

2012

The Historical Archaeology of Sixteenth-Century La Florida

Kathleen A. Deagan



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Florida Historical Quarterly by an authorized editor of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Deagan, Kathleen A. (2012) "The Historical Archaeology of Sixteenth-Century La Florida," *Florida Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 91: No. 3, Article 5.

Available at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq/vol91/iss3/5>

The Historical Archaeology of Sixteenth-Century La Florida

by Kathleen A. Deagan

Historical archaeology—also known as text-aided archaeology—is the study of the past through the integration of material remains, stratigraphic contexts, and written documents. The use of written documents provides the time frame of historical archaeological research in La Florida—that is, from the date of the arrival of Europeans (ca. 1513) and the written accounts they left. In the same way, the very notion of “La Florida”—a completely European-imposed geographical idea—also assumes a post-1513 chronology, and a spatial boundary that would have been quite alien to the indigenous peoples who lived there.

With that understanding, this essay is intended to survey and assess the historical archaeology of Native American and Spanish La Florida during the sixteenth century, with an emphasis on research that has added to, rather than simply confirmed, the documentary record. The Spanish geographic idea of La Florida during that century included a region extending northward from the Florida Keys to an ill-defined point north of the Chesapeake Bay and westward from the Atlantic Ocean to at least the Mississippi River. The European presence in this region during the sixteenth century, however, was essentially restricted to settlement attempts along the coasts and intermittent explorations into the interior. Consequently, historical archaeological research on the sixteenth century has been largely restricted to those areas.

Kathleen A. Deagan is Distinguished Research Curator Emerita at the Florida Museum of Natural History, a leading archeologist in the Spanish Colonial period, and the author of ten books.

No synthetic archaeological studies of sixteenth-century La Florida in the tradition established by documentary historians (See Hoffman, this volume) have been published. Possibly the most comprehensive overviews of the topic are Charles Ewen's *The Archaeology of Spanish Colonialism in the Southeastern United States and the Caribbean* (1990),¹ and the 1989 set of essays in *Columbian Consequences Volume 2: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands East* (1989).² Both volumes are in series published in observance of the 1992 Columbian Quincentenary, an event that stimulated a number of very active historical-archaeological research programs in the region. However, historical archaeological study of La Florida began well before 1992.

Early archaeological work

During its early years, historical archaeology in La Florida was largely restricted to peninsular Florida, and did not begin with an emphasis on the European presence. The historical archaeology of the region instead began with a focus on Native American sites occupied during the post-1513 period. In 1945, John W. Griffin (the first professional archaeologist to work in peninsular Florida) proposed an agenda for historical archaeology that called for a closer collaboration between historians and archaeologists in understanding the location, dates, and societies of Native American sites during the historic period. Hale G. Smith's publication of the *European and The Indian* (1956) followed this agenda, compiling information on 23 Native American sites in Florida attributable to the sixteenth century.³ This was an important cultural catalogue; however most of the sites were burial mounds containing European materials, and many were excavated in the late nineteenth century by such pre-professional

1. Charles Ewen's *The Archaeology of Spanish Colonialism in the Southeastern United States and the Caribbean*. Society for Historical Archaeology Guides to the Archaeological Literature of the Immigrant Experience in America, Number 1 (Gainesville, FL: Society for Historical Archaeology, 1990).
2. David H. Thomas, ed., *Columbian Consequences, volume 2: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands East* (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989).
3. John W. Griffin, "History and Archaeology in Florida," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 23 no. 3 (1945), 184-190; Hale G. Smith, *The European and the Indian: European-Indian Contacts in Georgia and Florida* (Tallahassee: Tallahassee Florida Anthropological Society, Publication 4 and Florida State University, Department of Anthropology, Notes in Anthropology 2, 1956). Smith's book is based on his 1950 dissertation.

archaeologists as C.B. Moore and Frank Cushing. Their work inspired later professional archaeological interest, but simultaneously inhibited the ability of professional archaeologists to study or fully understand the sites, largely owing to the limitations of nineteenth century excavation and recording techniques.⁴

Exploration

The multiple Spanish efforts to explore and conquer La Florida during the first half of the sixteenth century are well documented through historical analyses of primary texts.⁵ Archaeological research has been focused principally on tracking the routes of exploratory expeditions through the Southeastern United States (particularly that of Hernando de Soto) and their impacts on the indigenous people of the region. For example, during the years preceding the Columbian Quincentenary, researchers from throughout the Southeastern United States embarked on intensive programs to identify the route of Hernando de Soto's expedition of 1539-1543, which at least initially involved some 600 people, 220 horses, and a herd of pigs.⁶

4. For an overview of early archaeology in the region of La Florida, see Jerald Milanich, *The Archaeology of Precolumbian Florida* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida 1994), 2-8; John W. Griffin, "Some highlights in the history of Florida archaeology," in *Fifty Years of Southeastern Archaeology*, ed. Patricia Griffin (Gainesville: University Press of Florida 1996), 115-123.
5. Michael Gannon, "First European contacts," *The New History of Florida*, ed. Michael Gannon (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1996), 16-40; Paul E. Hoffman, *A New Andalusia and a Way to the Orient: The American Southeast during the Sixteenth Century* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990); Paul E. Hoffman, *Florida's Frontiers* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 20-45; Jerald T. Milanich, "The European Entrada into La Florida: An Overview," in *Columbian Consequences* vol. 2, 3-29; On the Gulf Coast explorations see Robert S. Weddle, *Spanish Sea. The Gulf of Mexico in North American Discovery 1500-1685* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1985).
6. See Hoffman, this volume, for the major historical studies. In addition, see Chester DePratter, Charles Hudson, and Marvin Smith, "The Hernando de Soto Expedition: From Chiaha to Mabila," in *Alabama and Its Borderlands: from Prehistory to Statehood*, ed. Reid Badger and Lawrence A. Clayton (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1985), 108-127. Much of the Alabama archaeological research has been reported in Cailup Curren, *The Route of the De Soto Army through Alabama* (Tuscaloosa: Alabama de Soto Commission, De Soto Working Paper 3, 1987); Keith Little and Cailup Curren, "Conquest Archaeology of Alabama," in *Columbian Consequences*, vol. 2, 169-195; George E. Lankford III, "A New Look at DeSoto's Route through Alabama," *Journal of Alabama Archaeology* 23, no.1 (1977): 10-36. Paul E. Hoffman discusses aspects of the controversy over the route in Alabama in "Hernando de Soto: A Review Essay," *Louisiana History* 41, no. 2 (2000): 231-239.

To date, only a single archaeological site has been verified as a location at which De Soto and his expedition members were actually present. The Governor Martin site in Tallahassee, almost within sight of the State Capitol, is identified as the expedition's encampment at the Apalachee town of Anhaica in the winter of 1539-1540. Over the five months of bivouac in Apalachee, the Spaniards seized and occupied the Apalachee town, raided food supplies, and took large numbers of Apalachee as slaves. Excavations at the site by Calvin Jones and Charles Ewen revealed that the soldiers occupied some existing Apalachee structures and built others themselves. Artifact remains included early sixteenth-century Spanish coins, chain mail fragments, crossbow bolt heads, glass beads and pig remains from the swine introduced to North America by De Soto.⁷

A second site occupied by the Desoto expeditionary forces may have been found near Citra, Florida, on the southern edge of the Orange Lake wetland.⁸ Artifacts similar to those from the Martin site have been recovered, and study is ongoing. If the newly discovered site is in fact an encampment, it provides a second important reference point for understanding the route and impact of the De Soto expedition.

Although there is some consensus among archaeologists on the general path of the De Soto expedition, debates over the details of the route remain.⁹ Other than at the few places occupied for extensive periods of time, the nomadic expedition left only ephemeral traces in the archaeological record. Archaeologists have traditionally approached this problem by a complex process of identifying sites that contain certain artifacts dating to the early sixteenth century (principally glass beads and brass bells)¹⁰;

7. Charles R. Ewen and John H. Hann, *Hernando de Soto among the Apalachee: The Archaeology of the First Winter Encampment* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998), 72-91.

