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Abstract

In 1972 Harold Huscher created a brief archaeological report on his 1966-1969 excavations on the Burnt Village site (9TP9), a Creek Indian village named Okfuskenena. That same year it was flooded by the waters of the West Point reservoir. His report is more a brief history of the project than a traditional site report. He died in 1991 without writing a full report. Here I present another portion of the data from that site, focusing on the maps and structures located during his excavations. This has been made easier through the use of modern mapping software. It also draws from the author's early archaeological experience with Huscher and this site located in western Georgia. While this is still not the much needed site report for the site, it is a step in that overall goal.
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Introduction

I first heard of the famous Burnt Village - Okfuskenena - in September of 1968 at the beginning of my junior year as a college student at the University of Georgia. I had just completed my first summer conducting archaeological excavations at a historic Cherokee site in the Keowee Valley in South Carolina, and began my course work as an Anthropology major at UGA. My recent decision to pursue a career in archaeology had me excited and I met with faculty member and Director of the Laboratory of Archaeology Dr. Joe Caldwell, hoping he had some lab work for me. I was aware of his wonderful reputation, and actually hoped I could work directly with him. He thought about my question for a minute or two and then said that he did have a lab job for me working with someone named Harold Huscher. I had not heard this name before.

Soon I reported to Mr. Huscher at his lab / office complex located in the Lucy Cobb building on Milledgeville Avenue in Athens. At that time the building had not been painted or maintained in decades and was on the verge of collapse. It was deemed fit by the University only for an archaeology lab. Huscher, who was teaching two sections of Introduction to Anthropology that quarter, spent a few minutes quietly telling me about his summer excavations at archaeological sites in the West Point Reservoir and the fascinating story of the Burnt Village. It was a small Creek town that had been attacked at night on September 27, 1793, by white renegades who were trying to run the Creeks out of Georgia. They killed several Indians, and burned the town to the ground. Huscher had no idea about my dedication or abilities, but seemed glad to have a student worker—as long as said student was properly compliant. The first task he set for me was taking field drawings made in pencil and carefully tracing every line and word with a
crow quill pen dipped in India ink to make the drawings permanent. This I did several
days a week for the next two or three months. With 20-20 hindsight I do believe he was
testing me to see if I would quit. I then moved up to washing sherds—a task I continued
into the spring of 1969. By then he trusted me a bit more and I was allowed to choose
more interesting projects such as reconstructing ceramic vessels and organizing the site
artifact catalogs. I then choose to work on the historic trade material from the Burnt
Village, 9TP9. Much of this material needed to be cleaned, preserved, and studied for
comparative purposes and he eventually gave me free reign to work on this collection.

During the summer of 1969 Huscher went back to the West Point area to conduct
more excavations, and I ran the lab for him in Athens. This required me to drive over
occasionally to bring artifacts back from the field, and I was given tours of all the sites,
especially the Burnt Village. Work at that site had essentially been completed by then,
and they were just excavating a few additional features. I remember the site as simply a
large field on the western bank of the Chattahoochee River. The river was not clearly
visible from the site due to a large number of trees along the bank to the east.

By the fall of 1969 I was still working with the Burnt Village trade materials and
Huscher decided we should give a paper on them at the Southeastern Archaeological
Conference meeting that was to be held at Macon, Georgia in November. At that time
SEAC was on Friday and Saturday, and The Conference on Historic Sites Archaeology,
led by Stanley South, met on Thursday. Our paper was to be in this session. I got to
work, wrote a paper, took many color slides of the historic artifacts, and made my first
professional paper presentation. Huscher edited the paper lightly and put his name ahead
of mine on it (Huscher and Williams 1969). I was very happy anyway.
I continued to work with Huscher and the West Point collections until I graduated from UGA in June of 1970. The Viet Nam war, my good health, and low draft number required me to enlist in the U.S. Air Force and leave the Georgia area for several years. In about 1971, Caldwell contacted me to get a copy of the Burnt Village trade goods paper I had written and presented, and it was included as an appendix in Huscher's 1972 limited report to the National Park Service on the West Point data. Margaret Russell's paper on the Okfuskee was also included as an appendix to this report (Russell 1972). This too-brief report lightly summarizes the data from the Burnt Village, and was never intended by Huscher or Caldwell to be a complete report for this important site. It primarily presents a synopsis of the historic references to the town (Huscher 1972). The only additional work on the West Point data was that of David Hally and Leila Oertel in 1977, on the Park Mound, 9TP41. Hally reports that he was required by the terms of the National Park Service to complete this report since Huscher was no longer associated with the University by that time. Huscher eventually retired to a small house in Standing Rock, Alabama, on property owned by Bob and Marjorie Gay. He died in 1991 and is buried in Standing Rock. Marjorie Gay reports that in his final years he wanted to complete the Burnt Village report, but simply never was able to accomplish it. I began working full time with UGA about that same time.

