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ABSTRACT

Over the past decades a great variety of explanations has been offered to describe the function of the banner-stone, one of the articles traditionally included in the class of "problematic" stone artifacts from the Archaic period of the Eastern Woodlands area of North America. Rather than consider a single function explanation, this paper will consider both the utilitarian and non-utilitarian aspects of this artifact. Evidence indicates that in its utilitarian aspect, the banner-stone was employed as an atlatl weight. As a non-utilitarian object, I propose that the banner-stone functioned as the marker or symbol of a category of ranked status positions.
For several decades now archaeologists, amateur and professional alike, have been intrigued by a large heterogeneous class of stone artifacts whose specific functions are not definitely known. It is still common today to encounter references to this class of "problematic" or "ornamental-problematic" artifacts. They are grouped together largely on the basis of one significant similarity, their unknown function. Traditionally, this class consists of a conglomerate of artifacts including gorgets, plummets, bird-stones, boat-stones, pipes of many varieties, discoidal stones, and the so-called atlatl weights or banner-stones. Considerable interest has been directed toward discovering the probable function of each type of artifact, particularly that of the banner-stone.

Although this particular class of artifacts has now come to be known as a throwing stick or atlatl weight, in the past there has been a multitude of explanations which purport to describe the "true" function of the banner-stone. They have been variously described as whale tail or thunderbird effigies, replicas of Scandinavian double-bitted axes, hair ornaments, parts of ceremonial wands, parts of headdresses, spindle whorls for making fires, net spacers, butterfly effigies, atlatl weights and tribal symbols (Moorehead 1917). There is good evidence, however, from a number of burial sites, particularly from Tennessee and Kentucky, of banner-stones which were found in direct alignment with what appear to be the antler handles and hooks from throwing sticks (Webb 1946, 1950a, 1950b; Webb and Haag 1940). From this evidence it seems more than likely that the banner-stone did serve a utilitarian function in the tool kit of Archaic man in the Eastern Woodlands of North America. Despite the fact that not every form of banner-stone has been found in such associations and that in many areas of the Eastern Woodlands
There is no direct evidence of the utilization of the atlatl, it is still probable that the various forms of the banner-stone were used as atlatl weights. Both the presence of soil conditions unfavorable for the preservation of wood and the collecting activities of amateur archaeologists might help explain the absence of such evidence. This is not, however, to exclude any possible non-utilitarian functions of the banner-stone. I propose that the banner-stone was also the symbol or marker of a category of ranked statuses.

The purpose of this paper is, firstly, to support the notion that the Archaic banner-stone was utilized as a functional part of the atlatl and, secondly, that it also served as a marker or symbol of a particular social category. A "social category" in this instance, denotes a number of individuals within a particular society who are grouped together on the basis of shared status position or attributes within that society. This specific social category consists of those individuals or small groups of individuals who were the owners of banner-stones. From the archaeological evidence, I believe it is possible to demonstrate that the individual or groups who owned these artifacts not only utilized them as a part of a hunting and gathering tool kit, but that they also functioned as symbols of a category of ranked status positions. The term "rank" is used here to designate a particular type of society in which positions of prestige are sharply limited. According to Fried (1967:52), "ranking exists when there are fewer positions of valued status than persons capable of filling them. A rank society has means of limiting the access of its members to status positions that they would otherwise hold on the basis of sex, age, or personal attributes." This, however, does not imply stratification since the data are not sufficient to demonstrate differential access to the basic resources upon which life depends (Fried 1967:109).
DEFINITION AND DISTRIBUTION

The particular artifact under discussion can be distinguished from the other members of the "problematic" class by its basic construction. Although they do vary in form, banner-stones, unlike other "problematic" forms, are characterized by an axial perforation. For simple descriptive purposes, they may be divided into two large groups, those with projections and those without. Those having projections from the body or midrib in the form of winglike or lunate symmetrical extensions are characterized by a perforation parallel to the shortest axis at the point of equilibrium. These banner-stones which consist of only a central core and without any projections are perforated parallel to the longest axis at the point of equilibrium (see Figure 1).