8. F. Ashley White, "Hernando de Soto and First Spanish Period Archaeology and Artifacts of the Florida Department of State Bureau of Archaeological Research Master Site MR03538." <https://sites.google.com/site/archaeologicalsite/desoto> (accessed July 14, 2012).

9. See Hoffman, this volume, for the Mabilia controversy.

10. Jeffrey P. Brain, "Artifacts of the Adelantado," *Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers* 8 (1979), 129-138; Keith J. Little, "European Artifact Chronology and Impacts of Spanish Contact in the Sixteenth-Century Coosa Valley" (PhD diss., University of Alabama, 2008); Keith Little, "Sixteenth-Century Glass Bead Chronology In Southeastern North America," *Southeastern Archaeology* 29, no. 1

and correlating these sites with documentary descriptions and geographical features. This can be problematical when the movement of such exotic goods throughout Native American networks is considered. Mark Allender, for example, argues that in peninsular Florida nearly all of the glass beads and other items used to identify sites along the proposed De Soto routes could be equally accounted for by Spanish shipwreck remains salvaged by native people.¹¹ That is, Native American trade networks, rather than the presence of Spanish explorers, may more directly account for the distribution of these artifacts.

The Tatham mound in Citrus County, Florida, is perhaps the best-documented Native American site associated with the De Soto expedition.¹² It lies along the early segments of the expeditionary routes of both Pánfilo de Narváez and De Soto. Excavated in 1985 and 1986, the mound produced a wealth of archaeological information including the skeletal remains of 339 post-contact individuals, along with 150 European glass beads, 298 metal beads and a number of metal artifacts (made by Native Americans using introduced or salvaged European metals). Two disarticulated bones showed trauma thought to be caused by metal (therefore European) edged weapons, underscoring the violent nature of the expedition.¹³ The site also contained a mass burial of some 77 people, interpreted as potentially indicating the remains of epidemic victims.

The question of introduced European disease and its impact on Native American demography is one of the central,

(2010): 222-232; Jeffrey M. Mitchem, "Artifacts of Exploration: Archaeological Evidence from Florida," in *First Encounters: Spanish Explorations in the Caribbean and the United States, 1492-1570*, ed. Jerald T. Milanich and Susan Milbrath (Gainesville: Florida Museum of Natural History, Bulletin Monographs in Anthropology and History No. 9, 1989): 99-109; Marvin T. Smith, *Archaeology of Aboriginal Culture Change in the Interior Southeast* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1987).

11. Mark Allender, "Sixteenth-Century European Contact Sites along the Florida Gulf Coast." (MA thesis, University of Florida, 1995).
12. Much of the work is reported and summarized by Dale Hutchinson, *Tatham Mound and the Bioarchaeology of European Contact: Disease and Depopulation in Central Gulf Coast Florida* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006); Jeffrey Mitchem, "Redefining Safety Harbor: Late Prehistoric/Protohistoric Archaeology in West Peninsular Florida" (PhD. diss., University of Florida, 1989); Mitchem, "Artifacts of exploration."
13. Dale Hutchinson, "Brief Encounters: Tatham Mound and the Evidence for Spanish and Native American Confrontation," *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 6, no.1 (1996): 51-65.

if unresolved, issues in the archaeology and ethnohistory of the pre-settlement contact period. The notion that European disease epidemics in La Florida initiated a chain of disruptions and depopulations shortly after, or perhaps even before, the arrival of Europeans (through material/animal vectors) has been widely influential in thinking about the pre-colonial contact period.¹⁴ Other researchers contend that epidemic disease was just one component of a complex and lengthy process of colonialism that led to cultural changes and population loss that varied considerably in intensity from location to location.¹⁵ Some suggest that indigenous processes of social change and environmental stress began in many areas before Europeans arrived, rendering populations more vulnerable to the effects of disease when it infected them.¹⁶ Archaeology's substantive contributions to the epidemic debate have been largely unrealized owing to a lack of consensus on what comprises evidence of epidemic disease in the archaeological record¹⁷ as well as the inherent difficulties

14. Henry Dobyns, *Their Number Become Thinned: Native American Population Dynamics in Eastern North America* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983); Keith Little, *European Artifact Chronology and Impacts of Spanish Contact in the Sixteenth-Century Coosa Valley* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008); Ann F. Ramenovsky, *Vectors of Death: The Archaeology of European Contact* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987); Smith, *Archaeology of Aboriginal Culture Change in the Interior Southeast*; Marvin T. Smith, *Coosa: The Rise and Fall of a Southeastern Mississippian Chiefdom* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000), 40-45.
15. For example, Brenda Baker and Lisa Kealhofer, "Assessing the Impact of European Contact on Aboriginal Populations," in *Bioarchaeology of Native American Adaptation in the Spanish Borderlands*, ed. Brenda Baker and Lisa Kealhofer (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1996), 1-15; and Russell Thornton, "Aboriginal North American Population and Rates of Decline, ca. A.D. 1500-1900," *Current Anthropology* 38 (1997): 310-315.
16. Charles Ewen, "Continuity and Change: De Soto and the Apalachee," *Historical Archaeology* 30, no.2 (1996): 41-53; Chester DePratter, "The Chiefdom of Cofitachequi," in *The Forgotten Centuries: Indians and Europeans in the American South 1521-1704*, ed. Charles Hudson and Carmen C. Tesser (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), 215-217; Jay K. Johnson, "From Chiefdom to Tribe in Northeast Mississippi: The Soto Expedition as a Window on a Culture in Transition," in *The Hernando de Soto Expedition: History, Historiography, and "Discovery" in the Southeast*, ed. Patricia Galloway (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 295-312; Christopher Peebles "Paradise Lost, Strayed, and Stolen: Prehistoric Social Devolution in the Southeast," in *The Burden of Being Civilized*, ed. M. Richardson and M. C. Webb (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), 295-312.
17. This and other archeological issues are considered by Dale Hutchinson and Jeffrey Mitchem in "Correlates of contact: Epidemic disease in archaeological context," *Historical Archaeology* 35, no. 2 (2001): 58-72.

in not only critically assessing documentary accounts, but also articulating them with archaeological evidence.¹⁸

Relatively minimal archaeological attention in La Florida has been paid to the routes and consequences of Spanish explorers other than De Soto. A single archaeological site in the Florida Panhandle, located in the St. Marks Wildlife Refuge south of Tallahassee, is thought to have been associated with the 1528 expedition of Pánfilo de Narvaéz.¹⁹ Given that only 11 years elapsed between the Narvaéz and De Soto *entradas*, it is extremely difficult to distinguish artifacts that may have been introduced by the former from those introduced by the latter expedition. There is some suggestion, however, that XRAY Fluorescence analysis of glass beads may hold the potential for distinguishing individual *entradas* by the chemical compositions of glass trade beads. Individual batches of beads can have distinctive dyes and glass “formulas,” providing a distinctive chemical signature.²⁰

Archaeologists have been somewhat more successful at tracing the 1566-1568 expeditions of Juan Pardo into the interior of La Florida. Pardo was acting on instructions from Adelantado Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, who had recently established settlements at St. Augustine, Florida (1565) and Santa Elena, South Carolina (1566, at what is now Parris Island, South Carolina). Between December of 1566 and March of 1568, Pardo led two expeditions into the region that is today the Carolinas and Tennessee. His objectives were to explore the interior, gain the submission of the region’s Native American population, and find a route from the Atlantic coast to

18. Questions of critical analysis and archaeological articulation are usefully explored by Patricia Galloway in her introduction to *The Hernando de Soto Expedition*, and Rebecca Saunders, “Seasonality, Sedentism, Subsistence, and Disease in the Protohistoric: Archaeological versus Ethnohistoric Data along the Lower Atlantic Coast,” in *Between Contacts and Colonies*, ed. Cameron Wessen and Mark Rees (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002), 32-48.