During the last 40 years very little additional work has taken place on the Burnt Village data. However, my interest in the site has never completely gone away. In 1996 I assigned an undergraduate student (Steve Hatch) to digitize the Burnt Village field maps at the University of Georgia. There were almost 80 of these maps, and they were recorded at four different scales when Huscher recorded them using a plane table and
alidade in the field. This was clearly a job for GIS, the new cool tool at that time. The feature numbers and post hole numbers had been inconsistently assigned and the software we used was a now obsolete program—the DOS version of Atlas GIS. After looking at the completed map I was disappointed in the lack of clear patterns in the data and did not pursue the matter further at the time. In the intervening years I have kept this data, but have done little with it because I knew there were many problems with the data set. For the current project, this data has been processed through ArcGIS and then analyzed using Surfer.

About five years ago Matt Williamson from Georgia Southern University initiated an analysis of the human remains from the Burnt Village burials as a physical anthropology project. His work is now nearing completion. About the same time he started his work, Thomas Foster and I applied, at his suggestion, for a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to complete a report on the Burnt Village map and artifact data, but this was not funded NEH. Thomas is now a faculty member at West Georgia University.
**Problems with the Original Data Set**

There is little or no doubt that site 9TP9 as excavated by Huscher proved to be the location of the Burnt Village-Okfuskenena of historical fame (Figure 1). The artifacts recovered are of the proper time period, fulfilling Huscher’s goal of identifying the location of this important site. Certainly an equally vital goal of his excavation was to discover specific details of the structure of this town—its houses and other buildings, their distribution, and their forms as derived from a study of the post molds discovered and recorded. In a broader sense, he was trying to discover as much as possible based upon archaeological data, of late 18th century Creek lifeways. It is also clear that a great deal of data were recovered from the site, very little of which has yet been published. Certainly my goal here is to rectify that situation. As an archaeologist who has been involved with many large archaeological data sets for almost four decades, I must now admit that there are a number of very real problems with the data set from the Burnt Village that severely handicap its ability to answer questions about the details of the structure of a Creek town. Some of these problems were due to the nature of the site itself, and some were due to the way Huscher chose to excavate it. I must discuss these in detail here first, before discussing what can be accomplished.

The first problem is that we simply have no real idea about the limits of the village from the archaeology data. An undated pre-1966 aerial photo of the area, found in the field notes, was used by Huscher to guide his work (Figure 2). The area investigated is primarily a narrow strip running essentially north-south on the summit of a terrace some 200 meters west of the Chattahoochee River. While it is possible that this was the core of the town, there is no data to prove this. No testing at all was conducted
below (to the east of) the terrace toward the river. Only very limited testing was conducted to the west of the terrace, and this only in the first season of work (Figure 3). There were no shovel tests made anywhere to define the village perimeter. To be fair, defining the limits of any archaeological site carefully was not part of the operating paradigm of southeastern archaeology in the 1960s. The field was farmed in corn up to the time of the flooding, and Huscher had to make arrangements with the farmer to remove certain areas from cultivation to permit excavations in those areas. Figure 4 shows an aerial view Huscher's 1966 work. We have no indication, however, if surface collections were ever made when the entire field was plowed that could have provided subjective statements on the distribution of artifacts in the field. We simply are left to assume that the narrow strip where work was concentrated was the area of highest artifact density.

The second problem is a simple, but annoying one—Huscher altered the grid system for the site after the initial 1966 season, rotating the north direction by 12.5 degrees toward the northwest and renumbering it. This was done by him based upon the road grader stripping operations conducted in May of 1967 prior to the second season (Figure 5). Both grids were simple polar grids, with the axes increasing in the east and south directions. I had to renumber these to use the current east and north conventions that are standard in all mapping software (Figure 6).

