ultimately not possible due to time and personnel constraints.

The final grouping of sites to be extracted from the site files was that from which Early
Spanish and Possible Early Spanish (15th-to-16th-century) artifacts had been recovered. To
date, qualifying items from Mississippi include halberds, trade beads of glass, cut quartz, and
turquoise, brass ("Clarksdale") bells, a Spanish coin, a rosette pendant and medallion, an iron
wedge, brass headband fragments, a brass point, and Spanish earthenware and cobalt blue
glass. The term "site" must be qualified for this category, in that many of the items of interest
are isolated surface finds which are not associated with an actual archaeological site. Table 1
and Appendix III provide specific information on each of the twelve "sites" from which these
artifacts were recovered.

Site locations for sites from these three groupings were digitized and plotted based upon
UTM coordinates, using USGS 7.5 minute (1:24,000) quadrangle maps and employing the
geographic information system capabilities of the Mississippi Automated Resource Information
System, a division of the State Institutions of Higher Learning. These data are presented in a
master map (Figure 1) and five detail maps (Figures 2-6) in Appendix II. Sites securely dated
to the Late Prehistoric to Protohistoric periods of particular interest here are identified
numerically with a number that is listed on the site forms in Appendix III as "Map Code." These
maps were then used to evaluate various hypothesized Soto routes (see Figure 7 in Appendix
II).

Historic Overview

Over the years a plethora of Soto routes has been proposed by numerous investigators. Routes
vary considerably based upon the quality of available data, the caliber of the research under­
taken, and the motives of those proposing the particular route (see Atkinson n.d. for a detailed
discussion of this issue). Many of these are included in the now-famous "spaghetti map" of the
U.S. De Soto Expedition Commission report (see Swanton 1939: Map No. 2) and will not be
expounded here.

For recent studies the 1939 Commission's official route map (Swanton 1939: Map No. 10) has
served as an important resource (cf. Phillips, Ford, and Griffin 1951; Brain, Toth, and Rodriguez­
Buckingham 1974; and Hudson, DePratter, and Smith 1990). In capsule, Swanton's route
envisioned the Soto expedition entering the state, crossing the Tombigbee River northwest of
Columbus at Morgan's Ferry near Aberdeen, and then proceeding in a northwesterly direction
to Chicasa, the central village of the ancestral Chickasaw, near Tupelo (or Pontotoc) where they
were supposed to have spent the winter of 1540-1541. After narrowly escaping annihilation by
the incensed Chickasaws the following spring they were thought to have traveled down the
Yocona River to the Yazoo Basin, finally crossing the Mississippi River at Sunflower Landing
due west of Clarksdale in Coahoma County.

Within the last two decades additional routes have been proposed for Soto's expedition, and
several of these will be briefly sketched out as a backdrop for a discussion of their congruence
with the state site file data in a following section (see also Figure 3).

Dr. Jeffrey Brain and various colleagues have spent a significant amount of time and effort
in researching the Soto route with a particular emphasis on the location of the Mississippi River
crossing predicated upon the Lower Mississippi Survey's intensive involvement in the archae­
ology of this area. In an article published in Mississippi Archaeology (1984:48-58), Brain reviews
the route proposed by himself, Alan Toth, and Antonio Rodriguez-Buckingham in 1974, according to which Soto crossed the Tombigbee near Columbus and proceeded northwest to Chicasa near Tupelo, fleeing the next spring due west across central Mississippi and the Yazoo Basin into the province of Quizquiz. The researchers believed that the army crossed the Mississippi River at Friars Point only a short distance north of Swanton’s previously proposed crossing at Sunflower Landing. Recent communication with Dr. Brain revealed that he now considers the location of Chicasa to be farther south, as indicated by the work of various researchers in northeast Mississippi.

As the result of a cultural resources survey in the vicinity of Sunflower Landing in Coahoma County, Richard Weinstein discovered a previously unreported Mississippian mound site. Aware of the implications of the location of this site in supporting a Mississippi River crossing at Sunflower Landing, Weinstein (1985) presented another route proposal. Briefly, this route takes De Soto from wintering quarters at Chicasa in southern Pontotoc County southwest to slightly above Greenwood and then north-northwest along the Yazoo-Mississippi meander belt and crossing the Mississippi just upriver from the Sunflower Landing site. Like Swanton, Weinstein (1985:15,21) considers Soto’s path across the Yazoo Basin to closely parallel the historically important Charley’s Trace.