19. Rochelle A. Marrinan, John Scarry, and Rhonda L. Majors, “Prelude to de Soto: The Expedition of Pánfilo de Narvaéz,” in *Columbian Consequences*, vol. 2, 71-82.

20. Daniel Seinfeld and Robert H. Tykot, “PXRF Analysis of 16th Century Glass Trade Beads from Conquistador Sites in Florida,” Poster presentation, Archaeological Sciences of the Americas Symposium 2012, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN. (October 6, 2012) http://www.vanderbilt.edu/anthro/asas2012/sm_files/ASASProgramForVandyPrinting_Final2_LoResForWeb.pdf (accessed November 3, 2012).

the silver mines at Zacatecas, Mexico.²¹ The expedition built several small forts along the route, including Fort San Juan in the native town of Joara, which was a major Catawba Indian political center during the sixteenth century. It was also a settlement that had been visited by the DeSoto expedition some 25 years earlier. Pardo left a contingent of 30 soldiers at the fort as the expedition continued onward, but learned some 18 months later that the fort and Spanish encampment had been burned and destroyed by the Indians.

The remains of Fort San Juan were discovered in 1986 at the Berry site near Morganton, North Carolina, and have been excavated intermittently since then.²² Archaeologists have uncovered four large, rectangular, burned, and apparently related structures. The buildings were constructed using both Native American and European elements including nail fasteners and sill beams notched for uprights using metal tools. The European artifacts from the site are similar to those from the De Soto-related Martin site in Tallahassee, including chain mail, nails, lacing tips, and storage jar fragments, items not normally associated with trade or salvage. The physical identification of Fort San Juan at Joara has provided a reference point for both the De Soto and Pardo expeditions, which in turn has helped to refine the understanding of these exploratory routes through the Native American landscape of La Florida.²³

-
21. Chester B. DePratter, Charles Hudson, and Marvin T. Smith, "The Route of Juan Pardo's Explorations in the Interior Southeast," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (1983):125-158; Charles Hudson, *The Juan Pardo Expeditions: Spanish Explorers and the Indians of the Carolinas and Tennessee, 1566-1568* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990); Hoffman, *A New Andalusia*, 243-44, 249, 255, Table 2 (257).
22. The research at Joara and Fort San Juan is reported in Robin Beck Jr., David G. Moore, and Christopher B. Rodning, "Identifying Fort San Juan: A Sixteenth-Century Spanish Occupation At The Berry Site, North Carolina," *Southeastern Archaeology* 25, no. 1 (2006): 65-77; Robin A. Beck, Jr., Christopher B. Rodning, and David G. Moore, "Limiting Resistance: Juan Pardo and the Shrinking of Spanish La Florida, 1566-1568," in *Enduring Conquests: Rethinking the Archaeology of Resistance to Spanish Colonialism in the Americas*, ed. Matthew Liebmann and Melissa Murphy (Santa Fe, NM: School of Advanced Research Press, 2010), 19-39; David G. Moore, Robin A. Beck, Jr. and Christopher B. Rodning, "Joara and Fort San Juan: culture contact at the edge of the world," *Antiquity Project Gallery* 78 (299) <http://www.antiquity.ac.uk/Projgall/moore/> (accessed May 20, 2012). Recent work can be accessed through Megan Best and Christopher Rodning, "An overview of recent excavations at the Berry Site" <http://www.warren-wilson.edu/~arch/mississippianchiefdoms> (accessed June 30, 2012).
23. Robin A. Beck, Jr. "From Joara to Chiaha: Spanish Exploration of the Appalachian Summit Area, 1540-1568," *Southeastern Archaeology* 16, no. 2 (1997): 162-169.

Failed Settlements

European attempts to establish colonies in La Florida began even before the first Spanish *entradas* intended to explore and control the region. These included Ponce de León's immediately aborted colony in 1521, generally thought to have been at Charlotte Harbor, and San Miguel del Gualdape, Lucas Vásquez de Allyon's ambitious colonization effort on the southern Atlantic coast of La Florida in 1526. Although neither site has been located by archaeologists, a cogent research design for the discovery of San Miguel del Gualdape has been developed and awaits full implementation.²⁴

Archeologists have, however, succeeded in finding traces of three slightly later failed colonial efforts: Tristan de Luna's attempt in 1559-61 to establish a colony at what is today Pensacola; the French Huguenot settlement of Charlesfort on Parris Island, South Carolina (1562-1563); and a camp of some of the survivors of Jean Ribault's reinforcement of French Fort Caroline (1565). Fort Caroline itself has eluded archaeological discovery.²⁵

In 1559, Tristan de Luna mounted the most impressive colonization venture until that time in La Florida. With 1,500 colonists and 11 ships, Luna planned to establish a colony at Pensacola Bay (Ochuse) on the Gulf of Mexico.²⁶ Just a month after arriving at Pensacola Bay, and before food and other supplies could be unloaded, all but three of the ships were destroyed in a hurricane. The colonists were forced to withdraw to a Native American town on the Alabama River, and a contingent of soldiers was sent on an exploratory expedition into the Appalachian summit of north Georgia (that is, to Coosa) in search of food.²⁷ The colony was abandoned in 1561. For the historiography see Hoffman, this volume.

In 1992 and 2006 archaeologists with the Florida Department of State and the University of West Florida discovered the remains

24. David H Thomas, *Historic Period Indian Archaeology of the Georgia Coastal Zone* (Athens: University of Georgia Laboratory of Archaeology, 1993), 43-45. http://shapiro.anthro.uga.edu/Archaeology/images/PDFs/uga_lab_series_31.pdf (accessed July 15, 2012).

25. For a comprehensive historical treatment of the French Huguenots in La Florida, see John McGrath, *The French in Early Florida* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000).

26. Charles W. Arnade, "Tristan de Luna and Ochuse (Pensacola Bay) 1559," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 37 (1959): 201-222; John Worth, "Documenting Tristán de Luna's Fleet, and the Storm that Destroyed It," *Florida Anthropologist* 62 (2009): 83-92.

27. Charles M. Hudson, Marvin T. Smith, Chester B. DePratter and Emilia Kelley, "The Tristán de Luna Expedition, 1559-1561" in *First Encounters*, 119-134.

of two of the wrecked Luna vessels near Emmanuel Point in Pensacola Bay. Their excavation and study has yielded a wealth of new information about ship construction, material culture, and shipboard life in the mid-sixteenth century.²⁸

Excavations also recovered insect, plant, and animal remains dating to the Luna expedition on the ships. The presence of pre-Columbian-style obsidian blades and Aztec pottery are intriguing, suggesting the continued use of the objects by native Mesoamerican people on the expedition, or the adoption of their materials by the Spaniards.

Archaeologists Chester DePratter and Stanley South have identified the site of Charlesfort in the context of their ongoing research at the Spanish town of Santa Elena (today the Parris Island Marine Base golf course near Beaufort, South Carolina). Archaeological evidence indicates that the Spaniards who established the town of Santa Elena in 1566 built their own Fort San Felipe on the footprint of the earlier French fort, which was apparently still in evidence at that time. French and Spanish artifacts have been recovered from the fort's interior.²⁹

A second French expedition in 1564 led by René de Laudonnière established Fort Caroline at the mouth of the St. Johns River near what is today Mayport.³⁰ The following year, Spaniards under Pedro Menéndez de Avilés routed the French and won the fort, renaming it Fort San Mateo. Several hundred Frenchmen escaped with Jean Ribault, who had come to Fort Caroline with relief supplies for the settlers, arriving in Florida almost simultaneously with Menéndez.

