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The Historic Cabin Site: The Last Trace of the Cherokee Town of Coosawatte

Patrick H. Garrow
Soil Systems, Inc.

INTRODUCTION

The Historic Cabin Site was excavated by members of the University of Georgia Carter's Dam field party during June and July, 1972. The site was discovered by accident, and had not been included among the excavation priorities for the 1972 field season. Rain delays and tight scheduling on the priority excavations dictated that the work be done on the Historic Cabin Site after regular work hours and on weekends. The site was located within an area that was under excavation for a diversion channel for the nearly completed Carter's re-regulation dam, and the site investigation had to be conducted on an emergency basis. The excavation proceeded in the absence of a formal research design. The sole purpose of the work at that time was to retrieve as much data as possible from the feature that composed the Historic Cabin Site, and complete the work before earth moving equipment bore the site and crew away.

Analysis and research conducted after completion of the excavation revealed that historic Cherokee sites had received surprisingly little attention from professional archaeologists. The few published examples formed two distinct site types. New Echota, once the capitol of the Cherokee Nation,
and home sites of Cherokee leaders such as Chieftains (Garrow 1974), reflect the most common site type that has been excavated. Those sites have yielded large quantities of European ceramics and other items that have tended to reinforce the view of almost total acceptance of Euro-American material culture by the Cherokees during the early nineteenth century. The second site type is represented by features that were excavated more by accident than design. That type, represented by a pit each at Lum-Moss (Baker 1970), Boyd Farm (Caldwell 1955), and the Coosawattee pit remnant reported in this paper, has yielded almost exclusively ceramics of Cherokee manufacture with very few items of Euro-American origin.

The paper which follows describes the pit remnant designated the "Historic Cabin Site," and compares that site with other published examples from the period. It is suggested, as a result of the excavation, analysis, and comparison that the dichotomy of site types described above reflects economic and social differentiation within the Cherokee Nation during the early nineteenth century. It is further suggested that the Native Cherokee ceramic art survived until the removal of the Cherokees to the west in 1838.

A number of individuals contributed to the excavation and analysis phases of this project. Arthur R. Kelly, Professor Emeritus, University of Georgia, found the feature, and lent encouragement to the project. The excavation crew consisted of the author, Greg Paulk, Paul Webb, and Janet Rausch. Steve Foreman prepared the plan and section maps of the feature, as well as the artifact drawings. William H. Adams and Thomas R. Wheaton, of SSI, and Marvin T. Smith, Al Bartovics and Steve Kowalewski of the University of Georgia read the manuscript in various stages and offered useful criticism. Kim Sellmann and Helen Naismith of SSI helped prepare the final draft.

The paper which follows is a version of a paper presented before the Historic Sites Conference meeting in Morgantown, West Virginia, in 1972. Many colleagues have offered comments on that paper over the past few years, and the author is deeply grateful for their interest and advice.
The Historic Cabin Site was located on the west bank of the Coosawatte River a few hundred feet downstream from the confluence of the Coosawatte River and Talking Rock Creek. Research conducted by Carole Hill (1968) has established that the Cherokee Town of Coosawatte was centered near the Historic Cabin Site. Since Coosawatte was an extended town, that means that the Historic Cabin Site probably fell within the town boundaries.

The early history of Coosawatte is not well understood. Hill's work (1968:21-38) indicates that Coosawatte changed hands from Creeks to Cherokees several times during the eighteenth century, and did not become indisputably Cherokee until the late eighteenth century. Coosawatte may not have been settled for the last time until after 1782. Sevier passed through the area in that year, and did not mention a town at Coosawatte, although he destroyed Ustanala which was located a few miles downstream from Carter's Dam. Sevier did visit Coosawatte in 1788, where he settled the terms of the Cherokee surrender. Coosawatte was apparently settled by the Cherokees from 1788 to the final removal in 1838.