A third problem was that the numbering of features was inconsistent. Some features were never numbered, some were numbered twice, and some were numbered but never accurately mapped. Finally, several numbers in the sequence were simply skipped and never used. I have done my best to rectify the situation now over 40 years after the
fact, but the solution is likely not perfect. All of the features were mapped using a plane table and alidade, the tools of choice at the time. As pointed out earlier, some areas were mapped several times and yielded different results each time.

A more substantial problem with the mapping data from the Burnt Village relates to the identification by Huscher of two or three Rotundas (his term) or Council House structures at the Burnt Village. The first of these was "identified" based upon an expansion of his X-9 from 1966. Huscher believed he saw a circle in an old aerial photograph in this area, and seemed determined to verify its existence there. This is represented in Figure 8 in his 1972 report, and is presented here in the 850 North region on the current site map labeled by me as Area 5. While the extreme eastern part of the area excavated does show a curving line of post molds, almost all of the rest of the area of his X-9 shows little in the way of continuing this hypothesized circular wall pattern. In recent conversations with Paul V. Lyles, who acted as Huscher's primary mapping assistant at the site in the 1960s, Paul made it clear to me that neither he nor any of the rest of the crew believed in the existence of any of the Rotunda patterns at the Burnt Village as then being defined by Huscher.

An additional problem that strongly impacts on the question of the reality of these hypothetical structures also impacts interpretations of other structures over the entire excavated area. As stated above, in May of 1967 Huscher obtained a road scraper to strip the plow zone off of the terrace in a set of long parallel north-south cuts (Figures 7-12). Subsequently the windrows of dirt left between the strips were removed and taken away as fill dirt. As the stripping was being conducted, areas that showed large features were identified immediately and protected. These areas with large features were then used to
define work areas for the 1967 and 1968 seasons. The areas near and surrounding these large features were then shovel scraped, post molds were marked and later mapped along with the large features used to define the work areas. The important point here is that the machine stripped areas between the work areas were apparently never systematically nor completely shovel scraped, nor mapped, although there were undoubtedly many post molds and perhaps small features located in these intermediate areas. Thus, most of the maps from these work areas are out of context of the entire site, and not easily interpretable. At best they have to be looked at as the isolated units that they are. We do not know, for example, what post patterns existed adjacent to Huscher's hypothetical Rotundas. His circles likely became self-fulfilling patterns in his interpretations.

It is also apparent from the many drawings of the excavations presented here that he did record some large features in the northern half of the stripped area for which he never recorded any nearby posts. I have drawn arbitrary lines around the areas that were shovel scraped and given them arbitrarily assigned numbers 1-7 from south to north to facilitate discussion (Figure 13). In Huscher's defense, he likely opened up much more area with the road scraper than he had time to record properly. Further, it is admittedly hard to ignore large features, but this approach has left us with a patchwork quilt of odd excavation areas, with the exception of Area 1 at the extreme southern part of the site. Most of these areas should be seen as simply random small views of the entire site that collectively do not add up to an adequate understanding of the entire village pattern. We simply do not understand the nature of the occupation at the Burnt Village from the excavations that took place there. I do reject for now the presence of Huscher's hypothetical Council Houses or Rotundas at the Burnt Village, however.
Another problem with the data—one that has no particular relationship with the way the site was excavated—is that the site has several components. Of most significance is the presence of an Early-Middle Woodland Cartersville occupation that likely also confused the post hole patterns. Certainly the vast majority of posts located at the site dated to the Creek occupation, but the posts from the Woodland occupation make structure interpretations more difficult to an unknown extent. As Huscher recognized, the many rock features located at the site may well date to the Woodland occupation.

One important potential data set that could be used to separate or recognize structures in Area 1, or even some of the other areas, is that of post hole depth. Unfortunately, this data is available for fewer than 25 percent of the approximately 1,800 posts that were mapped. A project to record these depths was implemented in 1968, but only two selected areas in the southern part of the site were completed. Neither of the hypothetical Rotundas in the northern part of the site had the depths of their post holes recorded, although it does appear that most were cored.

