

Bulletin
of the
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY
of
North Carolina

vol II ————— no 1

April, 1936

Cover

BULLETIN OF THE
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Vol III

April, 1936

No. 1

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Peachtree Mound and Village Site, by M. W. Stirling.....	1
Indian Slavery in the Carolina Region, by Sanford Winston	3
A Report of the Asheville Meeting, by Guy B. Johnson.....	9
The Winston-Salem Meeting.....	11
Book Review (Speck's <u>Catawba Texts</u>) by D. L. Rights.....	11
Keyauwee Exploration	13

OFFICERS

Wallace E. Caldwell, President
Chapel Hill

Douglas L. Rights, Vice-President
Winston-Salem

Guy B. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer
Chapel Hill

Sanford Winston, Editor
Raleigh

Dues, \$1.00 a year. Extra copies of Bulletin, 25¢ for members, 50¢ for non-members.

PEACHTREE MOUND AND VILLAGE SITE

by M. W. Sitrling

Chief, Bureau of American Ethnology

Editor's Note: This discussion of the Peachtree Mound and Village Site is part of the Smithsonian Report for 1934 (Publication 3324). It is reprinted here because of its interest to members of the Society, with the kind permission of the author.

To recover at least a part of the prehistory of southwestern North Carolina, an important Indian mound and village site in the Hiwassee River Valley, near the mouth of Peachtree Creek, was selected for excavation. This selection was made upon the recommendation of Dr. John R. Swanton, ethnologist in the Bureau of American Ethnology, who regards the location as, in all probability, that of Guasili, visited by Hernando De Soto and his soldiers in the summer of 1540.

The mound, 215 feet long, 180 feet wide, and $10\frac{1}{2}$ feet high, was built above a 2-foot stratum of black loam, in which were found burial pits, post holes, and much village-site debris. Originally it was a truncated pyramid, an artificial elevation commonly used by various southeastern Indian tribes as supports for temples or chiefs' houses. Within 4 feet of the top, three distinct hard-clay floors were superimposed, indicating that when the mound had reached a certain height the top was leveled off and a wooden structure with a clay floor was built. After its destruction by fire or other agencies a second structure was superimposed. This occurred at least three times.

Except for important features in the mound very few artifacts or burials were placed in the mound proper. However, Indians buried in pits dug into the mound surface were associated with articles of European origin, such as glass beads, lead bullets, and broken spurs, indicating contact with the white man. Most of the skeletal material was poorly preserved.

The most important feature in the mound proper was the remains of a structure 25 feet square and probably 7 feet high. Excavation revealed a hard thin floor extending beyond the walls, which may have constituted the floor of a much larger structure. The sides of the building consisted of piles of stones, which served as a foundation to support vertical posts (pl. 6, fig. 1). Four large post holes were found, one at each corner, remnants of the main roof supports. The stone walls rested on the clay floor, but the holes extended beneath it. Residue of the pole and brush roof lay in the center of the various compartments. There existed at least six partitions or rooms along the stone walls (pl. 6, fig. 2). These partitions were made with yellow clay encircling sticks 1 to 2 inches in diameter. Such a structure could have been used as a ceremonial sweat lodge or men's clubhouse.

Excavations in the surrounding village site and below the base of the mound indicate that the mound was superimposed on the village site. Numerous burials were obtained from this habitation area. The rich nature of the soil was not conducive to preservation. The bodies were flexed—knees drawn to the chest—soon after death, and placed in small pits, on the left side, with one or both hands drawn to the face. The most important burial was found beneath the mound floor, fairly well preserved (pl. 7, fig. 1). Associated with it were two copper ear ornaments and cane matting. Some intrusive burials were made in stone-lined graves (pl. 7, fig. 2).

Observations regarding artifacts, based on the fragmentary specimens recovered from both the mound and the village site, were as follows: Slate was the most commonly used stone for fashioning gaming stones, discoidals, and small celts. Vessels were carved from steatite. Mortars, axes, projectile points, and smoking pipes were made from a variety of materials. Animal bones were cut and polished for making awls and fish hooks. Various ornaments, such as beads and pendants, were carved from unio and conch shells. Small pieces of copper were fashioned into ornaments.

The smoking pipes were small, usually made from a dark, close-grained igneous rock. They were of the stemmed variety, bowls showing considerable variation in shape, size, and design. Small effigies occasionally occurred on the bowls. The baked clay pipes show a wide variety of form and incised designs. A few examples of the flaring trumpet-shaped bowls are comparable to those from Etowah, Macon, and the Nacoochee mounds in Georgia.