There is little doubt that acculturation of the Cherokees proceeded very rapidly during the early nineteenth century, but desire for change was not unanimous. The last great nativistic Cherokee prophet came from the mountains overlooking Coosawatte. That prophet, a half-blood named Charley, gathered a large following during the time of unrest surrounding Tecumseh's attempts to weld an alliance of the Indian Nations against the building encroachments of whites moving west. Charley's message, first delivered in 1812, was simple and direct. Charley said of his fellow Cherokees: "They had mills, clothes, feather beds and tables -- worse still, they had books and domestic cats! This was not good -- therefore, the buffaloes and other game were disappearing. The Great Spirit was angry, and had withdrawn his protection." (Wilkins 1970:57-58) In the manner of nativistic prophets, Charley called for his people to give up the ways of the whites and return to traditional Cherokee life. His movement collapsed after he predicted
that a great hailstorm would come on a specific day and kill all whites and nonbelievers. Charley gathered several hundred followers on a mountain peak in North Carolina, and awaited the end that did not come (Wilkins 1970: 58-60). The demise of Charley's movement must have dealt a severe blow to the traditional or conservative faction among the Cherokee. Certainly the acculturation of the Cherokee that had been repudiated by the prophet and his followers continued apace after 1812.

EXCAVATION AND DESCRIPTION

The pit remnant that made up the Historic Cabin Site represented the surviving historic Cherokee component of a large, deeply stratified, multicomponent site that was designated 9Mu104 (Fig. 1). Site 9Mu104 was missed during the original survey of the Carter's Dam Project, and was brought to the attention of members of the University of Georgia field party by machinery operators excavating the diversion channel. The upper six to eight feet of soil had been removed over most of the site when it was first visited by project personnel. A large Swift Creek occupation level was exposed over most of the work floor at that time, and collecting activities were concentrated on that area. A. R. Kelly, then the field director of the Bellfield excavation of the Carter's Dam University of Georgia field party, discovered the pit remnant that is the subject of this paper. The discovery was made while checking a profile cut through a narrow strip of undisturbed area that had been left in place to act as a plug to protect the diversion channel work area from premature encroachment by the river. A single cut the width of a bulldozer blade had been put through the plug to a depth of approximately six feet below ground surface. The historic Cherokee pit remnant was found exposed in the north wall of the bulldozer cut.

Examination of the profile exposed by the bulldozer cut indicated why the site had been missed in the original survey. The area that remained intact was covered by a mantle of sterile water deposited sand that ranged from two and a half to three and a half feet thick. The water laid sand covered
Figure 1. Location of Sites Mentioned in the Text.
an old plow zone level. Local informants later stated that the sand stratum was deposited during a flood that inundated the area in 1928 or 1929. Inspection of the sand stratum tended to confirm that information as there was no evidence of multiple flood depositions and the stratum did cover a definite plow zone.

The excavation strategy used to explore the pit remnant was dictated by the small amount of time available and the thickness of the overburden on the site. A five by ten foot trench was excavated through the sand and buried plow zone strata parallel to the exposed pit profile. A narrow control balk was left in place over the pit profile until the initial cut was completed. The trench revealed the north edge of the pit. The excavation was then enlarged with a backhoe to a unit 18.5 by 17 feet, and the control balk was removed with hand tools. The result was a 20 by 17 foot unit, which was then checked for additional features after removal of the plow zone with shovels. The plow zone was not screened, but a large sample of artifacts from several periods was recovered. Those artifacts will not be reported in this paper as they represent mixing of several of the components present at 9Mu104. No additional features were found, and the area north of the pit remnant was divided into three foot squares for further investigation. Five 3 foot squares were excavated from one to two feet deep, and yielded sparse amounts of Swift Creek ceramics. This established that the undisturbed soil, which was the color and texture of organically derived midden, did not contain a historic Cherokee midden stratum. Attention then turned to the pit remnant, and plan and section drawings were prepared (Figs. 2 and 3).