The temporal and spacial distribution of banner-stones can be limited to the Archaic period in the Eastern Woodlands area of North America. The Archaic will be defined for the purposes of this period according to Willey's distinctions (1966). This archaeological period may be divided into three sub-periods; that is, Early (8000-5000 B.C.), Middle (5000-2000 B.C.), and Late (2000-1000 B.C.). The heaviest concentration of banner-stones, however, is distributed through the end of the Early Archaic sub-period to the end of the Late Archaic (roughly 7000-1000 B.C.). Geographically, banner-stones are distributed throughout the entire Eastern Woodlands, an area within which I will include all of the North American continent from southern Canada to the Gulf of Mexico and from the eastern sea coast midway through the western portions of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and the western edges of Oklahoma and Texas. Rather than attempt to treat such a massive geographic area, this paper will confine itself to a smaller area surrounding the valley of the Green River in Kentucky. The reasons for making such a selection will be explained later.
Fig. 1. A sample of winged (a - c) and wingless (d - f) banner-stone forms: a, geniculate; b, curved pick; c, double-crescent; d, hourglass; e, tubular; f, humped (after Knoblock 1939).
EASTERN WOODLANDS AND THE ARCHAIC CULTURE

Before examining the specific sites of the Green River area, I shall first describe the physical environment during the Archaic and the cultural adaptations which were developed in response to it. The Eastern Woodlands, as a whole, is characterized by generally abundant local resources. The presence of deer, small game, fish, shellfish, nuts, wild seeds, and root foods provided an ample diet for human groups prior to cultivation (Willey 1966). By the beginning of the Early Archaic sub-period (8000-5000 B.C.), the final retreat of the last major glacial sheet had begun. Prior to this retreat the glacier had reached as far south as what is now the Ohio River Valley, that river and its tributaries developing from streams which flowed along the ice front. As the final retreat progressed, land surfaces which were previously locked under ice were freed and a succession of vegetation replaced the ice cover. Areas such as the valley of the Green River, although not glaciated, were nevertheless affected by the proximity of the glacial ice and also underwent a succession of changes in flora and fauna. By the beginning of the Early Archaic, the majority of Pleistocene Megafauna had undergone a series of extinctions and, aside from small localized groups of survivors, had disappeared, leaving behind a population of smaller mammals (Axelrod 1967).

The Archaic culture, as an adaptation to this post-glacial environment, actually consisted of a variety of adaptive responses to specific local habitats. It may be characterized in general by listing items of material culture such as large, long, basal-notched or straight-stemmed projectile points, ground and polished stone tools, rough mortars and pestles, and so on. Any evidence of cultivation or pottery manufacture is missing (Willey 1966). More important, however, than any list of artifacts is the particular...
CULTURAL ADAPTATION WHICH THESE ITEMS REPRESENT. IN THE CASE OF THE ARCHAIC PEOPLES, THE GREAT VARIETY OF TOOLS UTILIZED BY EACH GROUP OF PEOPLE INDICATES THAT A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT EXPLOITATIONAL SUB-SYSTEMS WERE BEING UTILIZED.


THE SAMPLE SITES

THE DECISION WAS MADE TO CONFINE THIS STUDY TO THE GREEN RIVER AREA FOR A NUMBER OF REASONS. IT IS OBVIOUSLY NOT FEASIBLE TO TREAT THE ENTIRE AREA THROUGH WHICH BANNER-STONES WERE LOCATED IN A PAPER OF THIS LENGTH. THE MOST REASONABLE SOLUTION TO THIS PROBLEM IS TO CONFINE THE STUDY TO ONE LOCAL AREA. THE GREEN RIVER REGION OF KENTUCKY WAS CHOSEN FOR THIS PURPOSE. SECONDLY, THIS PARTICULAR REGION HAS QUITE AN EXTENSIVE AMOUNT OF PUBLISHED DATA
available. Thirdly, if one is to locate and describe a specific category of a population and those artifacts which supposedly indicate a specific status within that population, a group of geographically and culturally related sites should be utilized.

As mentioned before, such a clustering of sites would most likely be located in areas defined by natural boundaries such as river valleys. A river valley would provide a convenient source of food and an avenue of communication and migration between sites. The shell mound sites located along the Green River and its tributaries offer such a group of related occupation sites.

Since each area offered an essentially different array of resources available for exploitation, the best sampling of sites should be taken from a fairly homogeneous locale. In this case, I have selected the following six sites along the Green River and its tributaries (see Figure 2): the Carlson Annis Mound, the Read Shell Midden, Indian Knoll, the Ward site, the Kirkland site, and the Parrish Village site. All of these sites contain abundant evidence of Archaic occupations, are located in the same relatively homogeneous environment, and may well have been occupied seasonally by groups of related peoples. All six sites are also connected by river channels. With these similarities in mind, it should now be possible to locate a specific category of individuals within this society.