Only a very general description can be made of the various potsherds until a more careful study has been made. Observations in the field justified conclusions that types above the mound floor level differed from those below the base. The sherds in the mound were decorated on the outside with a wide variety of stamped designs. They are tempered with coarse grit. Color varies from black through various shades of gray and tan to a dull brownish red; the inside shows construction and smoothing marks, yet is fairly smooth without any attempt at polish; the ware breaks irregularly, leaving a rough, lumpy edge. About half the rim sherds have thumb-nail marks or are incised; the rest are plain.

The various random samplings of sherds from below the mound level show variations from those in the mound. In one 10-foot square the sherds show a larger number painted red; the temper is not as coarse; the interior and exterior surfaces show evidence of more polish. An occasional shell-tempered sherd was found. From another 10-foot square below mound level a decided difference was noticeable. Twenty-five percent are painted red; many are undecorated; decorated sherds are either stamped or incised; 40 percent were shell-tempered. In many cases the shells disintegrated or leached out from the exposed surfaces, leaving a porous or cell-like surface. Strap and loop handles occurred more frequently below the mound, whereas lug and flange handles were found in the mound. The decorative stamp patterns are comparable to types from the Etowah and Nacoochee mounds in northern Georgia.

Positive conclusions or definite affiliations cannot be stated here. Nevertheless, the following recapitulation may be made: The mound was built primarily for ceremonial rather than for burial purposes as indicated by its several superimposed floors, large stone and wooden structures, and the lack of burials. The potsherds and smoking pipes belong to the general northern Georgia area, exemplified by Etowah and Nacoochee mounds. At least 2 and perhaps 3 culture levels were obvious; the village site beneath the mound, the mound itself, and the surface of the mound, which revealed contact with Europeans. The first Europeans to visit this site, in the opinion of Dr. J. R. Swanton, were De Soto and his army in the year 1540. The town at this place is said to have contained 600 wooden houses--probably an exaggeration--and was the capital of a province where the hungry explorers were given a hearty welcome. One of De Soto's men informed the chronicler Garcilaso de la Vega that "The lord who bore

the name of the province left the capital half a league to meet the Spaniards, accompanied by 500 of the principal persons of the country, very gayly dressed after their fashion. His lodge was upon a mound with a terrace round it, where six men could promenade abreast." Even though no artifacts were recovered that could be identified as belonging to these first European explorers, nevertheless Dr. Swanton, who has devoted considerable time to the study of De Soto's route, feels satisfied that this is the site of Guasili.

INDIAN SLAVERY IN THE CAROLINA REGION

by

Sanford Winston
State College, University of North Carolina

/Editor's Note: Reprinted from the October, 1934, issue of the Journal of Negro History, by kind permission of the Editor./

Although known to the specialist, the presence and extent of Indian slavery in colonial times has, except for a recent thesis by Lauber,¹ received but little attention, except as brief reports are found scattered throughout early records, letters, and travellers' descriptions. The present investigation represents a collection of such material as region. Comment has been reduced to the minimum.

From the early records which are available, it is evident that Indian slavery was no insignificant factor in the colonial period of Carolina. It was recognised in the Concessions of 1665 and in the Fundamental Constitutions.² The Carolinas were preeminent in the use and exportation of Indian slaves although North Carolina appears to have been a somewhat laggard second to South Carolina in this respect. The ready supply of Indians helped to meet the pressing need of the colonists for laborers, and New England offered a ready market for the surplus.

The colonists followed the example of the Spanish who had not only enslaved the West Indian natives from the earliest period but also transported Indians from Florida to work as slaves in the mines of Hispaniola.³ Thus the English and other settlers in North Carolina took over what was already a well established cultural pattern, a pattern which was gradually supplanted by the tremendously more important slavery of Negroes. Not only had Indian slavery been practiced by the Spaniards but also by the Indians themselves. "When Menendez founded St. Augustine in 1565, he discovered in a native village the

1 A. W. Lauber, Indian Slavery in Colonial Times within the Present Limits of the United States, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law (New York, 1913), Vol. LIV, No. 3.

2 R. D. W. Connor, History of North Carolina, Vol. I, p. 183.

3. Francois-Xavier Martin, The History of North Carolina in the Earliest Period (New Orleans, 1829), Vol. I, p. 3.

descendants of a band of Cuban Indians who had come to the mainland, been taken prisoners by the Florida Indians, and reduced to slavery."⁴

Such slaves were variously employed in domestic tasks, tilling fields, and hunting and fishing. According to Brickell⁵ and Lawson⁶ the Indians in North Carolina utilized slaves for work in their fields. Lawson reported that his Indian guide, Enoe Will, "had a slave, a Sissipahan Indian by nation, who killed us several turkies and other game, on which we feasted."⁷