28. Details of the search for and excavation of these vessels can be found in the papers contained in *Florida Anthropologist*, Volume 62, nos. 3-4 (2009) (whole issue); also Roger Smith, James Spirek, John Bratten, and Della Scott-Ireton, *The Emmanuel Point Ship Archaeological Investigations 1992-1995* (Tallahassee: Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, 1995); Roger Smith, John Bratten, J.R. Cozzi, and K. Plaskett, *The Emmanuel Point Ship Archaeological Investigations, 1997-1998* (Tallahassee: Florida Bureau of Archaeological Research and Report of Investigations No. 68 published jointly with the University of West Florida Archaeology Institute, Pensacola; James D. Collis, "Empire's Reach: A Structural and Historical Analysis of the Emanuel Point Shipwreck" (MA thesis, University of West Florida, 2008).

29. Chester B. DePratter, and Stanley South, *Charlesfort: The 1989 Search Project* (Columbia: South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Research, 1990); Chester B. DePratter, Stanley South and James B. Legg, "The Discovery of Charlesfort," *Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina* 101 (1996): 39-48.

30. McGrath, *The French in Early Florida*; René Laudonnière, *Three Voyages*, ed. Charles Bennett (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2001).

The contingent was shipwrecked before it reached safety, however, and several hundred Frenchmen were ultimately executed at Matanzas inlet on Menéndez's orders. Others, who were stranded near Cape Canaveral, were picked up and imprisoned, to die of hunger along with many of their Spanish captors.³¹

Despite repeated archaeological survey and test programs to locate the site of French Fort Caroline, no physical evidence of that settlement has yet been found.³² This is certainly in large part owing to the dramatic changes in coastal and estuarine morphology and modern development that have occurred over the last four centuries, and particularly during the past century.

A site thought to have been occupied by some of the shipwrecked survivors of the Fort Caroline reinforcement has been located in the Cape Canaveral National Seashore (the Armstrong site).³³ Sixteenth-century French coins, iron tools and nails, and metal objects reworked using European metallurgy techniques suggest that the shipwrecked Frenchmen may have made their encampment there before being found by Menéndez a few months later.

Colonization

St. Augustine, 1565-1572

Pedro Menéndez de Avilés founded the first enduring European settlement in La Florida in 1565 at St. Augustine. The 800 soldiers, sailors, and civilians established themselves at a Timucua Indian

31. McGrath, *The French in Early Florida*; Eugene Lyon, *The Enterprise of Florida. Pedro Menéndez de Avilés and the Spanish Conquest of 1565-1568* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1976), 121-130.
32. For reports on the unsuccessful archaeological searches, see Charles Fairbanks, "Archaeological Exploration at the Ft. Caroline National Historical Park Project, Florida" (Unpublished project report; Tallahassee, Southeast Archaeological Center, 1952); Rebecca Gorman, "Searching for Fort Caroline: New Perspectives" (paper submitted as partial requirements for the MA degree, University of Florida, 2005); Robert L. Thunen and Rebecca A. Gorman, "Looking for Fort Caroline: The 2004 Field Season and Beyond." (paper presented at the joint Southeastern Archaeological Conference and Midwest Archaeological Conference Meetings, St. Louis, Missouri 2004, on file, University of North Florida Anthropology Department, Jacksonville).
33. David Brewer and Beth Horvath, "In Search of Lost Frenchmen: Report on the 1990 and 1995 Archaeological Investigations at the Oyster Bay site (CACA-73, 8VO3128), Canaveral National Seashore, Volusia County Florida" (Tallahassee: National Park Service Southeast Archaeological Center, 2004); David Brewer and Beth Horvath, "In Search of Lost Frenchmen: Archeological Investigations at Canaveral NS," <http://www.nps.gov/archeology/sites/npsites/canaveral.htm> (accessed July 1, 2012).

town governed by a cacique named Seloy, principally because of its coastal proximity to the French establishment at Fort Caroline. Once the French were defeated and removed, their fort was renamed San Mateo, and 250 Spanish soldiers were garrisoned there. The remaining Spanish colonists under Menéndez built their own fortified encampment at St. Augustine. Within a few months, Menéndez had placed a second small garrison near the mouth of the Indian River, and in May of 1566 he established a second town at Santa Elena, located on what is now Parris Island, South Carolina (discussed below). This served as the capital of La Florida until 1577, while St. Augustine remained a small military garrison.³⁴

Even before establishing Santa Elena, relations between the Spaniards and the Timucua at St. Augustine deteriorated. In April of 1566, just eight months after they had arrived, the garrisons at both San Mateo and St. Augustine were in rebellion, and Timucua hostilities had escalated. The mutinies were quelled, but the resistance of the Timucua to Spanish presence in St. Augustine led Menéndez to relocate his settlement in May of 1566. The town and fort were rebuilt on what is today Anastasia Island on the east side of Matanzas Bay, and was reinforced by a 1,500 person fleet arriving in May of 1566.³⁵

In 1572 the town and fort were moved from Anastasia Island to its present location, partly because of the disastrous erosion of the island site, and partly because the Timucua in the immediate vicinity of St. Augustine were largely pacified.³⁶ Although no trace of the second town site on Anastasia Island has as yet been found, there have been long-term ongoing programs of excavation both at the site of what is believed to have been the initial encampment at Seloy, and the third, post-1572 town location.

The site of the initial 1565-1566 encampment is today located on the grounds of the Fountain of Youth Park and the Catholic Mission of Nombre de Dios, about one kilometer north of the Castillo de San Marcos.³⁷ Excavations have revealed a series of large, probably

34. The most detailed account of the Menéndez expedition is that of Eugene Lyon, *The Enterprise of Florida*.

35. Eugene Lyon, "The First Three Wooden Forts of Spanish St. Augustine, 1565-1571," *El Escribano* 34 (1997): 130-147.

36. Paul Hoffman, *Florida's Frontiers*, 47-62; Eugene Lyon, *Enterprise of Florida*, 140-157; Albert Manucy, *Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine: The People and their Homes* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1997).

37. The most recent comprehensive summary of the archaeological work at the Menéndez site is in Kathleen Deagan, *Fifty Years of Archaeology at the Fountain of Youth Park site (8-Sf-31), St. Augustine* (Gainesville: University of Florida, Florida

thatched rectangular structures built on wooden sill beam supports. These are thought to represent housing for the ten-man mess groups (*camaradas*) into which Menéndez organized his soldiers. Circular post structures in the style of Timucuan buildings were also present at the settlement, some of them clearly occupied during the Menéndez era. A very large, wood-floored structure interpreted as the Casa de Municiones (Store House/Armory) was located at the north end of the settlement. To the north of that, the base of what appears to have been a defensive wall extended some 200 feet along the northern side of the settlement. No evidence for a moat has been found archaeologically and it is likely that the entire encampment—enclosed by the wall on the north and surrounded with water on the other three sides in 1565—served as the initial “fort” of St. Augustine.

Despite the ephemeral nature of that occupation, thousands of fragmentary sixteenth-century Spanish artifacts (including pottery, lead shot, nails, buttons, beads etc.) have been recovered from barrel wells and trash deposits throughout the site. Analysis of food remains reveals that the Spanish diet was overwhelmingly comprised of local fish, shellfish, and plant foods, including acorns and greenbrier root.³⁸

Menéndez-era activity also extended to the south of the encampment, into the grounds of what is today the Shrine of Nuestra Señora de La Leche/Mission of Nombre de Dios.³⁹ A

Museum of Natural History, 2009). http://www.flmnh.ufl.edu/histarch/foy_site_reports.html (accessed August 1, 2012).