The pit remnant was initially believed to consist of two hearth stages separated by fine ash fill. Close examination revealed that the section believed to be the upper hearth was in fact a zone of densely packed fired cabin chinking. That material made up a portion of an intense stratum of artifacts referred to as the "trash stratum" in this paper. The fine ash fill overlay a prepared hearth of puddled clay that had been abandoned prior to deposition of the trash material. The trash stratum, ash fill, and puddled clay hearth were excavated as separate units and recovered materials
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Figure 2. Section of Pit and Overburden.
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segregated by stratum. All of the soil removed from each stratum was bagged in plastic bags and water screened through window screen in order to insure maximum recovery. The excavation and screening yielded many artifacts from the trash stratum, and few from the ash. The puddled clay hearth was devoid of cultural debris. The end result was a large collection of artifacts of both Cherokee and Euro-American origin, which combined, offer valuable insights into the material culture of a Cherokee family in the early nineteenth century.

It is evident that this feature was first used as a cooking pit, or perhaps the base for a log and stick chimney. Immediately after the pit was abandoned as a hearth or chimney base, the remaining depression was used for trash disposal. It was not possible to reconstruct the original horizontal or vertical pit dimensions, but the shape of the remnant suggests that the feature was square or rectangular. The diversity of the ceramic types found in the pit and the lack of even partially restorable vessels indicate that the original pit was probably much deeper than the surviving section. This pit is very similar in plan and section to a feature described by Joseph Caldwell (1955:277) from the Boyd Farm Site in the Buford Reservoir (Lake Lanier) Project (Fig. 1).

The trash stratum contained a wide array of native ceramics, trade items, and other material. The ceramics and trade items are described in detail in Appendices 1 and 2, but a brief accounting of the trash stratum material is required at this point to set the stage for comparison with artifacts recovered from sites of the same general time period in Northwest Georgia.

Twenty rim sherds, representing seven distinct native rim types, were recovered from the stratum. The rim collection reflects a tendency towards folded rims with notching (Fig. 4 and Appendix 1), but those characteristics are not present on all types. A total of 171 body sherds were recovered from the trash stratum. The designs and surface finishes present in the body sherd sample are delineated in Table 1.
Figure 4. Rim Sherds.
Table 1. Body Sherds from the Trash Stratum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design/Surface Finish</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamped</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Stamped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Plain</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnished Plain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Painted Plain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the body sherds, with the exception of the red painted plain, shared the same basic attributes, and differed only in surface finish or design. The red painted plain sherds may have originated in one of the other components present at 9Mu104, or could have been a specialized ceramic type within the Historic Cherokee occupation. The small ceramic sample extracted from the ash stratum closely paralleled that from the trash level (see Appendix 3).

The ceramics from the trash stratum closely resemble the ceramics recovered from the Boyd Farm in the Buford Reservoir Project (Caldwell 1955). The two samples differ only in design characteristics. Check stamping was the prevalent design described from Boyd Farm. The only other design described from Boyd Farm was identical to the Type II complicated stamped design found in the Historic Cabin trash stratum (Fig. 5). Perhaps it is significant that these two sites have yielded the only known examples of this design type from Northwest Georgia.

The trade materials recovered from the trash stratum are described in detail in Appendix 2. Glass trade beads, copper objects, glass fragments, iron items, a lead shot, a fragment of imported flint, and a single piece of lighter yellow creamware make up the trade goods inventory from that context. No trade goods were recovered from the ash level. The trade goods
Figure 5. Type II Complicated Stamped.
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from this site suggest an early nineteenth century date for the feature.

The trash level yielded a sparse amount of poorly preserved faunal material and a few corn cobs and peach pits. Identification of the faunal material was difficult due to the state of preservation, but the majority of the bones appeared to be deer, and the shell was freshwater mussel. A single fish bone of an unidentified species is present in the sample. Inorganic remains recovered included a large amount of fired cabin chinking. A few of the more complete examples of chinking are wedge shaped, but the majority have a single flat surface and rather amorphous shapes. Impressions on the surface of the chinking indicate that this material was applied to dressed pine logs. This indicates that a cabin stood near or on the pit remnant prior to the terminal use of the pit for trash disposal, and was the factor that led to naming the pit remnant the "Historic Cabin Site". There was a total lack of stone in the pit, although quartzite cobbles and burned limestone were recovered from the plow zone. This may indicate that the cabin had a mud and stick chimney, and it is certainly possible that the pit was the prepared base for that feature.