Indians at times also enslaved whites. The preamble of an act of North Carolina in 1707 indicates that whites . . . captured in small vessels, or shipwrecked, were taken by tribesmen as slaves.⁸ There is also the account of women and children captured on the plantations who were enslaved.⁹

The methods of securing Indian slaves in the Carolinas were primarily in connection with wars. During the entire period of the Tuscarora War, the enslavement of Indians was practised. The Indian allies of the English captured numbers of tribesmen to sell into slavery. In 1712, Colonel John Barnwell, disgusted at the lack of reward for his services and unwilling to return to South Carolina without some profit to his men, "lured a large number of Indians to the vicinity of the Coree village near New Bern (and) permitted his own men to fall upon them unaware, capture many of them and hasten away to South Carolina to sell their victims into slavery."¹⁰ From another source we learn that his men, after killing 40 or 50 Indian men, took "near upon 200 of their women and children"¹¹ for whom they would receive so much per head in goods. Colonel Moore's men also captured several hundred slaves to sell in Charleston.¹² It is estimated that in all more than 700 Indians were sold into slavery before the Tuscarora War was ended.

In the Journal of the South Carolina House of Assembly, 1712, it is pointed out that it would be disadvantageous to secure help from New York, for "if the five nations of Indians should come in and destroy the Tuscaroras they would... have all the advantage of the slaves ..."¹³ One frequently mentioned difficulty in the early records was the fact that Indian warriors after having captured some slaves would promptly depart with their booty, deserting their white leaders.

In 1715 the upper Cherokee chiefs, in a meeting with the Carolina troops on the Hiwassee River, near the present town of Murphy, evinced eagerness "for war with some neighboring tribes, with whom the whites were trying to make peace, and demanded large supplies of guns and ammunition, saying that if they made peace, they would have no means of getting slaves with which to buy ammunition."¹⁴

4 Lauber, op. cit., p. 30.

5 The Natural History of North Carolina, Dublin. Printed by James Carson, 1737. (Reprinted Raleigh, 1911), p. 321.

6 The History of North Carolina (London, 1718), p. 188.

7 Ibid., p. 101.

8 North Carolina Colonial Records, Vol. I, p. 674.

9 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 182.

10 Connor, op. cit., p. 103.

11 Pollock's "Letter Book," Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. I, p. 875.

12 Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. I, p. 826 and Vol. II, p. iv.

13 Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. I, p. 900.

14 Connor, op. cit., p. 107.

The right to make slaves of Indians captured in warfare seems to have been unquestioned. In a few cases, too, the whites landed on unsettled coasts and enticed natives aboard to transport them to the settled colonies for sale. According to Lawson, the New England settlers who unsuccessfully attempted to plant a colony at the mouth of the Cape Fear in 1660 sent Indian children north into slavery.¹⁵ It is also reported that in 1685 four Indians were kidnapped near the Cape Fear and taken to New York to be sold into slavery.¹⁶

In a description of the commerce of South Carolina in 1710, we find that the products of New England and the Middle Atlantic colonies were exchanged for skins, naval stores and "slaves taken by the Indians in war."¹⁷ According to Lauber, enslavement by any means was closely connected with the fur trade.¹⁸

Such methods persisted to a considerable extent throughout the colonial period. In 1760 the assembly at New Bern by legal enactment decreed that to encourage volunteers in the expedition against the Cherokees and other Indians, all Indians taken as captives should be declared slaves and the property of the captors.¹⁹ In a letter from Lord Germain to an Indian agent in 1776, reference is made to the fact that the rebel government of Carolina "not only offers considerable rewards for the scalps of these Indians but declared their children of a certain age which may be taken prisoners the slaves of the cantors..."²⁰ Two years later a complaint was registered by the Cherokees that "several of their people taken prisoners during the late War by North Carolinians (had) been sold for slaves..."²¹

A source of slaves of far less importance was the practice of the Indians of selling members of the tribe to the whites for a definite period as punishment. Lawson reports the effort to sell an Indian thief to the governor as a slave, but in this instance the governor declined to make the purchase.²²

In a letter dated May 25, 1713, Pollock mentioned the fact that "Provision being very scarce here, the assembly thought fit to have Colonel MacKay's sloop hired in the country's service, to carry off what slaves the Indians have here..."²³

As early as 1705 a letter of grievances, signed by 150 of the inhabitants, was sent to the Lords and Proprietors of the province of Carolina complaining of Governor Moore's action in regard to Indian slavery for his own private use so that the trade in skins and furs was being ruined and Indian wars would possibly result.²⁴

¹⁵ Op. cit., pp. 73-74. Also, see Hawks, History of North Carolina, 2nd ed., Vol. II, p. 73.

¹⁶ O'Callaghan, Calendar of Manuscripts, etc., Part II, p. 117.