38. Dietary analysis of floral and faunal remains have been carried out and reported by Elizabeth Reitz and Margaret Scarry and their students. Elizabeth Reitz, “Analysis of fauna from the Fountain of Youth Park site, St. Augustine (8-SJ-31),” (Project report on file, Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville, 1988); “Animal Use and Culture Change in Spanish Florida,” *MASCA Research Papers in Science and Archaeology* 8 (1991), 62-77; Kelly L. Orr and Carol Colaninno, *Native American and Spanish Subsistence in Sixteenth-century St. Augustine: Vertebrate Faunal Remains from Fountain of Youth (8SJ31)*, St. Johns Co., Florida (Athens: Georgia Museum of Natural History Zooarchaeology Laboratory, 2008); Margaret Scarry, “Plant Remains from the Fountain of Youth Park Site (8SJ31) St. Augustine” (Project report on file, Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville, 1989); Margaret Scarry and Elizabeth Reitz, “Herbs, Fish, and Other Scum and Vermin; Subsistence Strategies in Sixteenth-Century Spanish Florida,” in *Columbian Consequences* vol. 2, 354-358. See also Deagan, *Fifty Years of Historical Archaeology*, 208-215.
39. The many years of excavation and resulting field reports at this site are summarized in Kathleen Deagan, *Archaeology at 8SJ34, the Nombre de Dios Mission/La Leche Shrine Site, St. Augustine. Summary Report on the 1934-2011 Excavations* (Gainesville: Florida Museum of Natural History, 2012) http://www.flmnh.ufl.edu/histarch/NDD_site_reports.html. (accessed January 5, 2013).

series of posts and trenches dating to the mid-sixteenth century suggest that this may have been the site of the blockhouse erected by Menéndez in 1567 at "Old St. Augustine." Excavations have also documented a slightly later sixteenth-century occupation related to lime burning, including a potkiln using oyster shell as ore.

The lime burning operation was probably in service for construction activities in the third and final site of St. Augustine, established to the south of the present-day plaza in 1572. The layout of that settlement is still evident in the street plan of the area, conforming to the series of blocks depicted on the Baptiste Boazio drawing of St. Augustine in 1586. Archaeological verification of the church site shown on that image was established by the presence of densely concentrated Christian burials during a construction project in the 1960s. The church provided a point of reference for comparing the 1586 Boazio drawing to the present streetscape, and the buried remains of the town verified the 1586 layout. Since then, excavations by St. Augustine City Archaeologist Carl Halbirt have provided additional detail and have documented the pattern of spatial expansion during the sixteenth century and beyond in St. Augustine.⁴⁰

During the 1970s, the St. Augustine Restoration Foundation Inc. (now St. Augustine Foundation, housed at Flagler College, St. Augustine) initiated an intensive multidisciplinary research initiative to understand St. Augustine in the late sixteenth century. The program incorporated historical, anthropological, and archaeological research on "St. Augustine 1580" in support of potential reconstruction and interpretation.⁴¹

-
40. Kathleen Deagan, "The Town Plan of Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine: the Archaeological Evidence" (project report submitted to the St. Augustine Foundation, St. Augustine Florida, 1981), and "Downtown survey: The Discovery of 16th Century St. Augustine in an Urban Area," *American Antiquity* 46, no. 3 (1981): 626-633; Carl D. Halbirt, "New Evidence for St. Augustine's 16th Century Cultural Landscape" (paper presented at the 55th Annual Conference of the Florida Anthropological Society, Tallahassee, Florida, 2003, collection of the author); Carl D. Halbirt, "The Plaza de la Constitución, The Archaeology of One of St. Augustine's Oldest Landmarks," Unpublished Manuscript, Office of the City Archaeologist, St. Augustine (1996); Carl D. Halbirt, "Aviles Street: St. Augustine's Oldest Documented Road," *St. Augustine Archaeological Association Newsletter* 24, no.4 (2011): 1-5.
41. Paul E. Hoffman, "St. Augustine 1580, the Research Project," *El Escribano* 14 (1977): 5-19; Eugene Lyon, "St. Augustine 1580: the Living Community," *El Escribano* 14 (1977): 20-34; Albert Manucy, "Toward Recreation of 16th Century St. Augustine," *El Escribano* 14 (1977): 1-4.

The St. Augustine 1580 project also led to a multi-year archaeological focus (1977-1989) on St. Augustine's sixteenth-century urban sites, carried out through the State University Field schools, the Historic St. Augustine Preservation Board and the City of St. Augustine Archaeological Program.⁴² Excavations tested ten sixteenth-century residential home sites, the parish Church and cemetery of Los Remedios, the town plaza, and the hermitage and cemetery of La Soledad. Despite the heavy disturbances to the sixteenth-century archaeological deposits from 450 years of urban development, this body of research has elucidated the town plan and traced its expansion, confirming that this third site of St. Augustine was laid out on a grid plan according to the long-standing principles for colonial spatial organization codified in the 1573 "Ordinances Concerning Discoveries."⁴³

Archaeological excavation has also documented the architecture and use of space in residential lots. Wattle and daub and post and board building construction techniques were used. Homes were consistently near the front of the lots, usually on the street edges, with walled or fenced lots, gardens, barrel wells, and trash disposal pits located within the walls or fences. Barrel

42. Much of the data for the residential sites is synthesized by the articles in Kathleen Deagan, ed., "The Archaeology of 16th Century St. Augustine," *The Florida Anthropologist* 38, nos. 1-2 (1985) and Deagan, "The Town Plan of Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine" (1981). Work at other residential sites is reported in Stanley Bond, Valerie Bell, and Susan Parker, "Archaeological Excavations at the Puente Site (SA24) and Potters Parking Lot (SA 23), St. Augustine, Florida." (Ms. on file, Government House Library, St. Augustine, (1994); Bruce Piatek, Stanley Bond, and Mary Martin, "Excavations in the Government House courtyard"(draft project report on file, Florida Museum of Natural History Gainesville, 1994); Teresa Singleton, "The Archaeology of a Pre-Eighteenth Century Household in St. Augustine" (MA thesis, University of Florida, 1977). Cemetery excavations are reported in Olga Caballero and Martha Zierden, "Excavations at SA-28-1 (Spanish hospital site), St. Augustine" (project report on file, Florida Museum of Natural History, Gainesville, 1980); and Joan K. Koch, "Mortuary behavior patterning and physical anthropology in colonial St. Augustine," in *Spanish St. Augustine: The Archaeology of a Colonial Creole Community*, ed. Kathleen A. Deagan (New York: Academic Press, 1983), 147-181. Sixteenth-century dietary patterns and foodways are comprehensively reported by Elizabeth Reitz and Margaret Scarry, *Reconstructing Historic Subsistence with an Example from Sixteenth-Century Spanish Florida* (Glassboro, NJ: Society for Historical Archaeology, 1985). A synthetic discussion of sixteenth-century architectural practices can be found in Manucy, *Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine*.

43. Zelia Nuttall, "Royal Ordinances Concerning the Laying Out of New Towns," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 5, no. 2 (1922): 249-254. Also see Dora Crouch, Daniel Garr, and Axel Munding, eds., *Spanish City Planning in North America* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1982).

wells were regularly placed some 12-15 meters apart along streets, probably reflecting the ordinance-designated size of city lots. They seem also to be consistently placed between from 12 and 15 meters back from the streets, behind structures. Other wells farther away from homes were probably used for garden and livestock watering. This pattern of household use of space in the sixteenth century persisted through the first Spanish period (to 1763), revealing a marked conservatism in this aspect of Spanish colonial life.

From the earliest days of settlement in Florida, Spanish soldiers married Native American women, who introduced their own dietary and household management traditions into St. Augustine's households. The food preparation technologies used traditionally in Spain were replaced by unmodified Native American pots for cooking and storage as well as *manos* and *metates* for the preparation of corn and cassava. Little accommodation to Spanish cooking practice can be found in the archaeological record of these sites. Through the entire first Spanish period (1565-1763), pots with traditional Native American design and decoration dominated the "Spanish" kitchens of St. Augustine. Serving and tableware, however, remained nearly exclusively European in origin and appearance.⁴⁴

The year 1586 was the most notable and destructive time for sixteenth-century St. Augustine, because of both the burning of the town by Francis Drake, and Spanish officials' decision to abandon the northern town of Santa Elena and consolidate the settlements in St. Augustine (carried out in 1587). Archaeological evidence for what is thought to be the Drake raid has been occasionally located in St. Augustine's sixteenth-century deposits, most notably the recent find of a burned floor section still bearing the remains of a number of nearly intact, apparently abandoned vessels.⁴⁵ The simultaneous devastation of the town and the population increase provoked a

44. Deagan, *Sixteenth-Century St. Augustine*, 6-33. For analysis of this pattern and its implications, see Kathleen Deagan, "The Spanish Atlantic World on the Eve of Jamestown," in *Archaeology of Early European Colonial Settlement in the Emerging Atlantic World*, ed. William Kelso (Rockville, MD: Society for Historical Archaeology, 2010), 31-52. One of the few comparative studies of sixteenth-century Spain and Spanish America is Bonnie G. McEwan, "An Archaeological Perspective of Sixteenth-Century Spanish Life in the Old World and the Americas." (PhD diss., University of Florida, 1988).