The only diameters of posts that were explicitly recorded were from the same posts that had their depths recorded. The rest had circles drawn on the plane table maps apparently using a circle template in the field as they were measured and shot in at the same time. The inferred diameters of all these have been extracted from the digitized maps using modern tools in ArcGIS with the help of John Chamblee. The numbering of the post molds in the field over the several seasons of work was even more problematic than was the numbering of the features. For the work presented here an entirely new set of numbers has been applied to the posts. There are some posts that likely should have been defined as features and there are some features that should have been classified as
posts. I have not attempted to reclassify these, however. Any structural patterns should not be completely dependent on these misassignments.

I want to conclude this section by stating for the record that, despite the problems listed above, this dataset and Huscher's overall excavation project was a good one. I certainly look at the cup as half full rather than half empty. This is the most completely excavated Creek site in Georgia and much has and will be learned about the 18th century Creeks in Georgia from this data. It deserves to be more widely known—I would not be devoting so much time to it now if I did not believe this.
Area Descriptions

As I described above, the excavations at 9TP9 can be conveniently described to consist of data from seven areas. I will now describe these in turn. Each is presented in a series of maps, typically showing first all post molds, features, and burials, and then individual drawings of each category separately. One additional reason for presenting the data in this form is that the areas are spread over such a large north-south area that the details of posts and features would be lost on a single map of the entire site. As before, Figure 13 shows the relative locations of the numbered areas.

Area 1

Area 1 was the most southerly of the areas, and by far the largest. I have, therefore, subdivided this one area into three subareas for presentation of the maps, 1A on the southern end, through 1C on the northern end. This area also produced the most features, burials, and posts for the entire site. Clearly this was what Huscher considered the most important part of the site since so much effort was expended on it. The overall new grid range for this area was from 309-540 North and 902-990 East. Thus the area was roughly 230 feet by 90 feet in size, roughly two thirds the size of a football field. It was located on the highest part of the north-south terrace that was examined as the prime location of the site. Although we do not have a full site contour map (not common in the 1960s) Figure 3 shows that Area 1 at the far end of the stripped area was the highest part of the site. In this sense, it is clear why this was the area of the site with the highest feature and post density. It also would have been the area of the site that would have been least likely to flood when the Chattahoochee came out of its banks. There seems
little doubt that this was downtown Okfuskenena. Figures 14-17 show all the posts, features, and burials in this area. Because this area is so large, however, it makes it difficult to discuss in detail. Thus for discussion purposes I will take the three subsections of Area 1 one at a time and have created separate drawings for each subsection that are large enough to study.

**Area 1A**

This is the most southerly area of the site and the most complex. It also was at the extreme highest part of the terrace. While the eastern edge of this area was close to the edge of the terrace, and thus likely defines the edge of the high feature and post density as well, it seems clear that there was a good bit of the site to the west of Area 1A that simply was not explored by Huscher. In this sense, it is difficult to understand the part of the center of the site here outside of the context of and without much knowledge of the features and posts that must have been there in abundance.

Figures 18-21 show the maps for Area 1A. This part of the site has the highest number of features and the highest number of burials on the site. It also has the highest number and density of post molds on the site. Huscher’s original 1966 excavations concentrated on this part of the site. His Excavation Unit 7 from that year was located in the southeastern part of what became Area 1A in an area with a large number of burials with many historic trade goods (Figure 20). Figure 19 shows all the features in Area 1C that did not contain burials. Included in the large number of features here are at least six that are very large (and productive) trash pits. This sort of trash pit on many other sites is known to have resulted from digging a large hole initially for the creation of daub for use
in structures. The holes, after use, are quickly filled with garbage since no one wants a large open hole in their living area. The presence of this many daub pits implies a need for much daub, and thus for a relatively large building, or much rebuilding to an existing structure.

Figure 21 shows all the hundreds of post molds in Area 1A without any of the features or burials included. There is an obvious large concentration of posts in the upper center of the area. The numbers fall off rapidly to the northeast in the area, and fall off slightly to the southeast—the location of the majority of the burials in the area. Certainly there are multiple structures included in the post molds in Area 1A. Rather than discuss the possibilities at this point, I will discuss them after initial discussion of all of the 7 areas defined on the site.