¹⁷ A Letter from South Carolina (London, 1732- First ed., 1710), p. 17. Also, see W. J. Rivers, A Sketch of the History of South Carolina, etc. (Charleston, 1856), p. 234.

¹⁸ Op. cit., p. 168.

¹⁹ Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. XXIII, p. 517.

²⁰ Ibid., Vol. X, p. 894.

²¹ Ibid., Vol. XII, pp. 204-205.

²² Op. cit., p. 216.

²³ Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. XII, p. 216.

²⁴ Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. II, Appendix, p. 904.

The proprietors "appear to have been playing a double game. They posed as protectors of the tribes and made treaties to insure the peace and safety of their allies. Consistently with such action, also, they opposed the purchase by the colonists of captives taken in various intertribal difficulties. On the other hand, it was the proprietors themselves who gave permission to sell in the West Indies the Indian captives taken by the colonists in wars against the tribes."²⁵ Throughout the period, emphasis was placed primarily upon women and children as slaves, the men being generally killed. The practice of sending them to other colonies, particularly New England, was fairly general as they were less likely to escape. Furthermore, when at such a distance they were not a constant source of hostility on the part of their unconquered tribesmen.

In 1705, Pennsylvania forbade the importation of slaves from Carolina because it tended to make the Indians of that province suspicious and dissatisfied.²⁶ In 1712 Massachusetts passed a similar law due to the alleged fierceness and troublesomeness of the imported slaves and four years later Connecticut followed suit.²⁷ In 1715 Rhode Island prohibited the importation of Indian slaves due to the serious crimes committed by them and the discouraging effect on the importation of white servants from Great Britain.²⁸

On the other hand, friendly Indians in the Carolinas were apparently protected. At a council meeting at the home of Pollock in Chowan, August 7, 1713, complaint was lodged against one Prichard Jasper for selling a friendly Indian as a slave, and it was ordered that Jasper be taken into custody and brought before the board to answer the complaint.²⁹

Moreover, in a letter from South Carolina, April 5, 1716, it was stated that "There's another false ascertain from a New England Merchant that we used to set our Friendly Indians together to war on each other, for the advantage of slaves which you know to be false and that it was always our care to keep them at Peace..."³⁰

The actual number of Indian slaves is difficult to approximate. In 1708, Rivers estimated that one-fourth of the slaves in South Carolina were Indians,³¹ including 500 Indian men slaves, 600 women, and 300 children. Apparently the relationship between the number of Indian and Negro slaves was definitely inverse. As the latter increased, the former decreased.

²⁵ Lauber, op. cit., pp. 173-174.

²⁶ Conner, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 100.

²⁷ Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. II, p. 52.

²⁸ Records of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Vol. IV, pp. 193-194.

²⁹ Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. II, "Council Journal," p. 55.

³⁰ Ibid., Vol. II, p. 252.

³¹ Op. cit., p. 232.

Moreover, the total Indian population was not large. With the advent of the whites, the numbers began to diminish steadily. Protracted warfare, a decline in the birth-rate, and epidemic were all factors. Small-pox in particular took a heavy toll, at times sweeping away whole towns.³² It was estimated that by the beginning of the eighteenth century most of the Carolina tribes could not muster more than fifty men apiece.³³ Lawson, writing soon after the turn of the century, declared that "small-pox and rum have made such a destruction amongst them, that, on good grounds, I do believe, there is not the sixth savage living within two hundred miles of all our settlements, as there were fifty years ago."³⁴

The condition of slavery was not perpetuated by the Indians themselves, for, unlike the practices of the whites with respect to the children of both Indian and Negro slaves, the children of Indian slave parents were considered by the Indians as free and equal with other members of the tribe.³⁵

There appears to have been no legal distinction between Indian and Negro slaves with respect to "rights, duties, and conditions of life. They were thrown closely with the Negroes and due to the fact that they eventually disappeared, that they intermarried with, and were absorbed by, the large body of blacks, Dr. Hawks is perhaps right in supposing that they were used chiefly to hunt and fish for their masters, while the harder work of the field was left to Negroes."³⁶

"... we have evidenced that, in some families at least, the Indian hunter was considered an indispensable member of the servile portion of the household. With the gun or the net, he was far more useful than he could ever be made with the axe."³⁷

Such a division of labor is readily explainable in terms of the culture of the Indians, a culture unfitting them for protracted field work under the direction of white masters through Indian slaves seem at times to have been used in the southern fields side by side with Negroes.³⁸ They were not trained as skilled laborers as a general practice as such training was felt to discourage the immigration of white craftsmen.³⁹ In many cases they were kindly treated and were more or less inmates of the families to which they belonged. (Incidentally, it is recorded that coarse cloth, both imported and woven in the household, was utilized for the slaves' clothing.⁴⁰)

³² Lawson, op. cit., p. 28.