45. Carl Halbirt and MisCha Johns, "The Legacy of El Dragón: The 1586 Raid of Francis Drake" (paper presented at the St. Augustine Art Association 450th Legacy Program, on file, City of St. Augustine Office of the City Archaeologist, 2012).

rebuilding and expansion of the original town area, a process that is gradually being understood as archaeology continues.

Santa Elena

For the first few years after Santa Elena's establishment in 1566, the fledgling settlement was plagued by native resistance and soldiers' mutinies.⁴⁶ As the intended capitol, however, civilian settlers were sent to Santa Elena and, by end of 1569, the population had grown to more than 300 people in 40 houses. In 1571, Pedro Menéndez brought his wife and other family members to Florida and established wealthy households at Santa Elena, but Indian conflict led to the burning of the community in 1576. The town was briefly abandoned and ceased to be the capital of La Florida. By late 1580, however, 60 new houses and another fort had been built there. Six years later, the threats of French and pirate attacks, continuing native hostility, and the expenses of maintaining two forts in Florida caused Spanish authorities to abandon Santa Elena and consolidate the garrisons and populations at St. Augustine.

The site of Santa Elena was located conclusively in 1979 by Stanley South of the South Carolina Institute for Archaeology and Anthropology, initiating a multi-year program of archaeological excavation.⁴⁷ The settlement covers an area of about 15 acres, extending about 365 meters in length by varying widths. Excavations have uncovered portions of two forts and important

46. Eugene Lyon, *Santa Elena: A Brief History of the Colony, 1566-1587* (Columbia, SC: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1984); Karen Paar, "'To Settle Is to Conquer': Spaniards, Native Americans, and the Colonization of Santa Elena in Sixteenth-Century Florida" (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1999).

47. Fort San Marcos, one of the last Spanish Forts, had been misidentified as the French Charlesfort since the 17th century. After modification by the US Marines as part of their training camp for World War I, the fort site was excavated by Major George Osterhout (USMC) in 1923. Finding what were in fact Spanish ceramics but mistaking them for French, he published his findings, further cementing the site's reputation, shortly commemorated by the Huguenot Society of South Carolina with a monument. The site's Spanish nature was later asserted by Jeannette T. Connor and others, but was not further verified until Albert Manucy examined various artifacts from Osterhout's excavations in 1957. Knowing Spanish ceramics from his work at St. Augustine, Manucy correctly identified the site. see Paul E. Hoffman, "Sixteenth-Century Fortifications on Parris Island, South Carolina," (Ms. Report prepared for Joseph R. Judge, Associate Editor, *National Geographic Magazine*, 1978), 1-4. Collection of the editor of this volume of the *Quarterly*).

residential compounds dating to the post-1578 occupation.⁴⁸ The remains of the forts at Santa Elena are the only European-style sixteenth-century Spanish forts (moated and bastioned) that have been located archaeologically in La Florida (or, for that matter, North America).

Another singular discovery at the site is a sixteenth-century Spanish pottery kiln containing remnants of the last firing load.⁴⁹ The vessels were all of a type known as “redware” and several were made in late medieval, Moorish-influenced Spanish forms. No other post-fifteenth century pottery kilns producing European-style vessels have been excavated in Spanish La Florida or the Spanish Caribbean.

The two excavated residential compounds at Santa Elena appear to have been elite households, not only because of the size and configuration of the buildings, but also because of the size of the lots themselves. These adjacent households yielded a very rich assemblage of excavated artifacts. Rare Chinese porcelain, Spanish and Italian glazed pottery, metallic lace, jewelry, ornaments, weaponry and clothing fasteners have been recovered. As in sixteenth-century St. Augustine, so too the residents of these elite Santa Elena households incorporated Native American cooking pottery into their kitchen practices, but at a much lower intensity (31% of all artifacts) than the St. Augustine households of the same period (40%-59% of all artifacts).

In general, the artifacts at Santa Elena are more abundant, more varied, and were originally more costly than the artifacts recovered from contemporary contexts in St. Augustine. As

48. The extensive excavations at Santa Elena are documented in a series of reports published by the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina. See Stanley South, *The Discovery of Santa Elena* (Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1980); *Exploring Santa Elena* (Research Manuscript Series No. 184, 1982); *Revealing Santa Elena 1982* (Research Manuscript Series No. 188, 1983); *Testing Archaeological Sampling Methods at Fort San Felipe 1983*. *Research Manuscript Series 190*. (1984); *Excavation of the Casa Fuerte and Wells at Fort San Felipe 1984* (Research Manuscript Series No. 196, 1985); Stanley South and William Hunt, *Discovering Santa Elena West of Fort San Felipe* (Research Manuscript Series No. 200, 1986); Stanley South and Chester DePratter, *Block Excavation 1993* (Research Manuscript Series No. 222, 1996); Chester DePratter and Stanley South, *Discovery at Santa Elena: Boundary Survey* (Research Manuscript Series No. 221, 1995).

49. Chester DePratter, “Return to the kiln; Fall 1997 Excavations at Santa Elena,” *Legacy* 3, no. 1 (January 1998) <http://artsandsciences.sc.edu/sciaa/staff/depratterc/1998.html> (accessed July 20, 2012).

South and DePratter have noted, "the backyard collection in 38BU162N [a single house lot in Santa Elena] is more diverse and more abundant than that found in all of the [sixteenth-century] St. Augustine collections available for study in 1985."⁵⁰ Although there are various mitigating archaeological reasons for this (for example, the continuous occupation of the St. Augustine sites from the sixteenth century to the present, destructive urban development processes, and the sudden abandonment of Santa Elena), the role of Santa Elena as the capital of La Florida and as the home of elite society are the principal factors in its contrast to St. Augustine. Santa Elena vividly underscores the stark social and material inequalities in sixteenth-century Spanish society⁵¹.

The First Missions and the Hinterland

Even before founding Santa Elena, Menéndez de Aviles established military outposts in at least eight locations throughout peninsular Florida.⁵² The principal garrisons were located at Tequesta, in present-day Miami, at Carlos among the Calusa of southwest Florida, and at Tocobaga, in the Tampa Bay region. The former two locations were also the sites of short-lived Jesuit missions. Archaeologists have tentatively identified the locations of these establishments, however no systematic excavations designed to study the European outposts or Native American society during the early contact period have been carried out. This is largely owing to the long history of unscientific excavation and artifact looting at many of the sites, as well as to site destruction by twentieth century development.

The best documented of these outpost-missions is Carlos, the Calusa capitol on present-day Mound Key, where the Jesuit mission of San Antonio de Carlos (1567-1569) was located. Various surface collections and a few non-systematic excavations over the past

50. South and DePratter, *Block Excavation 1993*, 116.

51. Such social and material inequality also occurred within the communities. Testing by St. Augustine City Archaeologist Carl Halbirt has located sixteenth-century deposits with relative artifact proportions similar to those at Santa Elena. See Rebecca Barrera "The Impact of Site Formation Processes, Method and Theory: Inter-site Comparisons of 16th Century Spanish Santa Elena and St. Augustine deposits" (MA thesis, University of South Carolina, 2005). Sites at Santa Elena occupied by lower-status inhabitants have not yet been excavated.

