

failed woefully in the binding. The binding of the reviewer's copy is already falling off.

All scholars whose work deals with the decades preceding the American Revolution—decades so decisive in American, British, and world history—will be debtors to Dr. Corey and his staff, and will look forward to the completion of this monumental series, so superbly compiled and edited. This series is a good example of a major phase of work in which every first class, state historical organization engages.

Ohio University

A. T. Volwiler

Kincaid: A Prehistoric Illinois Metropolis. By Fay-Cooper Cole and others. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951, pp. vii, 376. Bibliography, index, maps, text figures and plates. \$7.50.)

This volume contains a detailed account of seven seasons work by the Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, at the Kincaid Site in Pope and Massac counties, Illinois. During those seven seasons several sections of the village area were excavated, six mounds were dug in entirety or in part and a search was carried on for the stockade which should be present. This work was done in the main by students of the University but during two seasons, 1939-40 and 1941-42, labor was furnished by the Work Projects Administration. Several advanced students acted in a supervisory capacity during the total time involved and thus gained invaluable experience. The author of this volume was the only person continually associated with the undertaking. He, therefore, is the one person qualified to bring together the vast amount of data resulting from such a large undertaking. Four students contributed appendices in the form of special papers ancillary to the body of the report. In addition to these four there are four others credited upon the title page by reason of their special efforts and contributions in one respect or another.

Kincaid is a large Middle Mississippi Site located along the north bank of Avery Lake which is a part of a former Ohio River channel. The site is composed of nineteen mounds and an extensive habitation area. If we may assume that the village was coextensive with the mounds then the length was about three thousand seven hundred feet with a width, north and south, of something over one thousand feet. In size it equates with other sites of the same time period and cultural affinity. The site is strategically located between the mouth

of the Cumberland River, upstream, and the Tennessee, downstream. Also, it is within thirty miles of the Mississippi, a river without peer in arterial significance.

Cole wisely leads the reader into the detailed account of excavations through the medium of a general statement relative to the chronological position of the Kincaid manifestation. It is but a phase of the entire prehistory of the area which goes back a respectable number of years to an initial occupation by a hunting-food-gathering folk who were completely nomadic. Intermediate to the two extremes—migratory vs. sedentary—are expressions of culture not yet too well known in this area. Cole, therefore, is being unduly modest in stating that the chapter is meant for the layman and nonspecialist. It is equally of value to the specialist and this is especially true in view of the fact that these poorly known manifestations are described in detail in subsequent chapters.

I object to the use of the word "contact" in connection with Kincaid. As Cole uses it the word is, in a sense, perfectly proper. He is thinking of the locale as being favorable for contacts to have taken place between the inhabitants of Kincaid and related or unrelated peoples moving through the area by means of the Ohio, Wabash, Cumberland, or Tennessee rivers. However, archaeologically, the word contact has come to mean extreme lateness and is usually reserved for aboriginal sites which were being lived upon at the time of initial European visitation or colonization. In this sense Kincaid is definitely not a "contact" site.

Chapter two is a detailed account of the excavations made during the seven season period. In the village area proper, the approach to investigation was through the medium of methodically located test pits. Several of these were expanded beyond the limits of the original test and "two became major excavations." Floor plans are included as text figures for two of these areas—presumably the ones referred to as "major." These plans point up two facts: (a) the complexity of Middle Mississippi habitation areas, and, (b) the futility of attempting to reconstruct so highly a complex pattern of life through the medium of limited excavation. A person who has not excavated such a village cannot conceive of the veritable maze of post holes, house wall trenches, pits, fireplaces, graves, lenses of debris, and lenses of sterile soil the excavator has to find his way through in order to develop the story of intense activity over a long period of time by an extremely active folk. For this reason Cole found it expedient to condense tremendously

the details of exploration and for the same reason I must do likewise. To one specifically interested in the details of house type, village plan, orientation of dwellings, etc., the published data is dissappointing. The day books and notes of the excavators are without doubt available for detailed study but someone should digest them if they have not already been so treated.

Another aspect of the exploration was disappointing both to the student of comparable sites and to the author and his co-workers. Sites such as Kincaid usually have one or more stockade lines as an integral feature. In this respect Kincaid was probably no exception but the evidence presented is not conclusive.

Five of the six mounds were of the truncate pyramid type generally thought to have served as foundations for buildings of importance to the villagers. The method of investigation was by trenching and occasional expansion of trenches to include major portions of interval structures as they were encountered. The floor plans resulting from this digging method leave much to be desired but due to the sheer mass of earth involved in total exploration there seems to have been no alternative. Excavation of these mounds which, as usual were erected by stages, provided artifacts which could be accurately relegated to time categories. Some change was noted in architectural details which, in the main, did not differ drastically from the dwellings in the village area. Floors, or "stages" 6, 3 and 2 in Mound Mx⁴ produced charcoal specimens which were dated by Bell and in this respect the mound was monumental so far as Ohio Valley archaeology is concerned.

The sixth mound was apparently erected exclusively for burial purposes. It was explored during four field seasons and the remains of one hundred fifty-five individuals were located. Regrettably all were in such a poor state of preservation that physical studies could not be made.

The burial mound was of considerable interest and importance for a number of reasons. It was the only concentration of burials found in the Kincaid explorations. The mound was erected upon an older village level—Lewis Component—which, in turn, was superimposed upon material representing the earliest of the pottery making peoples of this area—Baumer Component. The mound was also of interest in that change took place in burial practice within the body of the mound. The lower and oldest burials were in bark and log "tombs" while the upper and most recent burials were in stone lined graves.