The specific group of individuals of concern would be those who were owners of atlatls. After demonstrating the probable utilitarian function of the banner-stone, it will then be necessary to indicate what particular group of individuals owned them and why certain individuals within the group received "special" burial treatment with banner-stones while others did not. This differential distribution of banner-stones, in conjunction with their manner of manufacture, type of material from which they were
Fig. 2
Green River Archaic Sites

2. Read Shell Midden, Butler Co., Kent.
3. Indian Knoll, Ohio Co., Kent.
5. Ward Site, McLean Co., Kent.
MADE, ELABORATION OF DESIGN, AND THE PARTICULAR ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT WITHIN WHICH THEY WERE FOUND SHOULD INDICATE THEIR NON-UTILITARIAN FUNCTION AS SOCIAL STATUS MARKERS OR SYMBOLS OF RANK.

THE DUAL FUNCTION OF THE BANNER-STONE

Positive evidence of the utilitarian aspect of the banner-stone comes from burial evidence from Kentucky (Webb 1946, 1950a, 1950b). From the six Kentucky sites sampled, the artifacts associated with banner-stones point to their use as throwing-stick weights. Not only is the majority of stone weights found in burials associated with the other less perishable portions of the atlatl, but they are usually found in direct alignment (see Figure 3). That is, the antler handle, stone weight, and antler hook are found in the same order and correct distance apart to suggest that they were all originally mounted on a wooden spear thrower which had long since decayed, leaving only the stone and antler objects intact. From Webb's rather complete discussion of the banner-stone as a spear-thrower weight (1946, 1950a, 1950b), it is reasonable to conclude that the banner-stone was utilized to give weight and additional leverage to the throwing-stick (see Figure 4). From the direct alignments of banner-stones and the rest of the atlatl complex in numerous burials and the plausible reconstructions of the actual manner of attaching the weights, it seems more than likely that the banner-stone was actually an atlatl weight (also see Kellar 1955).

In addition to its purely utilitarian function, it may also be argued that the banner-stone also served as an indicator of a ranked status position. There are a number of factors which might indicate this additional non-utilitarian function. The material utilized by Archaic man to fashion these weights seems to have been selected for
Fig. 3. Burials with associated atlatl parts in situ. Parts of atlatl complex are circled (after Webb 1946).
Fig. 4. Suggested method of mounting a banner-stone as an atlatl weight (after Webb 1950b).
ITS ATTRACTIVE COLOR AND GRAIN RATHER THAN FOR ITS EASE IN HANDLING.

Steatite, banded slate, fine grained granite, and colored quartzites were the materials most often chosen (Knoblock 1939). The highly polished surface of each weight attests to the great investment in time, skill, and material required to first hammer out the correct form, peck and polish the surface, and then perforate the form with a reed drill indicates more concern for its manufacture than would be shown for an ordinary utilitarian article. Elaborate, finely polished designs, some of which resemble the wings of butterflies, were so well made that the edge of each wing was no more than one sixteenth of an inch thick (see Figure 1).

Another clue to their non-utilitarian function is that great pains were taken to repair forms which were probably broken in use. Banner-stones that were included in burials, however, were most frequently intentionally broken and their fragments scattered in the grave or deposited in a pile with the intentionally broken atlatl. It seems that while in use the banner-stone was important enough to be repaired for further utilization; however, it was also of sufficient importance to be destroyed and then included in special burials. The term "special" is used here for three reasons. Firstly, very few Early and Middle Archaic burials contained banner-stones. Secondly, burials which included banner-stones nearly always were accompanied by additional grave goods. Finally, the inclusion of any type of grave good in an Archaic burial was rare. These three facts seem to signify a differential treatment of the dead, an indication that some individuals were accorded greater deference or prestige than others.

