

Having read the comments of John Griffin, Jim Knight, George Luer, and Jeffrey Mitchem, I am glad that Louis Tesar suggested soliciting their comments on my proposed Fort Walton ceramic typology. When Louis first made the suggestion, I was a little worried. What would people think of my ideas? What would they say about them? My anxiety was natural, I think. After all, you can become personally involved in the things you write.

The results of this exercise are well worth any anxiety I felt. The comments will, in the long run, (as they do immediately) improve my typology. Additionally, the comments make contributions on their own. John Griffin reminds us that Willey's typology evolved, as good typologies should. If my proposal is adopted, I hope everyone who uses it remembers John's discussion and work to improve my construct. Jim Knight reminds us that typologies are tools we use to examine the past. As a carpenter has different tools for different jobs, we can have different typologies for different analyses. Typologies are not reality. George Luer presents new information on the ceramics of the Safety Harbor area and demonstrates the need for serious studies of the ceramics of that area that go far beyond what I have tried to do. Jeffrey Mitchem cautions against intemperate use of a system like the one I propose. He identifies a real drawback to the type-variety approach, one that everyone who uses it should remember. Finally, all of the discussants provide specific, substantive comments on the construction of my proposed typology and the types and varieties I have defined. I do not necessarily agree with every suggestion, but I do believe that the

typology is much sounder for the incorporation of many of them.

We must have researchers who make discoveries, who construct and evaluate theories and explanations, who improve our methods of investigating the past, and who publish the results of their work. However, we cannot rely on these contributions alone. We must have evaluations, comments, criticisms, corrections of published works if we are to derive the greatest benefit from the work of every archaeologist. I am pleased that my proposed ceramic typology is the first article in The Florida Anthropologist to receive this kind of treatment. I hope it is not the last.

John Griffin chides me for ignoring the fact that I am not the first person to attempt to subdivide some of Willey's types. I am sorry if I gave the impression that Willey's construct was a static entity, unmodified until I came along. Willey's typology has changed many times. Hale Smith (1948) proposed the addition of the types of the Leon-Jefferson complex; Willey modified the original typology in Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast (1949); John Griffin subdivided Marsh Island Incised and Pinellas Incised (1950); and, William Sears made major changes to the typology in his report on the Tierra Verde mound (1967).

Like any typology in wide use, Willey's has evolved. This evolution is evident in the addition of new types, in the subdivision of previously defined types, and in the alteration of sorting criteria used to assign sherds to a type. Such change is good. It is the sign of a vigorous and flexible tool. The results of this evolution can be seen in several of the comments.

Jeffrey Mitchem questions my failure to mention the "laminated, contorted paste" of Pinellas Plain in my description of its presumed replacement, Lake Jackson Plain, var. Pinellas (as did several anonymous readers). It is true that most archaeologists working in the Safety Harbor area do think of Pinella Plain in this manner. This is not the way Willey defined it, however. He stated that Pinellas Plain was similar in ware characteristics to Safety Harbor Incised except that it, "as a rule ... tends to be harder, more compact than Safety Harbor Incised" (1949:482). Willey defined Safety Harbor Incised very broadly. It could be clayey and possibly temperless or it could be tempered with fine or medium-coarse sand. Its paste could range from granular and compact to coarse, contorted and laminated. It is evident that Willey did not intend to restrict Pinellas Plain as it has come to be restricted.

Modification of Willey's original type definitions can also be seen in George Luer's comments. Luer is quite explicit about his modification of the definition of Sarasota Incised. He has also modified the definitions of Safety Harbor Incised and Englewood Incised. Willey did not restrict Safety Harbor Incised to globular bowls, bottles, and beakers (1949:481), nor did he restrict Englewood Incised to beakers (1949:472). These may be common vessel forms of these types but they are not the only forms, if Willey's original definitions are followed. Further evidence of the change in the definition of Safety Harbor Incised is evident in Luer's statement that what I call and illustrate as Fort Walton Incised, var. Safety Harbor, is not real Safety Harbor. The sherd that I illustrate is one that Willey himself identified as Safety Harbor Incised (see Willey 1949:Plate 49a). I do not want to suggest that Luer is wrong. He may well be right in saying that workers in the Safety Harbor area would not now call that sherd from the Safety

Harbor mound Safety Harbor Incised. But that it is because the definition has changed.