COMPARATIVE EXAMPLES

It is difficult to assess the position of the Coosawatte pit remnant in terms of cultural processes because of the scarcity of published data concerning historic Cherokee sites in Northwest Georgia, and the selective analysis techniques used in the few published examples. Two published sites appear to have been similar to the Historic Cabin Site in function and/or artifact content. One of these, the Boyd Farm Site (Caldwell 1955), has already been mentioned. The other site, Lum-Moss (Baker 1970:122-137), was located adjacent to the New Echota Site a few miles downstream from the Historic Cabin Site (Fig. 1). The Lum-Moss artifacts share fewer traits with the Historical Cabin assemblage than do those from Boyd Farm, but are significant in terms of understanding cultural processes among the Historic Cherokee of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Northwest Georgia. Two other excavated sites are particularly important for understanding the
immediate pre-removal period in this area. These sites are the Hicks Cabin at New Echota (Baker 1970:122-137), and Chieftains (Garrow 1974), historically called Ridge's Ferry, which is located near Rome, Georgia (Fig. 1).

The close parallels in pit form and ceramic types from Coosaawattee and Boyd Farm have already been discussed in this paper. The most significant difference between the two pits is that a creamware sherd was found at Coosaawattee, while European ceramics were absent at Boyd Farm. The two sites were linked very closely in time. In fact, it is doubtful that they were separated chronologically by as much as a decade. The Lum-Moss Historic Cherokee component also consisted of a single pit. Baker (1970:128) described the feature as ". . . (a) six foot in diameter, basin shaped pit. . . . " Baker referred to the feature as a "trash pit" and did not suggest that it had been used for any other function prior to the deposition of the trash. He recovered numerous sherds of native manufacture, as well as faunal remains and trade items. European ceramics were absent in the pit. Sherds with a curvilinear complicated stamped design, as well as examples with plain and roughened surfaces, were present in the Lum-Moss sample. Tempering in the Lum-Moss sherds ranged from sand to grit. Rims tended to be folded with notching, incising, or punctation. The illustrated examples (Baker 1970:129-130) are similar to the Historic Cabin rim types. Baker did not describe the trade goods from Lum-Moss in detail, but stated that silver and copper ornaments, gun parts, and various metal objects were present. He was reluctant to assign a firm date to the Lum-Moss pit, but stated ". . . the feature almost certainly relates to the 18th century (1970:131). " He did concede, however, that the pit could date as late as 1820.

The Lum-Moss pit seems to be closely related to the Historic Cabin feature. A curvilinear complicated stamped sherd illustrated by Baker is very similar to the Type I complicated stamped ceramics that made up the majority design type at the Historic Cabin Site (Fig. 6). The rim types at both sites are also very similar. The diversity of tempering agents found in the Lum-Moss sample was not reflected at the Historic Cabin, but there is no way to know at this point if the tempering differences are truly significant.
Figure 6. Type I Complicated Stamped.
The Hicks Cabin Site at New Echota was also excavated by Baker (1970). That site consisted of a badly disturbed chimney base that presumably was a remnant of a "Negro House" that belonged to a prominent Cherokee leader, Elijah Hicks. Baker (1970:123) dates the feature between 1820 and 1840. Most of the ceramics from the Hicks Cabin feature consisted of pearlwares. Numerous nonceramic items of white manufacture were also found in the pit. Native wares were represented by fragments of three vessels, all sand tempered. Designs and surface finishes present included check stamping, roughened, and burnished (plain?). Baker (1970:126-127) stated that the vessels were quite small and deviated in a number of ways from traditional Cherokee wares. The unmistakable conclusion drawn by Baker was that perhaps those vessels represented some stage in the development of the equivalent of the Cherokee's Colono-Indian wares (see Hume 1962 for a discussion of Colono-Indian wares).