James Atkinson, staff archaeologist for the Natchez Trace Parkway, has also proposed a Soto route in recent years. Having done much archaeological research in the northeast portion of the state, Atkinson proposes that the Soto expedition crossed the Tombigbee River somewhere between the Noxubee River and Tibbee Creek in Lowndes County, proceeded north or northwest to Chicasa in the vicinity of Tibbee or Line Creek, and continued in this general direction to the Alibamu area southeast of Houston. The expedition then followed Houlka Creek northwest to the upper reaches of the Yalobusha River and followed this stream to the Yazoo Basin along a historically documented Indian trail later used by the English to reach the Mississippi River in the Sunflower Bend-Friar’s Point vicinity (Atkinson 1987:69).

Finally, the route of Charles Hudson et al. (1990) is to be considered. Hudson has Soto crossing the Tombigbee River northwest of Columbus at Barton’s Ferry and proceeding to Chicasa, probably located south of Tibbee Creek, where he spent the winter of 1540-41. After Soto’s army’s near destruction the following spring, Hudson believes he traveled northwest, engaging the Alibamu along Line or Houlka Creek, and then continued to the northwest through the vicinity of what are now the towns of Houston, Pontotoc, New Albany, and Holly Springs. Soto is then thought to have turned west through the upper reaches of the Coldwater River drainage, reaching the province of Quizquiz and crossing the Mississippi River in De Soto County in the extreme northwest corner of the state. This is the route which is included in the National Park Service’s recently published (1990) De Soto Trail National Historic Trail Study.

**Route Comparisons**

Similarities and differences among the various routes proposed for the Hernando de Soto expedition are apparent. Thankfully, scholars are in general agreement as to the location at which the army entered what is now the state of Mississippi, i.e. Lowndes County in the vicinity of Columbus. The most thorough research into the Tombigbee crossing location has been undertaken by Rufus Ward, who suggests that Burnet’s (Barton’s) Ferry, about 11 miles northwest of Trinity Church, is the most likely candidate (Ward 1986:66-67). There is less of a consensus regarding the location of Chicasa. Based upon the now discredited assumption that the Chickasaw inhabited the area around Tupelo during the sixteenth century, most researchers prior to the 1980s had directed their Soto route near or through this locale. Sites in this vicinity plotted in the maps accompanying this study are almost certainly Late Protohistoric or even early Historic sites from which European artifacts have not been reported.
Background and Synthesis

Recent survey work in Clay County, however, has identified numerous small habitation sites falling within the Late Mississippi/Early Protohistoric period, a discovery which has been used by Johnson and his colleagues to argue that settlement in this area at the time of the Soto entrada had already changed from the nucleated and floodplain-oriented pattern characteristic of Mississippi cultures to a more dispersed, prairie oriented regime (Johnson, Atkinson, and Sparks 1984; Johnson and Sparks 1986; Johnson and Lehmann 1990; Johnson et al. 1991).

As indicated in Figure 7, the major disagreements among the Soto trail researchers concern the direction of the army from northeast Mississippi to the Mississippi River and consequently the location of the Mississippi River crossing. In these respects the Hudson route, which takes the army northwest to the river near Lake Cormorant, is at odds with all of the other posited routes, which maintain that Soto's path was more nearly due west through the heart of the Yazoo Basin, encountering the river in present day Coahoma County. Obviously, these are major issues in need of resolution.

Site File Contributions

While the Late Prehistoric-to-Protohistoric category is too general to provide any specific observations concerning the Soto expedition, at least one fact is obvious: that occupation in the central portion of the state (i.e. the North Central Hills) is virtually nonexistent throughout the period. Although this observation is admittedly based upon a limited amount of survey data, present evidence is probably ample for documenting that this was an area of meager aboriginal occupation. This condition is reflected in the narratives' description of an uninhabited upland between Chicasa and Quizquiz which required several days to traverse. Unfortunately, this evidence (or lack thereof) provides none of the clues needed to ascertain the direction of the army through this region (i.e. West vs. Northwest).

As for sites categorized as Late Mississippi/Early Protohistoric, many more observations are possible concerning aboriginal settlement and the Soto route. In general, occupations are clustered within two expansive areas, the Tombigbee and Mississippi River drainages, with the “near vacant” North central Hills separating the two. On the eastern side of the state, while sites categorized as Late Prehistoric-to-Protohistoric occur along the Tombigbee and its major tributaries, many of the sites with probable late fifteenth-to early sixteenth-century aboriginal ceramics are located well into the adjacent upland prairies to the west. As previously noted, this observation has been employed by some researchers to propose a pre-Soto shift in settlement-subsistence patterns in the area.