Griffin questions the lumping of Deptford types into Wakulla Check Stamped (as did nearly every reviewer). Upon sober reflection, I excluded the Deptford types of Wakulla. John is right that this is neither the time nor the place to attempt this. Therefore, you will not find Deptford subsumed into Wakulla in my typology.

Mitchem states that he doubts the utility of my plain varieties, since he thinks that they would be difficult to sort. Perhaps that is true, although varieties do not necessarily have to be 100% sortable. Context can be a major factor in the sorting of varieties. I would hesitate to totally ignore the paste differences I tried to isolate with my varieties of Lake Jackson Plain (see Tesar 1980:167, 168, 203-205, 1980b:14, 25-26; and this issue).

Knight states that I wish my typology to reflect cultural continuities through time, particularly between Weeden Island and Fort Walton. He also points out that there is evidence for such continuity, evidence that deserves emphasis. In earlier studies, I have emphasized the evolution of Fort Walton societies in the Apalachicola Valley from indigenous Weeden Island groups; Knight has emphasized the Middle Mississippian origins of many of the Fort Walton ceramic styles. Our positions do not conflict, at least not in my view. I would hope that my typology would be a tool useful to both of us. Anthropology has been devised as the description and explanation of cultural similarities and differences, stability and change (Price 1980:709), a typology should help us do anthropology.

Knight goes on to discuss the differences between my typology and the one he helped devise for the Cemochechobee site. Anyone thinking of using my typology should read and

seriously consider Knight's comments. Typologies are tools -- tools we use to extract data from the artifacts we dig up. There is no right or wrong typology, just different typologies that tell us different things about the past. What Knight and Frank and Gail Schnell tried to do at Cemochechobee is important. The questions they raised are interesting and well worth investigating. My typology is not the tool for that investigation, theirs is much better. Their typology, on the other hand, is not a particularly good tool for investigating the questions I want to ask, I think mine is.

John Griffin says that he would "hesitate to agree with Scarry that it (the type-variety system) is a system that lacks weaknesses". So would I. The type-variety approach is rife with weaknesses, as Griffin, Knight and Mitchem all point out. It lacks some of the weaknesses that I see in the type-series approach but it is not perfect. Anyone who uses by typology or anyone who continues to use Willey's typology should take care to remember the imperfection of their tools.

I want to thank Louis Tesar, John Griffin, Jim Knight, George Luer, and Jeffrey Mitchem for their contributions to my work. I think my typology has benefited from their comments; I know I have benefited as a scholar.

John F. Scarry  
Bureau of Archaeological Research  
September 12, 1985

## REFERENCES CITED

- Griffin, John W.  
1950 Test Excavations at the Lake Jackson Site. American Antiquity 16:99-112.
- Price, Barbara J.  
1982 Cultural Materialism: A Theoretical Review American Antiquity 47:709-741.
- Sears, William H.  
1967 The Tierra Verde Burial Mound. The Florida Anthropologist 20:25-74.
- Smith, Hale G.  
1948 Two Historic Archaeological Periods in Florida. American Antiquity 12:313-319.
- Tesar, Louis D.  
1980a The Leon County Bicentennial Survey Report: An Archaeological Survey of Selected Portions of Leon County, Florida. Miscellaneous Project Report Series 49. Florida Bureau of Historic Sites and Properties, Tallahassee.
- 1980b Fort Walton and the DeSoto Entrada: Culture Change in the Tallahassee Red Hills Area of Florida. Paper Presented at Southeastern Archaeological Conference, New Orleans.
- Willey, George R.  
1949 Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections. 113, Washington.