Area 1B

This area is obviously just north of Area 1A, but it is very different. The drawings for this area are presented in Figures 22-25. There are four burials in the area, all in its southern part (Figure 24). It is noteworthy that these are closer to the area of the likely structures in the southeastern part of Area 1A.

Figure 23 shows the features in Area 1B that are not burials. These are mostly small, and concentrated in the center and southern part of the area. Many are as small as many of the post molds in this area, and it is difficult to understand the rules Huscher used to assign a stain as a feature or post mold.

Figure 25 shows the post molds in Area 1B. In the center and northern part of Area B are a great many post molds, many of which are very large in size. Discussion of
the likely structures formed by these posts will be presented later in this report along with those from Area 1A.

**Area 1C**

This, the most northerly part of Area 1, is probably the most confusing of the three subareas. The drawings for this area are presented in Figures 26-29. There were a great many features defined in this area by Huscher (Figure 27), but there was only a single burial located here (Figure 26). Figure 29 shows the post molds for this area. A comparison of these two drawings shows a general pattern of many features / post molds on a perimeter area with fewer features / post molds in the center. None of them collectively present a clear or convincible pattern of a structure to me however. If there was a structure here, it would be over 40 feet in diameter. It is very confusing that the larger stains in Area 1C were defined uniformly as features, while the majority of those in Area 1B were defined as post molds.

**Area 2**

This small area was located from 590-612 North and 970-1000 East in the new grid coordinate system. Within this area are about 65 post molds that might be defining a structure. Huscher assigned Feature number 121 to what he saw as a small rectangular structure in the upper part of this area. This is shown as a rectangle on both Figures 30 and 31. This area is only about 10 by 8 feet, a very small structure if it is real. If the majority of the posts in Area 2, excepting the ones in the northeastern corner, defined a structure, it would be about 20 feet square and oriented slightly west of north. The area
Area 2

This very small area was located just north of Area 2, but was apparently defined separately from it by shovel scraping. The location in the new grid was from 619-642 North and 973-991 East. There were a few scattered posts and features here that are presented in Figure 32. I see no clear structure evidence here, but some might suggest that there is a small rectangular structure in the southern part of this area. This would be about 10 by 8 feet in size. There were no burials in any of the features in Area 3.

Area 4

This was a moderately large rectangular area in the very center of the part of the site that was stripped. A small portion in the northwestern corner was not mapped. The area was located from 722-757 North and 901 to 950 East on the new grid. Thus it was about 50 by 35 feet in size. Figures 33-36 show the various times recorded for the area. Figure 33 shows all the post molds, feature, and burials. Figure 34 shows all the features and the single burial without the post molds. There were eight total features in this area, as numbered on this figure. Feature 152 in the south western part of the area stands out as significantly larger than any other feature. Three of the features in the eastern side of the area were no bigger than some of the post molds. There was only a single burial in
the area, Feature 153. This is also shown on Figure 35 by itself in the middle of Area 4. All of the post molds are shown by themselves in Figure 36. There are just over 100 post molds in Area 4. While there are small hints of linear post arrangements here and there, I see no clear pattern that could confidently (or even non-confidently) be suggested as specific structures. There is no indication in the notes that Huscher saw any clear pattern here either. The best assumption was that the posts recorded in this area were so recorded a result of their proximity to the features there, particularly the large trash pit, Feature 152.

Area 5

Area 5, along with Area 6 just to the north, are two of the most curious and, unfortunately, contentious areas on the site. Area 5 was located in the upper center part of the site, and was crudely circular in shape. The range of new grid coordinates for the area was from 812-875 North and 905-973 East. Thus the entire area as defined was about 63 feet in diameter. Figures 37-40 present the data for this area. Note that there were two large features located outside the shovel scraped and mapped area, one to the north and one to the south (Figure 38). Actually, the one to the south consists of two features, one inside the other. It is unfortunate that the shovel scraping that defined Area 4 was not expanded to the north and south to incorporate the areas of these features.