Outside of the burial context, banner-stones are found quite frequently in midden heaps and scattered randomly within the sites. Of the six sites examined, a total of 67 banner-stones, or 15% of the total sample,
WAS LOCATED IN BURIALS WHILE THE REMAINING 376, OR 85%, WERE LOCATED RANDOMLY IN THE GENERAL EXCAVATIONS (SEE TABLE 1). THIS DISTRIBUTION WOULD SUGGEST THAT BANNER-STONES WERE POSSESSED BY A LARGE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS WITHIN THE POPULATION. THEIR INCLUSION IN BURIALS, HOWEVER, INDICATES THAT THE PERSONS BURIED IN SUCH A MANNER WERE IN SOME WAY RECEIVING TREATMENT THAT WAS DIFFERENT FROM THAT GIVEN THE MAJORITY OF THE INDIVIDUALS BURIED. FOR EXAMPLE, FROM THE 6 SITES THAT WERE SAMPLED, A TOTAL NUMBER OF 2,153 BURIALS WERE EXCAVATED OF WHICH ONLY 61, OR 3%, OF THE TOTAL NUMBER INCLUDED BANNER-STONES (SEE TABLE 4). THIS DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT SUGGESTS A TYPE OF SYSTEM OF RANKED STATUSES BASED ON PRESTIGE. I DO NOT, HOWEVER, INTEND TO INDICATE ANY TYPE OF STRATIFICATION, BUT RATHER TO SUGGEST THE PRESENCE OF A SEGMENT OF THE POPULATION THAT, FOR SOME REASON, WAS RANKED ABOVE THE REST. IT IS NOT THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER TO SPECIFY WHAT THE EXACT CRITERIA FOR SUCH RANKING WERE, BUT ONLY TO DEMONSTRATE THAT A SIMPLE SYSTEM OF RANKED STATUS POSITIONS WAS IN OPERATION. EVIDENCE OF SUCH A SYSTEM MAY BE INFERRED FROM THE DIFFERENTIAL DISTRIBUTION OF BANNER-STONES IN BURIALS AND IN THE GENERAL EXCAVATIONS.

THE NATURE OF THIS SOCIAL CATEGORY MIGHT BE CONJECTURED FROM CONSIDERATION OF THE AGE AND SEX OF INDIVIDUALS IN BANNER-STONE BURIALS. EVIDENCE FROM THE TOTAL NUMBER OF BURIALS AT ALL SIX SITES WHICH INCLUDE ATLATL WEIGHTS INDICATES THAT BANNER-STONES WERE INCLUDED IN BURIALS OF PERSONS OF ALL AGES AND BOTH SEXES. FROM THE ETHNOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE OF LIVING HUNTING AND GATHERING PEOPLES, WE MIGHT SUPPOSE THAT WOMEN AND SMALL CHILDREN WERE ENGAGED IN THE CONSIDERABLE GATHERING ACTIVITIES INVOLVED IN THE SUBSISTENCE PURSUITS OF THE ARCHAIC. IT IS UNLIKELY THAT THEY WERE THE OWNERS OF SPEAR THROWERS. IT SEEMS PROBABLE THAT THE ACTUAL OWNERS MAY HAVE BEEN THE INDIVIDUAL ADULT MALES WHO WERE MOST CLOSELY INVOLVED
IN PERFORMING THE ROLE OF HUNTER. AN ANALOGOUS SITUATION HAS BEEN
REPORTED FOR THE YIR YORONT OF AUSTRALIA. SHARP REPORTS THAT THE USE
OF THE STONE AXE, A CRITICAL PART OF THEIR HUNTING AND GATHERING TOOL
KIT, WAS STRICTLY LIMITED TO ADULT MALES WHILE WOMEN OR CHILDREN WANTING
TO USE THESE IMPLEMENTS WERE ONLY ALLOWED TEMPORARY ACCESS TO THESE
ARTICLES (1968:86-7). OWNERSHIP MIGHT ALSO HAVE BEEN INVESTED IN THE
FAMILIES OF THESE MALES. THE PREPONDERANCE OF WEIGHTS, HOWEVER, WAS
FOUND IN ASSOCIATION WITH YOUNG ADULT MALES (SEE TABLE 2). THE PRESENCE
OF ATLATL WEIGHTS IN GRAVES OTHER THAN THOSE OF YOUNG ADULT MALES MAY
INDICATE THAT THESE PERSONS WERE CLOSELY RELATED TO THE OWNER OF THE
BANNER-STONE. TABLE 2 INDICATES THE DISTRIBUTION OF BANNER-STONES IN
BURIALS ACCORDING TO THE AGE AND SEX OF THE INDIVIDUAL BURIED THERE. THE
TOTAL RESULTS INDICATE THAT OF THE BURIALS INCLUDING BANNER-STONES, 26
WEIGHTS, 39% OF THE TOTAL NUMBER, WAS BURIED WITH YOUNG ADULT MALES.