Employing an extensive familiarity with the aboriginal ceramics of Northeast Mississippi, Atkinson (1987:63-73) has narrowed the potential location of Chicasa. Having effectively argued that settlement in the Tupelo area is Late Protohistoric to Historic Chickasaw, Atkinson asserts that the earlier Protohistoric occupation was dispersed through the Black Prairie further to the south. On the western side of the state it can be seen that floodplain agriculture and settlement systems oriented around mound centers continued to hold sway within the Yazoo Basin during the Late Mississippi period. A concentration of sites is evident in the northern portion of the basin where the Walls, Hushpuckena, and Parchman phases are located. While Late Mississippi occupations are also present in the lower portions of the Yazoo Basin, it is not until the Natchez Bluffs area of the extreme southwestern corner of the state is reached that intensive Late Mississippi period occupation is again evident, this time associated with the Emerald phase of the Plaquemine culture.

Finally, Spanish artifacts and their proveniences must be addressed (see Table 1). The easternmost of these is the halberd recovered from the Luxapalila Crossing area of the Tombigbee River north of Columbus. This and the other halberds to be discussed below would be more accurately considered possible Spanish artifacts because comparable items are known to have been used in warfare in the Southeast as late as the Civil War, and none of the halberds
Table 1. Sites in Mississippi with Early Spanish artifacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name/Number</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxapalila Crossing/none</td>
<td>Lowndes</td>
<td>Halberd</td>
<td>isolated find*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon's Bluff/22-Ok-520</td>
<td>Oktibbeha</td>
<td>Earthenware and cobalt blue glass</td>
<td>recent identification by Florida Museum of Natural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills/22-Ok-756</td>
<td>Oktibbeha</td>
<td>Iron wedge</td>
<td>identified by Dr. Marvin Smith as probably early Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Harmon Lake”/none</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Spanish pendant</td>
<td>recent identification by Florida Museum of Natural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/none</td>
<td>Pontotoc</td>
<td>Halberd</td>
<td>isolated find with no provenience*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Schlater”/none</td>
<td>Leflore</td>
<td>Halberd</td>
<td>isolated find*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksdale/22-Co-669</td>
<td>Coahoma</td>
<td>Clarksdale Bells-3 (?)</td>
<td>May be from Oliver site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver/22-Co-503</td>
<td>Coahoma</td>
<td>Clarksdale Bells-2 (?); cut quartz beads (2);</td>
<td>all items from burial contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>glass beads (100); brass point (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber-Mcwilliams/22-Co-601</td>
<td>Coahoma</td>
<td>Brass headband fragments</td>
<td>aboriginally reworked European-made metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Near Spanish Fort site”/none</td>
<td>Sharkey</td>
<td>15/16th century spanish medallion</td>
<td>isolated find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sartartia Mound/22-Yz-608</td>
<td>Yazoo</td>
<td>Clarksdale Bell fragment</td>
<td>from mound at Sartartia, exact context unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramlett/22-Co-551</td>
<td>Coahoma</td>
<td>Possible 16th century pendant</td>
<td>Identified by Dr. Marvin Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Whether or not these halberds can be positively attributed to Early Spanish expeditions remains uncertain.

...has received sufficient study to place it temporally with any certainty. Proceeding westward, two Late Mississippi sites in the vicinity of Starkville have produced relevant artifacts. Jim Atkinson (1979) has reported an iron wedge excavated from a burial at the Rolling Hills site. While reworking the collections excavated from the Lyon’s Bluff site, Richard Marshall recently discovered earthenware and cobalt blue glass potentially of early Spanish origin. Only a short distance to the northwest at Harmon Lake in southern Clay County, a Spanish pendant has also been identified at an otherwise pre-Mississippi site (Marshall 1978; Johnson et al. 1991:20). All of this evidence supports the contention that this locale was a focus of Late Mississippi/Early Protohistoric occupation. Both Atkinson (1987) and Richard Marshall (1986) have ventured proposals concerning the location of various Indian groups in this area at the time of the entrada.