Chapter three is devoted to a brief description of Kincaid materials broken down into categories. A discussion of the sources of lithic materials is of value and is based upon a study by Bell. I concur completely with the thesis that raw materials and their sources are as important as the finished product in the interpretation of prehistory. Trade objects, especially pottery, are discussed and these point to contacts with peoples removed a considerable distance from southern Illinois. Time periods are also thus indicated which in the main agree with the periods established through other media.

Interposed between the detailed description of the Kincaid explorations and the Summary and Conclusions, are three chapters which cover the cultural assemblages representing the time period between Kincaid and the pre-ceramic nomadic food gatherers of the earliest period. These are valuable additions to our growing literature on Ohio Valley prehistory.

The report on Kincaid by Cole ends with a summary in which the site is placed in its proper position culturally and chronologically. Herein it is also related to comparable components elsewhere in the Ohio Valley. A detailed comparison of Kincaid with these other sites would have been welcome but in view of the mass of material which would thus be derived it is understandable why it is omitted. Also regrettable is the fact that correlations between Kincaid as a preliterate expression of culture with linguistic groups of the southeast as expressed in ethnography, or ethnohistory, is lacking.

The supporting papers in the form of appendices start with one by Robert E. Bell and although all are of importance, his is by far the most valuable. This paper is the best account of the method and procedure followed by the dendrochronologist in the Mississippi Valley which has come to my attention. An accurate master chart for the eastern red cedar, *Juniperus virginiana*, now exists for the years from 1450 to 1942. Although such a chart is too recent for much that concerns the archaeologist of the Ohio Valley, it is still of vital importance. Also, the present flare for dates derived through the medium of radio-active carbon, should not obscure the importance of dendrochronology. Results obtained from the former method are in some instances open to question and the C-14 dates given to us for Angel Site are too far out of line to repeat in print. Eventually the C-14 dates for recent sites may be forthcoming but even if they are the tree ring method will be more accurate and will not be obsolescent.

Bell was able to state with finality that Kincaid was occupied from some time prior to 1523 until some time after

1613. It is interesting, and gratifying, to note that these actual dates coincide perfectly with "guess dates" previously given for the complex.

Kenneth G. Orr contributes an appendix covering cultural change within Kincaid. This is based upon the statistical treatment of artifacts, mainly pottery, taken from controlled levels from various portions of the site. He refers to the pottery samples as being taken from "four domiciliary mounds—Mx⁴, Mx^{1A}-35, Mx^{1A}-41, and Mx^{1B}" yet, with the exception of the first mentioned, all are elsewhere described as "knolls." These would seem to have been spots in the village which had grown from use as dwelling sites or were, in fact, natural elevations which had been lived upon intensively. In either event the end result apparently was not affected for the actual dates derived by Bell verified the statistical conclusions of Orr. The wonder of it is that Orr was able to establish a chronology based upon material taken from intensively occupied sections of the village. And here, may I say again, that a person who has not excavated such a site has no conception of the complexity involved. The formula used for determining the standard of error of one proportion is incorrectly stated on p. 303. This, no doubt, is a typographical error.

Appendix III, by John W. Bennett, is the Kincaid Designative Trait List. The traits are broken down into "Activity" categories each of which is sub-divided into "Complex, Class and Items." The idea of so dividing the cultural assemblage of a site such as Kincaid is a good one. It leads to the question as to whether or not an archaeological report could be written in terms of a prehistoric ethnology.

An example of what could be done with much of the material derived from an archaeological excavation is given by Charles G. Wilder in Appendix IV in a study of Kincaid Textiles. The sherds used could have been included only as ceramic traits of the textile marked variety. Wilder, however, has put life into them by demonstrating the weaving techniques involved and how these techniques changed with the passage of time.

It has been tempting to insert, upon occasion, statements relative to Kincaid as compared to Angel Site. The two are, in the main, identical. There are, however, differences which may reflect variation in time or the relative geographical position of the two sites. There are instances where matters of interpretation of evidence might have been discussed. But this seems not the place for such comments. It is quite obvious that the two sites were built and lived upon by members of the

same ethnic and linguistic group and that they were coexistent. If we think of such sites in terms of "City-States" then it is possible, indeed probable, that the spheres of influence came together on the peripheries to the east of Kincaid and west of Angel.

The task so ably completed by Cole was an unenviable one. To write a report upon work performed by one's self is chore enough but to take the notebooks of others and integrate them into a concise and complete account of such a large undertaking is quite another matter. It is a tribute to Cole, that not only did he carry the work to its logical conclusion in the form of this publication but also that he was able to do it. The integration which is so obvious in the report is the result of vision and planning and organization, all of which can be ascribed to Cole since he is the only individual who had a continuous part in the project.

Indiana Historical Society

Glenn A. Black

The Tudor Chamber Administration, 1485-1547. By W. C. Richardson. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952, pp. xiii, 541. Index, appendix, bibliographical note, and illustrations. \$6.50.)

Mr. Richardson has undertaken an ambitious task and the result is highly creditable for its careful research and the insight it gives into a significant phase of Tudor financial administration. While there exist numerous studies on Tudor finance, much remains obscure, and Mr. Richardson has endeavored to do important groundwork on the problem of chamber administration, without which, he states, "no adequate history of the four great revenue courts of the period could be written."

After giving a survey of the obsolescence, inadequacy, and corruption of the system of exchequer control under Edward IV and Richard III, the author shows how Henry VII bypassed the unwieldy and often inefficient exchequer by setting up and developing the chamber administration, whereby he secured financial independence. This institution established a personal treasury, which became greatly expanded under Henry VIII. After 1487, the practice of directing special types of revenue through chamber channels developed rapidly, and soon standard revenues, formerly paid to the exchequer, were diverted into the chamber. The minute details of this process cannot be mentioned in a review, but they will prove