The Chieftains Site, known prior to the Removal as Ridge's Ferry, dated from approximately 1819 to 1838, and differed sharply in function from the Hicks Cabin Site. Excavations were carried on at Chieftain's from 1969 to 1971, and centered on the remains of George Lavender's Trading Post (1822-1836). The analysis of this site has not been completed as of this date, but the ceramics have been reported in manuscript form (Garrow 1974). A very large ceramic sample was recovered in association with a cellar that belonged to the trading post building. This sample included 14,337 sherds from more than 328 vessels that represented wares of variable quality. Table wares made up 93.3 percent of the total sample, and consisted primarily of pearlwares and creamwares with a small minority of porcelain and lustre wares. The second largest ceramic category was made up of coarse earthenwares with a total of 581 sherds (4.1 percent of the sample) from 24 vessels. All of the sherds in this category were presumably products of Euro-American potters. The smallest ceramic category consisted of 373 sherds from vessels of native manufacture. More than eight vessels were present in this category, and these sherds accounted for a mere 2.6 percent of the total ceramic sample (Garrow 1974:III-2). The Chieftains trade ceramics sample
The Historic Cabin Site consisted of discarded vessels that had presumably been broken in transit. The native ceramics, on the other hand, probably derived from vessels discarded by Lavender's Indian customers.

Identifiable Cherokee ceramic types are present in the Chieftains sample. These include a large portion of a Galt check stamped globular jar with a folded notched rim. Three curvilinear complicated stamped and four small check stamped sherds of a second type were also recovered. Those check stamped sherds were decorated with a paddle that was badly deteriorated and left deep wood grain impressions. Three hundred and fifteen plain sherds were recovered in direct association with the trading post cellar, and those sherds appear to have belonged to vessels best categorized as Colono-Indian wares. The majority of those sherds had a black substance added to the exterior—perhaps as a crude form of water proofing. The few rims recovered were not typical of late Cherokee ceramics, and most closely resembled the simple squared rim styles on trade ceramics of the period. The remainder of the native ceramic sample consisted of incised sherds that may have been of Creek origin (Garrow 1974:III-25 to III-26).

Lavender's Trading Post dated from 1822-1836 (Wilkins 1970:183, 283-284). It would be foolhardy to assume that the native ceramics found at that site were typical of the state of the Cherokee ceramic art of the period, but there is no doubt that the excavation results mean that at least some semblance of the traditional Cherokee ceramic culture survived to the immediate removal period. It is also apparent that the appearance of Colono-Indian wares among the Cherokees of Northwest Georgia was very late as Baker has suggested (1970:126-127).

The Historic Cabin Site apparently represents a special feature that was utilized by a single family. The original function of the feature was closely linked to the use of a cabin constructed of dressed pine logs, and the feature may have served as the base of a mud and stick chimney or hearth for that cabin. The artifacts recovered from the site then assume special meaning. The native ceramics were probably the products of a single potter. The prevalence of the curvilinear complicated stamped pottery demonstrates the design
preference of the individual potter, and not the overall popularity of curvilinear complicated stamped pottery in the population. The prevalence of check stamping at the Boyd Farm Site would, by these criteria, again represent a personal preference by a single potter. The significant factors in correlating the Boyd Farm and Historic Cabin Sites would then become the total attributes of the two samples, instead of their apparent differences. Characteristics of paste, temper, and other factors would then supplant surface finish or design. By those criteria, the two samples are virtually identical. The clinching factor in the case of these two samples is the occurrence of the exotic Type II complicated stamped designs (Fig. 5) at both sites. These sites are the only two instances in Northwest Georgia where that particular design is known to occur. Considering the similarities, the Boyd Farm pit and the Historic Cabin feature share both function and time.