Still farther to the north, an item known as the “Pontotoc Halberd” has been recovered. The actual provenience of this item is unknown. Records at Archives and History report that it is a surface find from Pontotoc County, although it should be pointed out that Pontotoc County encompassed the western portion of Lee County as well until 1866. Donor and date of acquisition are unknown. Sometimes also touted as a Soto artifact is the “Tupelo Halberd,” which has been omitted from the table due to several factors, including discrepancies concerning its place and manner of discovery, the suspiciously good state of preservation of this item and its dissimilarity to other possible Spanish halberds which Brain has labeled Schlater Halberds (see Brain 1985a,
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An unprovenienced Clarksdale Bell has recently surfaced which may also be from the Tupelo area, although this assignment remains uncertain (see Johnson et al. 1991:20-21).

All of the remaining Spanish artifacts are attributable to the Yazoo Basin. The majority of these are from sites in Coahoma County and include brass headband fragments from aboriginal burials at the Humber-McWilliams site (see Leader 1990), Clarksdale Bells from (debatably) the Clarksdale site (see Brain 1985b, xxxvi; Weinstein 1985:17-18), a possibly sixteenth-century pendant from the Bramlett site, and Clarksdale Bells and cut quartz and turquoise beads from a mound at the Oliver site. Peabody (1904) also reported glass beads and a brass point from Oliver. While Late Mississippi sites in the Coahoma County area can be shown to have a relative abundance of early Spanish trade items, the ease with which such items can be transported will always make employing these in attempting to discern Soto's presence at any particular site (or even general area) problematic.

Two additional artifacts have been reported from the Lower Yazoo Basin: a Spanish medallion from "near the Spanish Fort site" and a fragment of a Clarksdale Bell from a mound at Satartia. How these items came to rest in this locale is perplexing, as none of the narratives suggest that the army set foot in this portion of the state. As such, they serve as excellent examples of the portability of such artifacts and the corresponding hesitancy which must be used in employing them to document Soto's route.

Brain (1985a) has proposed, however, that the locations of Spanish armaments (particularly Schlater Halberds) provides a useful indicator of the actual path of the army, because their provenance is more likely a result of loss or abandonment than of trade; he has thus used halberd finds in supporting his Soto route. The question remains, however, as to whether these items can be securely attributed to the Spaniards in the first place.

Comments

The need for additional study is evident. It seems unlikely that more major historical documents will be discovered. In the case of historic trails, while these have been frequently employed in the reconstruction of the route, it can be shown that they are for the most part inadequate-to-useless for tracing the path of the Soto expedition (see Elliott n.d.). Thus, the weight of future investigation will fall upon the practitioners of archaeology. As previously indicated, there are still existing collections which must be reviewed before it can be said that we are in command of all the presently available data. It is expected that this endeavor will provide only a minor addition to our present knowledge, although the example of the Lyon's Bluff materials shows that it should not be neglected.

Brain (1985b:xlviii) has pointed out that further route refinements will inevitably require the documentation of sites either visited or occupied by the Spanish explorers, for it is only through the establishment of such loci that the path of the expedition can be more accurately plotted. Within the state of Mississippi the most likely site to be identified is Chicasa, the village from which the Spaniards were burned out by the Chickasaws. The discovery of this site would provide valuable information concerning the material culture of both the Spanish and Chickasaw at the time of their encounter. Furthermore, it might serve to resolve the issue of the legitimacy of Schlater Halberds as Soto artifacts. Such knowledge would also greatly assist in identifying additional contemporaneous aboriginal sites and thus aid in resolving the now disputed settlement-subsistence regime for the area (see Smith 1991:33-34).

Unfortunately, the discovery of Chicasa would do little to help in determining the direction of the army from northeast Mississippi to the Mississippi River. This route would be best determined through the identification of the province of Quizquiz, an unlikely proposition in that the Spanish were in this locale for only a short time. The encampment near the third village of Quizquiz, at which the army resided for several weeks while constructing barges for the river
crossing, would be the most promising candidate, although this site may have been claimed by
the meanderings of the Mississippi River over the last four and a half centuries. Certainly this
has been the fate of the actual crossing point.

Using aboriginal evidence alone, it seems unlikely that a definitive placement of Quizquiz
will ever be achieved, as both the Sunflower Landing/Rena Lara and Lake Cormorant locales
have the appropriate Late Mississippi diagnostics (as does the Commerce Landing area). The
Commerce Landing locale has been written off primarily due to geographic inadequacies (Brain
1985b: xxxv). Neither has the area produced any Spanish artifacts, a deficiency which could also
be leveled at the Lake Cormorant locale. But further investigations in these areas may yet
produce such items.