³³ Letter of Mr. Thomas, missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1706, in South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, Vol. V, p. 42.

³⁴ Op. cit., p. 224.

³⁵ Wm. Bartram, Travels through North and South Carolina, etc. (Philadelphia, 1791), p. 186.

³⁶ Connor, op. cit., p. 72. Also see Hawks, Vol. II, p. 229 and Brickell, p. 42.

³⁷ Hawks, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 229-230.

³⁸ Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1897-1898, p. 233.

³⁹ Lauber, op. cit., p. 245.

⁴⁰ Hawks, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 577.

Marriage of whites with Indians, whether slave or free, was prohibited by statute after 1715. A later act extended this to the third generation. Both the participants and the clergyman or justice of the peace were subject to heavy fines if they violated the laws.⁴¹

Manumission of Indian slaves in North Carolina was only for meritorious service and then only by the permission of the country council.⁴² In general freed slaves were considered quite undesirable because of the possibility of the incitement of trouble among the unfreed slaves. Hence a freedman who remained in the province more than six months or returned to it was liable to be sold at public auction.⁴³

The records indicate that Indian slaves were not averse to running away from their masters. At a Council meeting held at the Chowan Court House November 11, 1718, the problem of one Pompey, an Indian rogue, was discussed and an order was issued that he be apprehended dead or alive, a reward being offered for his capture.⁴⁴

Following the Tuscarora War, such escapes were frequent, consisting chiefly of the captive Tuscarora. The council frequently had to request the famous "King Blount" to force his people to return such slaves according to his agreement with the Carolina government.⁴⁵ As late as 1777, a slaveholder complained to the North Carolina House of Commons that two other Carolinians had taken his Indian slave and a committee was appointed to look into the matter.⁴⁶ The problem of escape is known to have been met by Indian slaveholders by mutilating the feet of slaves so as to make running rapidly impossible and tracking easy.⁴⁷

The value of Indian slaves naturally varied considerably. During the French and Indian War, when the Indians on the western frontier rose against the English, anyone who captured a hostile Indian was granted ownership of him as a slave. If the Indian were killed, his captor was granted 10 pound from the public treasury.⁴⁸ Obviously the price of a slave must have normally exceeded 10 pounds. In 1713 the seizure of "one Indian woman slave named Ann and one female child as his own proper good and chattles" resulted in a judgment against Capt. Richard Sanderson of 30 pounds.⁴⁹ Such lawsuits were not uncommon.

In the same year, Colonel Pollock bought eight Indian captives at 10 pounds a head for shipment to the West Indies.⁵⁰ That such moderate prices did not always prevail is noted from Captain Moore's report to General Rutherford his Command during the Expedition against the Cherokees in which he stated that three Indian prisoners, two squaws and a lad, were sold for the exorbitant

41 Martin, The Public Acts of the General Assembly of North Carolina, Vol. I, pp. 45-46.

42 Martin, The History of North Carolina from the Earliest Period, Vol. I, p. 66.

43 Loc. cit.

44 Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. II, pp. 314-315.

45 Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. XII, pp. 315, 534, 536, 570, 674.

46 Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. XII, pp. 138-139, 302.

47 Brickell, op. cit., 321. Also, see Lawson, p. 198.

48 Laws of 1760 (3rd session), ch. 1, sect. 13.

49 Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. II, pp. 113-114.

50 Ibid., Vol. II, p. iv.

sum of 242 pounds.⁵¹ The inventory of a North Carolina estate as early as 1693 valued an Indian woman and child at 15 pounds and a boy at 12 pounds.⁵² A bill of sale in 1711 gave the price of an Indian between twenty and twenty-five years of age as 14 pounds.⁵³ In general Indian slaves were sold at considerably lower prices than Negro slaves.

On the whole, Indian slavery appears to have been unsatisfactory as the "tribesmen were sullen, insubordinate and short lived."⁵⁴ Lawson said, "They are not of so robust and strong bodies, as to lift great burdens, and endure labor and slavish work, as the Europeans are; yet some that are slaves, prove very good and laborious." ⁵⁵ They reacted strongly to climatic changes and could not withstand hard labor. In their own tribal tests, they expended great effort, it is true, but such feats were interspersed with long rest periods. The culture of the Indian had made him a liberty loving individual, intolerant of restraint. Hence the colonists found both white and Negro servants far more desirable and, as the colonies flourished, far more abundant.