It is not possible at this time to postulate a very tight date for the Historic Cabin and Boyd Farm Sites. The occurrence of the light plain creamware sherd at the Historic Cabin Site is hardly a conclusive dating key. Creamware of that type was produced in England from 1775-1820 (South 1977: 212). This does not necessarily mean that the occurrence of this material on the Historic Cabin Site can be dated prior to 1820. Excavations at Lavender's Trading Post clearly indicated that out-of-date ceramic types, creamware of this type among them, were being sold and used after the terminus date of manufacture (Garrow 1974:III-2-20). The remaining trade materials at the Historic Cabin Site offer no firm dating guides. The glass beads are types used during the early nineteenth century, but could have been made and sold up to the time of the Removal in 1838. All factors considered, the Boyd Farm and Historic Cabin Sites may well date after instead of before 1820. In fact, the idea must be seriously entertained that the Boyd Farm, Historic Cabin, Hicks Cabin, and Lavender's Trading Post Sites were all contemporaneous.

The Hicks Cabin Site was probably a chimney base for a log cabin inhabited by a Negro slave who belonged to the wealthy Cherokee leader Elijah Hicks (Baker 1970:123). It is hardly surprising that so little ceramic material of native manufacture was present in that feature. Lavender's Trading Post
was also a special case. The artifacts recovered from that site would naturally be expected to be heavily weighed in favor of items of European manufacture. The Lum-Moss pit, although possibly early nineteenth century in date, may have ante-dated the other sites in this sample by as much as a quarter century. The function of the Lum-Moss pit may well have been similar to the features at Boyd Farm and Historic Cabin.

The basic difference between the Historic Cabin and Boyd Farm Sites and the somewhat different Hicks Cabin and Lavender's Trading Post Sites appears to have been predicated more on differences of function and socioeconomic class than on broad chronological differences. This means that conservative or less affluent Cherokee families probably retained their native ceramic traditions up to the time of the Removal in 1838, while members of the leading social and economic class emulated their white counterparts more closely in regards to material culture.

Much more work needs to be done on the differences in the material culture by social and economic class among the Cherokees in nineteenth century Northwest Georgia. The Historic Cabin Site has offered a tantalizing glimpse into this process, but has hardly provided the needed answers.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is not possible at this time to present a meaningful discussion of the state of the Cherokee material culture in nineteenth century Northwest Georgia. Excavations to date have not been designed to reflect a representative cross section of Cherokee sites from this period, and the major field efforts have centered on sites reflective of the leading edge of the progressive faction in the Nation during those years. New Echota and Ridge's Ferry, where the most extensive excavations have been undertaken, can hardly be expected to return a representative view of Cherokee life. The few excavations conducted on sites utilized by less prominent Cherokees and reported in this paper were excavated more by accident than design. The Historic Cabin Site, the historic component at the Lum-Moss Site, and the Boyd Farm Site each
consisted of a single pit. The more extensive excavations conducted by Joseph Caldwell at Galt's Ferry have not as yet been reported in published form and were unavailable for inclusion in this study.

It is, however, possible to state a research hypothesis at this time that can be explored through future projects. The excavated sites that can be attributed to the nineteenth century occupation of Northwest Georgia by the Cherokees can largely be split on the basis of the presence or absence of trade ceramics. Excavations over the years at New Echota have revealed a large amount of ceramics of English origin. Work at the Lavender Trading Post by this author yielded an immense sample of English trade ceramics. Excavations on "less substantial" nineteenth century sites in the area have been most remarkable for the almost total lack of trade wares. The Historic Cabin Site yielded one fragment of light plain creamware from the trash stratum. That sherd could not be used to date the site since evidence developed at Lavender's Trading Post indicated that creamware was being shipped to and sold in the Cherokee Nation after the terminus date of the manufacture of creamware in England. Also, the few examples of native ceramics found both at New Echota and Lavender's Trading Post indicated that the Cherokees lacked what can best be described as fully developed Colono-Indian wares until very late in their tenure in Northwest Georgia. In fact, there is ample reason to question whether the few evidences of Colono-Indian wares were simply highly localized developments or truly reflective of the Cherokee ceramic art in the immediate removal period. The majority of the Cherokees may have retained their traditional ceramic culture until the Removal, and carried this tradition to their new homes in the west.