Concerning the Mississippi River crossing issue, it has been suggested recently by Dr. Roger
Saucier that a useful avenue of inquiry would be to identify those locations at which a barge
crossing would have been possible (i.e. opposing point bars) at the Soto dateline and then to
evaluate these in terms of the local archaeology and written accounts of the expedition (personal
communication 12/1990). Vernon Knight (1989) has stressed that further analysis of the route
must take a "long ribbon" approach (presentation before the Mississippi De Soto Trail Commiss­
on, 12/8/89). That is, any portion of the route cannot be considered separately from adjoining
portions of it. This requirement is particularly relevant in terms of the Mississippi River crossing
issue as it relates to the trans-Mississippi evidence from Arkansas. Interestingly, major
proponents of two of the competing trail routes (i.e. Hudson and Brain) both consider that their
version is in compliance with "long-ribbon" requirements, while each has cited the other's
shortcomings on these grounds. For example, Hudson claims that Brain's placing of the
Mississippi crossing in Coahoma County south of the St. Francis River is unworkable when
directions, distances, and physiographic characteristics are considered between this locus and
the subsequently encountered provinces of Aquixo, Casqui, and Pacaha in eastcentral and
northeast Arkansas (letter from Hudson to Brain and Weinstein dated 1/24/90). Similarly, Brain
maintains that Hudson's Mississippi River Crossing at Lake Cormorant and subsequent return
to the Mississippi River in the Friar's Point/Sunflower Landing vicinity is unworkable consid­
ering the narrative accounts of the character and timing of hostile encounters with various
Indian provinces downstream (letter from Brain to Hudson dated 4/24/90). Alternatively, Brain
would have the then Sotoless army embarking in the vicinity of Vicksburg, north of Natchez,
the location of the intensive Late Mississippi occupation which he equates with the province of
Quigualtam (Brain 1985b: xlv-xlvi).