Huscher interpreted the post molds in Area 5 as a large circular council house, or rotunda, to use his term. To say that the pattern of post molds as presented in Figure 40 is unconvincing is an understatement. At best there is a very crude circular area defined by his work. While there may be structures or fragments of structures in Area 4, I here
reject the idea that there was a large circular building of the sort Huscher suspected in this set of post molds. In 1966 Huscher thought he saw a circle in the old aerial photo presented here in Figure 2. I have carefully reexamined this exact photo (still curated in the collection in the UGA Laboratory of Archaeology) and have seen what he saw. The "circle" is vague and not very convincing at best in the photo. I believe it was spurious. I am left to conclude that Huscher wanted to find a structure of this sort at the historic Creek site, excavated the area of the "circle" starting in 1966, found some post molds, and concluded that he had thus identified such a structure. He even arranged for a major public event on the site in late 1966 to celebrate the "discovery". The area was stripped at the beginning of the 1967 season and rerecorded. Unfortunately by then he was so wedded to the idea that this was a council house that he never shovel scraped beyond the original area to examine the context of the post molds defined here. As stated earlier, Paul V. Lyles, then a young student who mapped most of the site for Huscher using a plane table, confirmed that neither he nor any of the other field workers with Huscher believed in the existence of the circle. He reported that no one on the crew or anywhere else was about to disagree with Huscher, however. I remember clearly that no one would ever disagree with Huscher for fear of his temper.

Examination of Figure 40 does show curious wall segments in Area 4. The most obvious is in the most northerly part of the area. A clear straight line of posts about 20 feet long was located along the edge of the scraped area. This might be associated with a crude line 10 feet to the southwest to create a rectangular structure, but this is not certain. There is a clear right angle of posts in the southeastern part of the area, but its orientation only could have made sense as a structure if the unit had been expanded further to the
southeast. The posts on the western and northwestern sides of the area also cannot be evaluated out of the context of what was located past the mapped area. There are a few interesting features in the center of the area (Figure 38), but these do not prove anything about a council house one way or the other. There were no burial features located in Area 5.

**Area 6**

The story of Area 6 was much the same as the story just related for Area 5. Although this area was not tested in 1966, Huscher believed there was second circle on the old aerial photo and after stripping the area in early 1967 and shovel scraping just enough in this area to "confirm" a second rotunda or council house. In short, I must also reject this second structure.

Area 6 is a crudely triangular area located to the north of Area 5. It was the second largest area of work on the site after Area 1. The grid location of this area was from 908-1005 North and 865-960 East. Thus it was just about 100 feet across. The drawings for this area are shown in Figures 40-43. Figure 40 shows all the post molds, features, and burials. Figure 41 shows the 18 features in the area (including the single burial Feature 100). Note that three of the features are outside the area shovel scraped and mapped. This again highlights the fact that there likely were plenty of post molds there that simply were neither located, nor recorded. Most of the features in Area 6 are in the upper center part of the area close to the one burial. Several of the features were very small, no larger than many of the post molds.
The portion of area 6 that Huscher defined as containing a second council house was the southwestern part. Attention on Figure 43 is brought to a very prominent line of post molds in the south center part of Area 6. This clear line runs northeast, and can be seen curving gently toward the northwest. At the "corner" there is short curious curve of posts that goes off to the northeast. It seems likely that these two lines are chronologically separate. The initial line goes toward the northwest and, in my view, simply disappears. Huscher clearly believed that this line went around to the west, southwest, south, and then back to the southern end of the initial good line of posts. I see such a pattern as spurious, most particularly since we have no idea about the posts that might have been (and likely were) in the area to the west outside the shovel scraped area. His round structure here is completely unconvincing.

As to what structure the long line of posts is part of, I simply am uncertain. The line of posts is over 40 feet long and may be an internal wall in the site rather than part of any building, regardless of its possible shape. I see no structural patterns in the post molds in the northern part of Area 6.

**Area 7**

This very curious area was the most northerly of all the defined areas at 9TP9. Figure 44 shows all the features and posts located here. It consists of a small area that was shovel scraped and mapped for post molds (1058-1093 North, 957-970 East) and 11 large features located to the west and southwest from the area where the post molds were recorded. Apparently the area between the features was never shovel scraped so we know nothing of any post molds there. This area of the site was one of the last studies,
and all that was done was to define and dig the large, obvious features in this area. In this sense, they are out of context and were just mapped and excavated for the artifacts that were located in their fill. There is a curious pattern of five very large features just west of the post mold area (Features 140, 141, 142, 145, and 175). These may have defined part of some structure in this area, but without the post molds no comment is possible. Needless to say, the posts that were recorded in Area 7 do not define any structure. There were no burial features located in Area 7.
Discussion of Structures

As discussed earlier, the hypothetical structures that Huscher discussed as rotundas or council houses in Areas 5 and 6 likely do not exist. Further, as discussed in all the other areas except Area 1, the evidence for structures is minimal. There may be very small structures in Areas 3 and 4, but these are not at all clear. This leaves us with Area 1, and the possible structures located in it.