52. Hoffman, *Florida's Frontiers*, 52-57; Eugene Lyon, "Pedro Menendez's Strategic Plan for the Florida Peninsula," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (1988): 1-14.

century recovered a large collection of European artifacts ranging from the early sixteenth century to the late seventeenth century.⁵³ Much of the material undoubtedly came from shipwreck salvage, but some may be associated with the sixteenth-century Jesuit missions and the equally unsuccessful Franciscan mission attempt in 1697.⁵⁴

The town of Tequesta, where a Spanish garrison and Jesuit mission were located from 1567-1570, is thought to have been at the Granada site, a large Tequesta habitation site on the north side of the mouth of the Miami River. A large portion of the site (which no longer exists today) was excavated during the 1970s prior to its development. The excavations recovered Spanish artifacts, but the fortified mission settlement itself was not located.⁵⁵

The town of Tocobaga was the political center for the Tocobaga people of the central Florida Gulf coast and is thought to have been located at the Safety Harbor site in Pinellas County.⁵⁶ Menéndez established a garrison of 20 men there during 1567 but, like the outposts at Carlos and Tequesta, it was soon abandoned in response to intense native hostility. No sites associated with the Jesuit mission efforts in the northern parts of La Florida (1568-1572) have been archaeologically identified.

The Franciscan missions of La Florida are—both historically and archaeologically—essentially part of the seventeenth century story. Although the first Franciscan friars arrived in Florida in 1573, no missions were formally established until 1587. The first decade of Franciscan mission activity was marked by uncertainty and contraction, and punctuated by the violent revolt of Guale mission Indians in 1597.⁵⁷ The sites of several Franciscan missions

53. Clifford Lewis, "The Calusa," in *Tacachale: Essays on the Indians of Florida and Southeastern Georgia during the Historic Period*, ed. Jerald T. Milanich and Samuel Proctor (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1978), 19-49; Ryan Wheeler, *Treasure of the Calusa: the Johnson/Willcox collection from Mound Key, Florida*. (Tallahassee, FL: Rose Printing, 2000).

54. See John Hann, *Missions to the Calusa* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1991).

55. John W. Griffin, ed., *Excavations at the Granada site* (Tallahassee: Florida Dept. of State, Division of Archives, History and Records Management, 1982), 5-6.

56. Ripley P. Bullen, "Tocobaga Indians and the Safety Harbor culture," in *Tacachale*, 50-58; Jeffery Mitchem, "Redefining Safety Harbor: Late Prehistoric/Protohistoric Archaeology in West Peninsular Florida" (PhD diss., University of Florida, 1989), 53-58.

57. Discussed in Michael J. Francis and Kathleen Kole, *Murder and Martyrdom in Spanish Florida: Don Juan and the Guale Uprising of 1597* (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 2011); Hoffman, *Florida Frontiers*, 74-90; Michael Gannon, *The Cross in the Sand* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1965), 39-43.

established in 1587 have been located, however only in recent decades has there been renewed archaeological attention to them.⁵⁸

Mission Nombre de Dios at St. Augustine (1587-1763) was perhaps the first Franciscan mission in Florida, with a church built in 1587 within a settlement of already largely Christian Timucuan people. The late sixteenth-century mission church was discovered in 1933 when workers planting trees found several human skeletons on the grounds of the Fountain of Youth Park. Roy Dickson excavated the burial site in 1934 under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution, and it was left open as a tourist attraction until 1995, when the remains were reburied. The 1934 project remained unreported until the 1950s and the skeletal remains themselves were not studied until 1992, by which time they were largely deteriorated.⁵⁹

Dickson excavated more than 112 burials, finding that in 26 cases two or more individuals were placed in the same burial pit. Six of these burials incorporated adults and children, perhaps representing family burials and possibly reflecting epidemic disease that eliminated whole families. Grave goods (predominantly shell and glass beads) accompanied the burials of infants and children. Most of the burials were extended in the typical Catholic fashion, however there were bundle (i.e. disarticulated before burial) and

-
58. The site of the Mission San Pedro de Tacatacuru among the Mocama Timucua on Cumberland Island, is examined in Jerald Milanich, "Tacatacuru and the San Pedro de Mocamo Mission," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 50, no. 3 (1972): 283-291. Tests at the Mocama Timucua Mission of San Juan del Puerto on Fort George Island, Florida, are reported in Martin Dickinson, "Delineating a Site through Limited Research: the Mission of San Juan Del Puerto (8DU53), Fort George Island, Florida," *Florida Anthropologist* 42, no.4 (1989): 396-409; John W. Griffin, "Preliminary Papers on the Site of the Mission of San Juan del Puerto, Fort George Island, Florida," *Papers of the Jacksonville Historical Society* 4 (1960): 63-66; and Judith A. MacMurray, "The Definition of the Ceramic Complex at San Juan del Puerto" (MA thesis, University of Florida, 1973). James Davidson and Rebecca Douberly of the University of Florida recently began renewed excavation of the mission center.
59. On the burial excavation, see Lillian Seaberg, "Report on the Indian Site at the 'Fountain of Youth'" (Ms. on file, Florida State Museum, University of Florida; Reprinted in *Spanish St. Augustine: A Sourcebook for America's Ancient City*, ed. by Kathleen Deagan (New York: Garland Press, 1991), 209-279. The skeletal analysis is reported by David Dickel, "Results of Investigation of Twelve Burials at 8-SJ-31, the Fountain of Youth, St. Augustine, Florida" (Unpublished report, on file, Florida Bureau of Archaeological Research, Tallahassee, 1990).

flexed burials among the extended remains. Five burials included an adult accompanied by a single disarticulated human skull.

These non-Christian aspects of the cemetery may indicate the incorporation of traditional Native American burial practices into early mission burial sites, a process that David H. Thomas describes as a “pre-parochial” or intermediate stage of mission development.⁶⁰ This is particularly well-illustrated at the mission site of Santa Catalina de Guale, which has been the focus of very important, decades-long systematic excavations directed by Thomas.⁶¹ Two stages of the mission occupation have been delineated (1587-1597, and 1604- ca. 1650). Excavations have uncovered the remains of the churches, *conventos* (friars’ quarters), a kitchen, wells, the churchyard of the complex and part of the Indian pueblo associated with the mission. The work has provided detailed information about early Franciscan mission architecture and building construction, organization of space, diet, material culture, and economic strategies.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the site has been the excavation of the 20 by 11 meter wattle and daub church itself, in which more than 400 native people had been buried. The burials were accompanied by an extraordinary array of grave goods, including nearly 70,000 glass beads, religious medallions, gold and silver ornaments, crosses, plaques, Spanish majolica vessels, and some Native American ritual objects. This is a far more elaborate and costly assemblage of objects than any found in La Florida’s Spanish

60. David H. Thomas, “Saints and Soldiers at Santa Catalina: Hispanic Designs for Colonial America,” in *The Recovery of Meaning*, ed. Mark Leone and Parker Potter (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1988); David Hurst Thomas, *St. Catherine’s: An Island in Time* (Atlanta: Georgia Humanities Council, 1988), 73-140.

61. David Hurst Thomas, “Archaeology of Mission Santa Catalina de Guale: Our First Fifteen Years,” in *Spanish Missions of La Florida*, ed. Bonnie G. McEwan (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993), 1-34; David H. Thomas and Fred C. Andrus, *Native American Landscapes of St. Catherine’s Island, Georgia* (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 2008); Elliot Blair, Lorann S. A. Pendleton, Peter Francis, Eric A. Powell, and David H. Thomas, *The Beads of St. Catherine’s Island* (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 2009); David Hurst Thomas, “Native American Landscapes of St. Catherine’s Island,” in *The Beads of St. Catherine’s Island*, 15-35. A comprehensive consideration of pre-and post-contact Guale diet and subsistence, as well as of mission subsistence in La Florida, is provided in Elizabeth Reitz, Barnet Pavo-Zuckerman, Daniel C. Weinand and Gwyneth A. Duncan, *Mission and Pueblo Santa Catalina De Guale, St. Catherine’s Island, Georgia: A Comparative Zooarchaeological Analysis* (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 2010).

settlements and missions, with the possible exception of Mission San Luis de Talimali, the capitol of the Apalachee Mission province after ca. 1650.⁶² Although most of the materials from the Santa Catalina church excavation were from the early seventeenth century occupation, the assemblage is an unprecedented look at the material strategies employed both by Spanish missionaries and by Guale people in the delicate early stages of evangelization and conversion.