Conclusion

Obviously, there are numerous issues yet to be settled concerning Hernando de Soto's route
through Mississippi. Even with the archaeological evidence which has accumulated over the
last fifty years it would certainly be premature to proclaim that a definitive De Soto trail can
be discerned at this point (cf. appendix F in the 1990 De Soto Trail National Historic Trail Study).
More work will be required. With the exception of Johnson's recent investigations in northeast
Mississippi, the Soto route has not been the focus of problem-oriented survey. While Johnson's
research suggests that Clay, Oktibbeha, and Lowndes Counties are a major settlement focus,
he also points out that additional survey, particularly to the south in Noxubee County, will be
required to properly evaluate the character of Late Prehistoric/Early Protohistoric settlement
in the area (Johnson et al. 1991:70). Similarly, testing of more of the sites in the Yazoo Basin
which have been equated with the province of Quizquiz should be undertaken. In this vein,
recent testing at the Sunflower Landing site has cast serious doubt on the long-held assertion
that this might be one of the sites visited by Soto (Styer 1991). Ongoing research by David Dye
in De Soto County should shed more light on the legitimacy of extreme northwest Mississippi
as Quizquiz territory.
Further research will certainly bring us closer to deriving a firmer route determination. It is toward this end that the Mississippi De Soto Mapping Project was undertaken. While the map resulting from this project does not provide definitive evidence concerning the route of the expedition, it does provide an up-to-date representation of the late fifteenth-to sixteenth-century aboriginal sites as well as an illustration of the loci of early Spanish (and possible early Spanish) artifacts within the state. As was the intention of this project, this map can now be employed for assessing previously proposed Soto routes, for making modifications in these, for constructing new routes, and for establishing a commemorative roadway (or roadways) across the state.
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Appendix I
Diagnostic Ceramics by Region
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE(S)</th>
<th>TYPE/VARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Anna, Foster, Emerald, Natchez</td>
<td>Addis Plain, vars. Addis and G'lenville Manchac Incised, var. Manchac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Foster, Emerald, Natchez</td>
<td>Chicot Red, var. Fairchild Mississippi Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, Emerald, Natchez</td>
<td>Addis Plain, var. St. Catherine Barton Incised, vars. Arcola and Estill Fatherland Incised, var. Stanton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* adopted from Brown 1985: Table 2  
* Anna phase(?)  
◊ Emerald phase(?)
Table 2. Late Prehistoric-to-Protohistoric ceramics in the Lower Yazoo Basin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE(S)</th>
<th>TYPE / VAR</th>
<th>CERAMIC SET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake George II and Wasp Lake I</td>
<td>Owens Punctated, <em>Owens</em>, <em>Poor Joe</em>, and <em>Widow Creek</em> Winterville Incised, <em>Ranch</em></td>
<td>Yazoo 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasp Lake I and Wasp Lake II</td>
<td>Avenue Polychrome, <em>Avenue</em> Carson Red on Buff, <em>Carson</em> Nodena Red and White, <em>Dumond</em> and <em>Nodena</em></td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasp Lake I and Wasp Lake II</td>
<td>Owens Punctated, <em>Manly</em> and <em>Menard</em> Winterville Incised, <em>Broutin</em> and <em>Wailes</em></td>
<td>Yazoo 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasp Lake II and Russell</td>
<td>Barton Incised, <em>Trudeau</em> Winterville Incised, <em>Angola</em> and <em>Tunica</em></td>
<td>Pocahontas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasp Lake II and Russell</td>
<td>Barton Incised, <em>Davion</em> and <em>Portland</em> Owens Punctated, <em>Redwood</em></td>
<td>Yazoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* adapted from Brain 1988: Figure 41
Table 3. Late Prehistoric-to-Protohistoric ceramics in the central to upper Yazoo Basin.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE(S)</th>
<th>TYPE/VARIETY</th>
<th>CERAMIC SET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hushpuckena II*</td>
<td>Owens Punctated, <em>vars. Manly and Menard</em></td>
<td>Yazoo 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winterville Incised, <em>vars. Brouin and Wailes</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Town Red, <em>vars. Ball Ground and St. Pierre</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>According to Brain, “Presumably, Barton Incised and Parkin Punctated were also present.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parchman*</td>
<td>Barton Incised, <em>vars. Davion and Portland</em></td>
<td>Yazoo 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owens Punctated, <em>var. Redwood</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winterville Incised, <em>var. Tunica</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunica mode of punctation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls ‡</td>
<td>(frequent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bell Plain (most frequent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi Plain, <em>var. Neely's Ferry</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parkin Punctated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barton Incised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Town Red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(minorities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barton Incised, *var. Kent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranch Incised (Winterville Incised, <em>var. Ranch</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodes Incised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls Engraved, *var. Walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nodena Red and White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avenue Polychrome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(rare)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fortune Noded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyronza Punctated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls Engraved, *var. Hull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mound Place Incised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson Red-on-Buff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Brain 1988:269
‡ Phillips 1970:936-937
Table 4. Late Prehistoric-to-Protohistoric ceramics in the central to upper Yazoo Basin.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE / VARIETY</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkin Punctated, <em>var. Parkin</em></td>
<td>Brain <em>et al.</em> 1974: Table 1 and Figure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Incised, <em>var. Kent</em></td>