Indian slavery passed because it did not function satisfactorily. In part due to the fewness in numbers, the practice was crippled by the inability or refusal of the Indians to adjust to an existence so foreign to the ways of living of their people. Unsteady, undependable workers, with a tendency to sicken, and a marked predilection for running away, the Indians, relatively few in numbers at best, were replaced by the more dependable Negro slaves; and Indian slavery rapidly disappeared with the rise of the republic. It is worthy of note, however, as an interesting episode, important in its day, in the history of slavery in the United States.

A REPORT OF THE ASHEVILLE MEETING

The annual meeting of the Archaeological Society of North Carolina was held at the George Vanderbilt Hotel, Asheville, on October 5, 1935. President Wallace E. Caldwell called the meeting to order at eleven o'clock. There was a good attendance. Mr. Burnham S. Colburn, of Biltmore Forest, welcomed the group to Asheville and invited those present to visit his home and see his collection after the afternoon meeting. It was at Mr. Colburn's home that the first annual meeting of the Society was held in October, 1933. Next President Caldwell spoke for a few minutes on the purposes and achievements of the Society. He pointed out that, although we are only two years old as an organization, we have made a good start toward building up a more scientific attitude

51 Colonial Records of North Carolina, Vol. X, p. 897.

52 Hawks, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 577-578.

53 North Carolina Historical and Genealogical Register, Vol. III, p. 270.

54 Albert Busnell Hart in The Encyclopaedia Americana (1927), Vol. XXVII, p. 391.

55 Op. cit., p. 174.

in the study of the Indian, have begun the accumulation of a museum collection, have held interesting meetings, have published four issues of a Bulletin which has attracted very favorable comment, have increased steadily in membership (75 paid members for 1935), have made a good start toward an archaeological survey, and are about to undertake a field study of an important Indian site.

Mr. Caldwell presented Mr. William Colburn, of Detroit, Michigan, who gave an illustrated talk on the excavation of two mounds, the Peachtree Mound near Murphy, N. C., and the Dillon Mound in North Georgia. A short report of the work on the Peachtree Mound, taken from the Smithsonian Institution Report for 1934, will be found elsewhere in this issue of the Bulletin.

Mr. Douglas L. Rights, of Winston-Salem, next spoke on "A Photographic Review of Archaeological Specimens." Numerous photographs of artifacts from the Yadkin River valley were projected on the screen to accompany the comments of the speaker. Mr. Rights emphasized the importance of good photography in archaeological work. After some discussion, the meeting adjourned for luncheon. After the luncheon, President Caldwell spoke informally for a few minutes, entertaining his audience with various anecdotes and "tall tales" from the field of archaeology.

The afternoon session opened with a talk by Mr. Joffre L. Coe, Chapel Hill, on his work with the University of Chicago field party at the Kincaid Site in Illinois during the summer of 1935. Mr. Coe was especially interested in house structures, and he illustrated with projected photographs the methods of exposing postholes, beams, walls, etc. The final speaker on the program was Mr. Guy B. Johnson, of Chapel Hill, who reported informally on a field trip in Randolph County by several officers of the Society in the spring of 1935. On a site which is thought by Mr. Douglas L. Rights and others to be the location of the Keyauwee Indian town visited by John Lawson in 1701, the party investigated a burial pit. The skeleton of an adult was removed. It was accompanied by 1300 marginella shell beads, several scallops and other shells, and a wooden ear spool on which were found fragments of the copper sheet which once covered it. It was pointed out that this site is gradually being destroyed by cultivation, that it is shallow and could be excavated at relatively little expense, and that its probable historic connection with the Keyauwee Indian town makes it of unusual importance in North Carolina archaeology. Mr. Johnson outlined a proposed study of the site, presenting estimates of cost prepared by Mr. Coe to the effect that a thorough excavation could be done for \$150 to \$200. A discussion of the proposal followed, the outcome of which was the unanimous passage of a motion by Dr. James B. Bullitt that the Society undertake the excavation of the site when funds are secured. Before the meeting adjourned cash and pledges amounting to over fifty dollars had already been collected.

The annual business meeting of the Society followed. The nominating committee, composed of Mr. Walton Johnson, chairman, Dr. James B. Bullitt, and Mr. Douglas L. Rights, presented the following nominations, which were unanimously adopted: For president, Dr. Wallace E. Caldwell; for vice-president, Mr. Douglas L. Rights; for editor, Dr. Sanford Winston; for secretary-treasurer, Dr. Guy B. Johnson; for three-year term on executive board, Mr. B. S. Colburn and Mr. H. M. Doerschuk. The meeting was adjourned about 4 p. m. After this several members and guests went to Mr. Burnham S. Colburn's home to see his museum of Indian material and North Carolina minerals.

Guy B. Johnson.