Some of the most original and valuable information from this program has been generated by the extensive bioarchaeological studies of the Santa Catalina de Guale skeletal remains, directed by Clark Larsen.⁶³ Studies of skeletal and dental morphology and pathology, as well as bone isotope analysis, have provided details about health conditions before and after contact in the region, starkly documenting the physical perils of mission life. Bioarchaeologists have also questioned the cultural identities of the people buried at Santa Catalina by comparing them to the remains of prehistoric Guale people in the region. Preliminary work suggests that the mission population differed noticeably from the prehistoric Guale population of the area. They were, however, quite similar to the population of Santa Maria de Yamassee, a seventeenth century mission site on Amelia Island, Florida, that was ethnographically documented to have been occupied by Yamassee Indians. This has raised questions about the true distinctions between populations referred to by the Spanish as "Guale" versus "Yamassee." Although bioarchaeologists have always assumed these populations to have been members of separate cultural groups, it is suggested that these names may, in fact, have actually reflected geographical locations within essentially the same population.⁶⁴

The intersection of bioarchaeology, archaeological settlement studies, tree ring data, and isotope analysis have demonstrated that sixteenth-century coastal Guale people relied on corn in their diets and were, in general, largely sedentary. This finding directly

62. John Hann and Bonnie G. McEwan, *The Apalachee Indians and Mission San Luis* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998).

63. Clark Spencer Larsen, *The Archaeology of Mission Santa Catalina De Guale. Bio-cultural Interpretations of a Population in Transition* (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1990); See also the essays in Clark Spencer Larsen, ed., *Bioarchaeology of Spanish Florida: The Impact of Colonialism*. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001).

64. Mark C. Griffin, Patricia M. Lambert, and Elizabeth Monahan, "Biological Relationships and Population History of Native Peoples in Spanish Florida and the American Southeast," in Larsen, *Bioarchaeology of Spanish Florida*, 274-309.

contradicts the historical accounts of the Jesuit missionaries in the region, who bemoaned that the Guale people never stayed in one place, and did not farm. Dendrochronological analysis (tree ring studies), however, has revealed that the years 1562-1571 marked a period of severe and prolonged drought along the south Atlantic coast. It seems quite possible that the early Spanish observers in the region were describing a more mobile and temporary way of life that compensated for the difficulty of farming during such a prolonged drought period.⁶⁵

These and other results of multidisciplinary historical bioarchaeological studies of native peoples throughout La Florida are slowly helping to refine our understanding of the complex and chaotic population movements among indigenous peoples during the second half of the sixteenth century.⁶⁶

In recent decades, historical archaeologists studying La Florida have increasingly placed the native people of the region at the center of their efforts. Growing out of studies initially intended to chart the paths of European explorers, a number of researchers (particularly those interested in the interior parts of La Florida) have concentrated on revealing indigenous social and political dynamics, population movements related to shifting power structures, ecological changes, and the emergence of new ethnic identities among Native American groups during the sixteenth century.⁶⁷ That is also another story that extends

65. For a summary of this research, see David H. Thomas, "The Guale Problem," in *Native American Landscapes*, 3: 1095-1115. On the original dendrochronological research, see David W. Stahle, Malcolm K. Cleaveland, Dennis B. Blanton, Matthew D. Therrell, and David A. Gay, "The Lost Colony and Jamestown Droughts," *Science* 280:5363 (April 24, 1998): 564-567.

66. For synthetic discussion of this complicated topic, see John Worth, "Ethnicity and Ceramics on the Southeastern Atlantic Coast: An Ethnohistorical Analysis," in *From Santa Elena to St. Augustine: Indigenous Ceramic Variability (A.D. 1400-1700)*, ed. Kathleen Deagan and David Hurst Thomas (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 2009), 179-207.

67. Examples and entrees to the associated literature can be found in the essays in Cameron B. Wesson and Mark Rees, *Between Colonies and Contact: Archaeological Perspectives in the Protohistoric Southeast* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002); Patricia Galloway, *Choctaw Genesis, 1500-1700*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995); Marvin Smith, *Coosa*; Amanda L. Regnier, "Stylistic Analysis of Burial Urns from the Protohistoric Period in Central Alabama," *Southeastern Archaeology* 25, no. 1 (2006): 121-134. The essays in Deagan and Thomas, *From Santa Elena to St. Augustine*, consider issues of Native American identity, interaction, culture change, and movement as revealed in pottery production and distribution.

into the seventeenth century and later; however, it is an area in which archaeology can potentially make original and otherwise unobtainable contributions. One of the difficulties in this emphasis is that in most cases, only those archaeological sites containing European-derived artifacts or animal bones can be confidently dated to the sixteenth century. This presents a potential sampling bias, in that there were undoubtedly many indigenous communities that did not participate in, or perhaps even rejected, the interactions and exchange networks that brought European materials into sixteenth-century Native American settlements.

Summation

The contributions of historical archaeology to the study of sixteenth-century La Florida have been most evident in the reconstruction of sixteenth-century explorers' routes and, consequently, the identification of Native American towns and settlement patterns. Questions about the impact of these explorers on the Native peoples of La Florida, particularly with regard to epidemic disease, remain unresolved (but still under investigation) by archaeology.

As archaeological research has become more interdisciplinary and more technologically sophisticated, new insights into Native American health, genetic relationships, diet, the environment, and work stresses associated with colonization are becoming more apparent. Many archaeologists are turning to questions of political and social processes in native La Florida during the "protohistoric" period in an effort to understand the underlying or predisposing conditions of cultural continuity and change. This emphasis represents a return—albeit in more modern terms—to the earliest concerns of historical archaeology in Florida (John W. Griffin's 1948 agenda) for closer collaboration between historians and archaeologist in understanding the location, dates, and social organization of Native American sites during the historic period.

Archaeological attention to sixteenth-century European sites in La Florida began somewhat later, with the excavations in sixteenth-century St. Augustine and Santa Elena. The hastily-constructed, mostly coastal, and short-lived sites of much sixteenth-century European occupation have suffered from coastal erosion and modern development and none have been located outside these two principal towns. Excavations in the Spanish towns, however, have revealed a

great deal about colonial life that is not documented in historical records, including details of spatial organization, architecture and building construction, clothing, diet, household life, health, and hygiene. This information, contextualized with documentary evidence, has allowed archaeologists to address questions of gender roles, multi-ethnic interaction and intermarriage, and material expressions of social inequality.

The most glaring omission in these programs is the absence of information from the very earliest periods of occupation (the missing second site of St. Augustine and the first period of Santa Elena) when these social patterns were first solidified. The study of the 1526 town of San Miguel de Gualdape, also as yet undiscovered, would be particularly important in understanding the development of the adaptive strategies of Spanish colonists, sixteenth-century American Indians and, possibly, African slaves. This importance arises because San Miguel was launched from the essentially late medieval Caribbean colony of Hispaniola (rather than from Spain, as Menéndez's colony was), before there was any substantive Spanish knowledge about the people and landscapes of La Florida.

At the end of the sixteenth century, the Spanish presence in La Florida was much reduced, and there was debate over whether the colony should even exist. It was, however on the brink of a major expansion of missions, garrisons and ranches into the hinterland and entry into a new international arena of conflict in the seventeenth century. That is another, even richer archaeological story.