<td>Brain <em>et al.</em> 1974: Table 1 and Figure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillips 1970:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillips, Ford, and Griffin 1951:126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mound Place Incised, <em>var. Chickasawba</em></td>
<td>Brain <em>et al.</em> 1974: Table 1 and Figure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Red, <em>var. Beaverdam</em></td>
<td>Brain <em>et al.</em> 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood White, <em>var. Hollywood</em></td>
<td>Brain <em>et al.</em> 1974: Table 1 and Figure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillips 1970:90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillips, Ford, and Griffin 1951:134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Phillips 1970 presents Kent as a general Mississippian period variety with several others, including Campbell, Arcola, and Estill, as specifically Late Mississippian.
Table 5. Late Prehistoric-to-Protohistoric ceramics in the central to upper Yazoo Basin.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE/VARIETY</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Polychrome, var. Avenue*</td>
<td>This is the only variety of Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Incised, vars. Kent*, Davion*, and Portland*</td>
<td>&quot;At least one variety of Barton expected in every Mississippian manifestation early to late, north to south&quot; (Williams and Brain 1983:126).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Plain, var. Bell*</td>
<td>Some other varieties are as early as Winterville phase (Williams and Brain 1983:105).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Red-on-Buff, var. Carson*</td>
<td>Both of Phillips' Carson varieties are late or terminal Mississippian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune Noded, var. Fortune*</td>
<td>This is the only variety of Fortune Noded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood White, var. Hollywood*</td>
<td>This is the only variety of Hollywood White.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland Incised, var. Blanchard*</td>
<td>Some varieties, e.g. Bethlem, are as early as Winterville phase (Brain 1988:26).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Plain, var. Neely's Ferry*</td>
<td>Neely's Ferry is the coarse shell tempered pottery of the Parkin, Nodena, and Walls complexes—late Mississippian (Phillips 1970:194).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mound Place Incised, var. Chokasawuba*</td>
<td>Other varieties, e.g. False River, are as early as Winterville phase (see Williams and Brain 1983:186).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Red, vars. Beaverdam*, Ballground*, and St. Pierre*</td>
<td>Some other varieties of Old Town are as early as Crippen Point (cf. Williams and Brain 1983:192).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkin Punctated, vars. Parkin* and Harris*</td>
<td>Some Parkin varieties begin as early as late Winterville (see Brain 1988:378-380 and Williams and Brain 1983:196).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes Incised, var. Rhodes* and Horn Lake*</td>
<td>These are the only Rhodes varieties discussed by Phillips (1970:157), who attributes both to the late Mississippian Walls complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterville Incised, vars. Brouin, Waites, Tunica, and Ranch*</td>
<td>Some varieties begin as early as Winterville Phase (see Brain 1988:386 and Williams and Brain 1983:208); not formally described until Phillips 1970:172.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Paul Appliqué, var. Vernon Paul*</td>
<td>This is the only variety of this type; Phillips (1970:167) says ware is equivalent to var. Neely's Ferry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls Engraved, vars. Walls* and Hull*</td>
<td>These are the only two varieties of this type. Phillips (1970:169-171) assigns both to late Mississippian.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on Brain et al. 1974
• Brain 1988 Parchman phase diagnostic
◊ Brain 1988 Hushpuckena II phase diagnostic
Table 6. Late Mississippi/Early Protohistoric ceramic types in the upper Tombigbee drainage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE(S)</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chuquatonchee Creek (and throughout Mississippian period)</td>
<td>Mississippi Plain</td>
<td>Atkinson 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama River</td>
<td>Mississippi Plain, var. Warrior (w/punctations or pinches on exterior lip)</td>
<td>Johnson et al. 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout Mississippian and Protohistoric</td>
<td>Mississippi Plain, var. Warrior</td>
<td>Johnson et al. 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibbee Creek, Lyons Bluff, Sorrells</td>
<td>Mississippi Plain, var. Warrior</td>
<td>Marshall and Poole 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana River, Bell Plain, var. Hale</td>
<td>var. Hale</td>
<td>Marshall and Poole 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrells, Mhoon</td>
<td>var. Mhoon</td>
<td>Marshall and Poole 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama River</td>
<td>Bell Plain, var. Hale</td>
<td>Johnson et al. 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville I through III and Alabama River</td>
<td>Bell Plain, var. Hale</td>
<td>Jenkins 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibbee Creek, Lyons Bluff, Sorrells</td>
<td>Bell Plain, var. Hale</td>
<td>Marshall and Poole 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama River</td>
<td>var. Waide (w/punctations or pinches on exterior lip)</td>
<td>Johnson et al. 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama River</td>
<td>var. Waide (w/punctated fillet)</td>
<td>Johnson et al. 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibbee Creek, Lyons Bluff, Sorrells</td>
<td>var. Big Sandy</td>
<td>Marshall and Poole 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuquatonchee Creek</td>
<td>Alabama River Applique</td>
<td>Atkinson 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville III and IV, Alabama River</td>
<td>Alabama River Applique, var. Sorrells</td>
<td>Johnson et al. 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville III and IV, Alabama River</td>
<td>Alabama River Incised, var. Alford</td>
<td>Johnson et al. 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama River, Lyons Bluff(?), Sorrells(?)</td>
<td>Barton Incised</td>
<td>Atkinson 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundville III, Alabama River</td>
<td>Barton Incised, var. Demopolis</td>
<td>Johnson et al. 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuquatonchee Creek</td>
<td>Carthage Incised, var. Carthage</td>
<td>Atkinson 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuquatonchee Creek</td>
<td>O'Byam Incised, var. Stewart</td>
<td>Atkinson 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuquatonchee Creek</td>
<td>Parkin Punctated</td>
<td>Atkinson 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama River</td>
<td>Parkin Punctated, var. Bridgeville</td>
<td>Johnson et al. 1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II
Maps