THE WINSTON-SALEM MEETING

The Spring meeting of the Society will meet in Winston-Salem May 2, 1936. A tentative program calls for several papers to be read in the morning session and for a round table discussion to be held in the afternoon session. The round table discussion will be divided into two parts. The first part will deal with the Indians of North Carolina and their material culture, to be led by Rev. Douglas L. Rights. The second part will be devoted to the interpretation of the material culture of the Indians, especially projectile points and pottery, and a discussion on the methods of excavating, referring to the proposed Keyauwee excavation to be held in June. The latter will be led by Mr. Joffre L. Coe.

All members are urged to attend this meeting and to participate in the discussion groups. Interested members are invited to make out beforehand a list of questions and present them, together with an account of their own field explorations and finds, during the discussion period.

Further details will be sent to the members before the meeting.

BOOK REVIEW

CATAWBA TEXTS. By Frank G. Speck. (New York: Columbia University Press. Pp. 91. \$2.00.)

Few volumes close with better grace in subscribing FINIS than Dr. Frank G. Speck's Catawba Texts. This is the last utterance of a rapidly vanishing language. Less than half a dozen survivors of the once powerful and populous tribe of Catawba Indians retain their native speech. From these Dr. Speck has painstakingly gathered last vestiges of mythology, folk lore and tribal customs preserved in Catawba idiom.

This is also probably the largest and best contribution to knowledge of the language of the Siouan tribes of the Southeast, to which the Catawba belong. The natives who occupied the Piedmont area of Virginia and the Carolinas, a territory of 70,000 square miles, have vanished from the scene of their former occupancy with the exception of the Catawba, of whom 200 remain, largely a mixed race. (Possibly the so-called Croatan Indians of Robeson County may include this stock, although identification has never been made). The numerous tribes disappeared rapidly. Only fragments of their speech have been gathered from odd sources.

In 1836, the Catawba language attracted the attention of linguists and ethnologists, who in subsequent study found it to belong to the Siouan linguistic group. This discovery made possible identification of the Piedmont tribes.

The Catawba were the most populous of these tribes, numbering perhaps 6,000 members prior to 1700. They once occupied a position of considerable influence, and their record has been honorable. It is significant that these

important texts, scant remains though they may be, are the contribution of the once famous Catawba Nation.

Dr. Speck obtained his material from four aged narrators, Mrs. Samson Owl (wife of a former chief of the North Carolina Cherokee), Mrs. Margaret Wiley Brown and her two children, Mrs. Sally Gordon, and Sam Brown. With extreme patience and considerable prompting the work was accomplished. Bit by bit ancient myths, legends and tribal customs were refreshed in memory and rehearsed in native speech. Languages live and die, and the Catawba language was perilously near extinction. In view of the difficulties and vague possibilities of the task, Dr. Speck has done well. The wonder is not in the paucity of material preserved, but in the fact that so much has been rescued. There is, of course, no hope for long, detailed tribal narrations, such as James Mooney obtained from the North Carolina Cherokee. Infrequent use of this speech and lapse of memory must be taken into consideration. For more than a century the Catawba Nation has suffered greatly, its members have endured untold hardships and their advantages have been few. In such distressing circumstances language suffers decline. In backwoods settlements and mill villages the King's English is not to be expected, notwithstanding Elizabethan survivals. From the collections gathered from the Catawba survivors, however, a fair knowledge of their speech is made available.

To linguists, ethnologists and other scholars Catawba Texts will have the greater appeal, adding an important link in the chain of aboriginal studies. Contribution to knowledge of the Southeastern Indians is exceedingly valuable. But while these texts may not draw an extensive circle of readers from popular appeal, they will be sought especially by many who are interested in the Indians of the Carolinas and adjacent territory, and doubtless by a considerable number beyond. There is so little material available in this field that this work will stand out prominently as a source book for years to come.

The first part of the texts includes myths and tales. Here we find our old friend Ugni, the comet, familiar figure of Indian mythology, falling from the rope that he stretched to the realm above to carry him and his mother there. We learn how the opossum lost his tail, not by the clipping of the cricket, as told by the Cherokee, but by the furtive operations of the snail. Our frisky hero, the rabbit, steals fire from the buzzard and water from the turtle, and with the snail goes for the doctor. The version of the flood story informs us that the rescue was not by the ark, but by climbing trees of an island, suggestive of refuge from freshets on Piedmont watercourses. The sending out of a dove bears implications of contact with the biblical story.

Folk beliefs constitute the second part. The wren causes laziness; the hummingbird originated from dandelion down blown from the hand of an Indian; a rabbit's foot is recommended as a love charm; crows cawing mean fair weather; charming indeed is the belief that the whippoorwill (witkuya--name derived from the call of the bird) waits to put on his hat, the pink lady slipper, before he cries forth in the spring. The taboo against cooking deer and turkey meat together confirms the belief of the Southeastern Indians as told to the early explorers that cooking various meats in the same pot spoiled hunter's luck.