FURTHER EXAMINATION OF THE BURIAL DATA INDICATES ANOTHER ADDITIONAL
22 BANNER-STONES INCLUDED WITH MALES BELONGING TO THE OTHER AGE CATEGORIES,
THEREBY MAKING A TOTAL OF 48 BANNER-STONES, OR 72% OF THE TOTAL INCLUDED
WITH MALES. CLOSER INVESTIGATION OF THESE DATA ALSO INDICATES THAT THE
SECOND LARGEST NUMBER OF WEIGHTS WAS BURIED WITH INFANT MALES, PERHAPS
AS AN INDICATOR OF THE POTENTIAL STATUS POSITION WHICH THEY MAY HAVE FILLED.
BECAUSE OF THE CONDITIONS OF PRESERVATION IN MANY OF THE SITES, THE AGE AND
SEX DETERMINATIONS OF MANY INDIVIDUALS WERE DIFFICULT. IT MIGHT BE OF
INTEREST TO CONSIDER THE GROUP OF UNDETERMINED INDIVIDUALS, SOME OF WHOM
MAY HAVE BEEN MALES. THIS WOULD MAKE THE FIGURE OF 72% THE PROBABLE MINIMUM
OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF BANNER-STONES ASSOCIATED WITH MALE BURIALS. THIS
72%, OR 48 ATLATL WEIGHTS, REPRESENTS A TOTAL OF 42 INDIVIDUAL MALE BURIALS
(SEE TABLE 3). IT IS ALSO INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT ONLY MALES HAVE SO FAR
BEEN DISCOVERED IN BURIALS CONTAINING MORE THAN ONE BANNER-STONE. THIS
WOULD SEEM TO LEAVE LITTLE DOUBT THAT THE ATLATL WEIGHT WAS PREDOMINANTLY A MALE POSSESSION, PROBABLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE ROLE OF HUNTER.

Table 5 highlights the fact that banner-stone burials were usually accompanied by other intentionally offered grave goods. In the category of grave goods I include items such as caches of artifacts, utility artifacts, red ochre, the antler hooks and handles of the atlatl complex, and banner-stones. This excludes all items of dress which would have been part of personal adornments such as shell beads, gorgets, awls, clothes pins, hair pins, and bits of cloth. The presence of these items does not indicate any intentionally placed artifacts, but rather articles of dress or ornamentation. Since the data are not sufficient to permit distinguishing differences in the elaborateness of dress, it is probably best to exclude this information. A generalization on the frequency of all types of grave goods, as defined above, may suffice. The vast majority of burials contained no evidence of any artifacts, either items of personal adornment or intentionally placed grave goods. Of those burials with artifacts, only 18% of the entire sample of 2,153 burials contained these intentionally placed grave goods and banner-stones. Since, in the Archaic, grave goods of any type are rather rare, the number of burials including both banner-stones and grave goods might indicate the relatively higher rank of the individuals buried there.

By taking a rather large leap from the data already cited, an enticing possibility emerges; that is, the small bands of semi-nomadic hunters and gatherers that exploited the territory may have been guided by an individual possessing a kind of seasonal or episodic authority. This authority status may have emerged in response to environmental factors which demanded seasonal migrations and some leadership to coordinate them. Evidence of such population movements might be inferred from the sample sites. Five of these
Table 1

Intra-Site Distribution of Banner-Stones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Number of Banner-Stones in General Excavations (N)</th>
<th>Number of Banner-Stones in Burials (N)</th>
<th>Total Number of Banner-Stones at Each Site (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Knoll</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrish</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson Annis</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Shell Midden</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key To Tables 2 and 3

Abbreviations:

AGE GROUP

Nb - New Born
I - Infant x-3 years
C - Child 4-12 years
J - Juvenile estimated age
A - Adolescent 13-17 years
SA - Sub Adult 18-20 years
YA - Young Adult 21-35 years
MA - Middle Aged 36-55 years
OA - Old Adult 56-x years
Table 2

Combined Total of Banner-Stones in Burials From 5 Sites*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Undetermined

TOTAL 48 72% 11 16% 8 12% 67 100%

* The sixth site, the Parrish Village site was omitted from this table since no banner-stones were found in burial context there.
Table 3

Total Number of Banner-Stones in Burials Correlated with Individual Burials*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burials-</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Only</td>
<td>Burials With</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banner-Stone</td>
<td>Banner-Stones</td>
<td>Banner-Stone</td>
<td>Banner-Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 36 6** 11 8 55 6

* Only 5 sites are included here since the Parrish Village site contained no banner-stones in burial context.