Since this area presented the best opportunities to define structures on the site, I have studied the post molds here in more detail. Specifically, I created a simple GIS dataset of the post molds based upon their diameters using the program Surfer from Golden software. Although the entire site grid has been presented and studied in Huscher's original English system (feet and tenths of feet), I have converted all the post mold diameters into centimeters. This included categories of individual post mold diameters from 7 through 45 centimeters and then grouped diameters up to the largest diameter of 78 centimeters. It is unclear if these largest sizes were actual post molds, or small features of unknown purpose. I have simply followed the field notes as to which are defined as post molds and which are defined as features.

I then spent many hours turning different diameter post molds on and off to look at the resulting patterns created by the post molds of specific diameter only. This was done separately for Areas 1A and 1B. Figure 45 shows what I consider the best results for Area 1A. This drawing includes post molds with diameters of 25-26, 30-38, 44, and 48-49 centimeters. While it is not completely clear, there is a general pattern of a large rectangular to square structure oriented at about 45 degrees off of the cardinal directions. The structure is quite large, almost 50 feet on a side. There were a large number of post
molds on the inside of the structure, and it appears to have been rebuilt many times. There were a few burials and small features on the inside, but the majority of the burials and large features are to the northeast, east, and southeast sides of the structure. Figure 46 shows the structure with all the features included. While this "structure" is admittedly uncertain, I believe it is likely the best that can be derived from the mass of post molds in Area 1A. I saw hints of curved lines in the drawing with all the post molds, but could not clarify this with the post mold diameter method. The lack of depths for the majority of these posts precluded using such data for helping to delineate any structures in Area 1A.

Figure 47 show the first of two possible structures in Area 1B. It is formed from huge post molds (if they were post molds) in the lower part of Area 1B. The diameters used for this were 41, 44, 48-49, 52-65, 67-73, and 77-78. The size would be about 20 by 25 feet. If this was a real structure (and apparently Huscher believed it was) it was built more strongly than any other native structure I have seen. One possible option for this strange "strong house" would be a store house for an English trader. I should immediately state that we have no historical data referring to a trader stationed here at Okfuskenena and this is purely speculative.

Finally Figures 48 and 49 show another structure I believe was located in Area 1B. The posts used to define this structure were obviously smaller than those for the first structure here. The diameters used were 20, 23-24, 26-28, 30, 32-33, 35-38, 40, 42-43, and 50-51. None of these were the same as used for the previous structure. This structure is a bit north of the first in Area 1B, and is larger. This structure was about 40 feet by 20 feet in size, a fairly large structure and generally oriented with the cardinal
directions. It clearly overlaps with the first structure in Area 1B, but there is no way to
know which was earlier and which one was later.

No clear structure emerged from the Area 1C data using the post mold diameter
data.
Future Work on the Collections

As I see it, there are several pieces left to the completion of a pseudo site report for the Burnt Village site. Even though it has been under West Point Lake for almost 40 years, it is clear that the completion of this project is an important goal for Georgia archaeology. This site remains the most completely excavated (albeit flawed) Creek Indian site in Georgia. The 18th century history has been addressed by Huscher himself in his brief report (Huscher 1972). This can likely be amplified by several scholars including perhaps Thomas Foster. The physical anthropological study of the human remains has been completed by Matthew Williamson. An analysis of the ceramic and lithic artifacts from the site is currently underway at the University of Georgia. This work is being accomplished by Vanessa Hanvey under the direction of the author. A detailed analysis of the historic artifacts from the site is also currently underway by the present author. This is a 40 year overdue project based upon the analysis I conducted on the collection in 1969-1970. I have been carrying the data around for all these years! It also remains for all the features to be drawn and studied in detail as to function. While the data from this important site have lingered for much too long, the report may finally be completed in the not too distant future. Stay tuned.
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