Part three contains medicine practices. Reference is made to scratching

and bleeding, and the custom of blowing medicine through a reed is explained. As may be expected, the ancient custom of the Indians in treating like for like appears. Absurd remedies wholly discounted by medical science resulted. A red root for sore mouth and yellow root for jaundice are examples.

Social customs, all too few, are preserved in part four. The wild goose dance and the bear dance are prominent.

The closing part deals with industries and occupations. Making of cane baskets, tanning, fishing trapping and hunting are well represented, and there are several recipes for cooking. Description of pottery making is given in detail, appropriately indeed, for the Catawba Nation alone of the Indians east of the Mississippi retain the art of their forefathers.

All of the texts are printed in the Indian language with translation interlined for the benefit of those who cannot read the original.

Douglas L. Rights.

KEYAUWEE EXPLORATION

The Archaeological Society of North Carolina is making preparations for a two to three weeks excavation of a village site in Randolph County, North Carolina, starting June 14, 1936. This site is believed by some to be the location of the Indian village "Keyauwee" visited in 1701 by John Lawson, then surveyor general of North Carolina. Soon after his visit the village was abandoned and its exact location remains much of a mystery today. It is hoped that this excavation will yield sufficient evidence to determine the culture of its inhabitants, if not definitely to prove it to be the "Keyauwee" village.

In the spring of 1935 several interested members of the Society visited this site and conducted some preliminary excavations. In one of the test pits a burial was uncovered. Lying with the skeleton were 1300 small *Marginella* shell beads, seven bivalve shell beads, and one wooden ear-spool covered with copper. The beads were lying in such a fashion as to indicate that they were sewn onto some garment (?), and there was some evidence to indicate that they were painted with yellow ochre. The beads were formed by grinding off the upper whorl of the spire above the aperture to expose the inner whorl making an opening from the apex to the anterior canal. Several specimens were sent to Mr. Bookelman at Tulane University for identification. He reports as follows: "...I would classify the univalve shells as *Marginella apicina* Menke, whose habitat ranges from Cape Hatteras to West Indies. ...the other specimens or half of a bivalve I would classify as *Liocardium serratum* Linn. whose habitat ranges between Cape Hatteras southward..."

The ear-spool was composed of two oval shaped pieces that were semi-circular in cross section. The two halves were probably fastened together by a small wooden (?) pin. The hole in which it was placed can be seen on both pieces. The wood was examined by Dr. J. N. Couch of the University of North Carolina and determined to be a coniferous wood, probably pine. The copper covering was examined by Dr. Carl Borgmann of the University of North Carolina,

and with the help of the paper on a "Brief Metallographic Study of Primitive Copper Work", appearing in Vol. I, No. 2 of the American Antiquity, he was able to determine that the copper was hot worked and annealed at about 600 degrees.

The persons in charge of this excavation are: Dr. James B. Bullitt, director; Rev. Douglas L. Rights, assistant; Mr. Joffre L. Coe, assistant; and Mr. Harry Davis, assistant on the part of the State Museum.

The purpose of this excavation is not so much to find Indian material as it is to increase the interest of the members and other citizens of the state in the problems of archaeology. In too many cases collectors, "amateur archaeologists", and professional archaeologists place too much emphasis on the finding of "relics", and in doing so lose sight of the real problems which they were digging to solve. The preliminary explorations of the "Keyauwee" site have indicated that the yield of material should be good, but it is also possible that the finds may be very few. Whatever the case may be, a careful exploration of the site, together with a detailed study of what material may be found, will be well worth the money invested in the project. The problems of archaeology are solved in the earth and in the study of the broken and discarded material - the perfect and beautiful specimens only add a stimulus and glamour to the work. The finding of a handful of potsherds, broken implements, charcoal, and broken or burned bones in a carefully excavated refuse pit will tell more about the life of the people than a dozen perfect pots or axes obtained from careless digging.

The members and any other interested persons are invited to visit the work. In order to avoid as much confusion as possible the director has asked that anyone who wishes to take a part in the digging make arrangement with him before the first of June. Arrangements may be made so that members who wish to spend several days at the site may sleep and eat at the camp, their only expense being the cost of the food. If this is not possible the members can find room and board at Asheboro which is six miles away. The director has complete charge of the excavation, and it is his duty to see that all exploration is done correctly. All finds that are made on the surface or otherwise at the site should be turned in to the director for examination and cataloging. All mail after June 14 may be addressed in care of the Keyauwee Exploration, General Delivery, Asheboro, North Carolina.

The success of this exploration depends entirely upon the spirit in which the members cooperate with the Director in working for the good of the whole.