** Only burials of males from these sites have included multiple banner-stones. In each case the burial included two banner-stones.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Number of Burials With Banner-Stones</th>
<th>Total Number of Burials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Knoll</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Shell Midden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson Annis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,153</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Total Number of Burials Compared to Burials with Banner-Stones
Table 5
Burials With Grave Goods
Compared With
Total Number of Burials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Burials With Grave Goods</th>
<th>Total Number of Burials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Knoll</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrish</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Shell Midden</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson Annis</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>378</strong> 18%</td>
<td><strong>2,153</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITES APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN SMALL HABITATION SITES WHICH WERE UTILIZED FOR SHORT PERIODS OF TIME, PROBABLY TO EXPLOIT SEASONALLY SCATTERED RESOURCES. THE SIXTH SITE, INDIAN KNOLL, MAY HAVE REPRESENTED A MORE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT FROM WHICH SMALLER GROUPS COULD HAVE MIGRATED DURING RELATIVELY LESS ABUNDANT SEASONS OF THE YEAR. IN ADDITION, THE NUMBER OF "SPECIAL" OR BANNER-STONE BURIALS RELATIVE TO THE TOTAL NUMBER OF BURIALS SUGGESTS AN AVERAGE OF 35 UNDIFFERENTIATED BURIALS TO EVERY SPECIAL ONE. IN OTHER WORDS, THE DATA SUGGEST THAT THE AVERAGE SIZE OF A HUNTING BAND EXPLOITING THIS AREA WAS 35 INDIVIDUALS, ONE OF WHOM OCCUPIED A SPECIAL LEADERSHIP STATUS. THIS IS IN ACCORD WITH THE PREDICTED SIZE OF A HUNTING BAND AS SUGGESTED BY SANDERS AND PRICE (1968), SERVICE (1962), AND OTHERS. IT IS POSSIBLE THAT THIS SPECIAL LEADERSHIP STATUS WAS BASED UPON CRITERIA OTHER THAN AGE AND SEX, THE ONLY CRITERIA WHICH SANDERS AND PRICE RECOGNIZE FOR A BAND LEVEL OF ORGANIZATION. THIS DIFFERENTIATION COULD BE IN RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS OF WHICH WE CURRENTLY HAVE INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE; SUCH AS, SEASONALLY ABUNDANT RESOURCES. IN SHORT, I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT THE "SPECIAL" OR STATUS BURIALS REPRESENT THE EMERGENCE IN THE ARCHAIC OF A NEW ROLE DIFFERENTIATED ON THE BASIS OF THE EXERCISE OF A SEASONAL OR EPISODIC LEADERSHIP AUTHORITY WHICH MAY HAVE EMERGED IN RESPONSE TO PARTICULAR ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS.

CONCLUSIONS

ALTHOUGH THE BANNER-STONE CAN BE DEMONSTRATED TO HAVE PERFORMED THE UTILITARIAN FUNCTION OF SERVING AS AN ADDITION TO THE THROWING STICK OR ATLATL, IT CAN ALSO BE SHOWN TO HAVE AN ADDITIONAL NON-UTILITARIAN FUNCTION; THAT IS, IT IS A MARKER OR SYMBOL OF A SOCIAL CATEGORY OF RANKED STATUSES. THE PARTICULAR PORTION OF THE POPULATION THAT POSSESSED THIS ARTICLE WAS YOUNG ADULT MALES PROBABLY INVOLVED AS HUNTERS IN SUBSISTENCE ACTIVITIES.
However, the prestige criteria by which these statuses were ranked cannot be demonstrated with the present data.

One final idea suggested by the data may be the presence of an episodic authority role which emerged in response to seasonal environmental factors. This final notion, however speculative it may seem, might prove to be a stimulus to a further examination of archaic society which would acknowledge a greater complexity of that social system than that previously attributed to it.
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