The lack of a well-developed Colono-Indian ceramic industry, if indeed it was absent, could be attributed to a combination of factors. The Federal road through the northwest section of Georgia was not completed until 1813. Lavender's Trading Post was not opened until nine years later. Trade ceramics outweighed all other categories of materials at Lavender's Trading Post. This reflects the fragility of those materials, since the recovered sample apparently resulted from breakage in transit. The breakage rate in transit and
the difficulties of transport probably combined to price trade ceramics beyond the means of most of the Cherokee families. The Cherokee Nation remained a frontier area until a very few years before Removal. These factors probably combined to perpetuate the native Cherokee ceramic industry long past the time when other crafts had disappeared.

The persistence of the native ceramic art until Removal in Northwest Georgia is a hypothesis that can be tested through a well designed research approach. Specific Cherokee homesteads can be pinpointed through research based on archival material correlated with study of the 1832 survey of the Cherokee Nation. Many of the cabins that were built and occupied by Cherokees in this period are still standing. Removal inventories have survived for most of Northwest Georgia, and the combined sources could easily be used to derive a representative excavation/research sample. Concrete statements concerning the Cherokee material culture of this period must await implementation of such a project.
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APPENDIX 1: TRASH STRATUM NATIVE CERAMICS

Rim Sherds

Type 1 (3 Sherds)
This rim type has a mildly outflaring folded rim with vertical notching. It occurs with a complicated stamp motif which extends beneath the rim fold.

Type 2 (3 Sherds)
This type is characterized by a folded rim which flares out from the throat of the vessel at a 45 degree angle. The folded portion of the rim exhibits finger smoothing, and the vessel is decorated with a complicated stamp design that extends beneath the rim fold.

Type 3 (4 Sherds)
The Type 3 rim consists of a simple squared rim that is slightly outflaring in profile. One of the sherds exhibits a single fingernail notch at the top of the rim.

Type 4 (3 Sherds)
This example has a simple rounded rim with a double row of square punctates parallel to the rim edge. The associated vessel type is apparently an open bowl, and faint traces of a complicated stamped design extend almost to the rim edge.
Type 5 (4 Sherds)
This type has a simple squared rim with "v" shaped notches on the rim edge. The "v" notches were apparently made with a wooden instrument since wood grain impressions are visible on one example.

Type 6 (2 Sherds)
This is the most complex rim type recovered in the trash stratum. It consists of a simple squared rim with a horizontal fillet strip located 1.5 centimeters below the rim edge. The fillet strip contains closely spaced vertical notches that were made by a relatively sharp instrument. The area between the fillet strip and the rim lacks decoration, but a complicated stamped design extends beneath the fillet strip from the body of the vessel. (see Wauchope 1966, Fig. 230-S for a similar example.)

Type 7 (1 Sherd)
This rim is quite different from the other rims in the sample, but is definitely a historic Cherokee type. The immediate rim edge is moderately outflaring and contains closely spaced fine vertical notching on the exterior of the rim. The decorative design on the sherd is a form of simple stamping, but is different from the simple stamped examples described among the body sherds. (see Wauchope 1966, Fig. 230-U for a similar example.)

Body Sherds

Type 1 Complicated Stamped (82 Sherds)
This category consists of 82 body sherds which appear to have been decorated with the same paddle. It was not possible to reconstruct the paddle design in its entirety since most of the sherds are small and all exhibit greater or lesser degrees of overstamping. One recognizable element of the stamp is closely related to a type described by Wauchope (1966:Fig. 228) as "nested rectangles." The main difference between that portion of the design element in this collection and the sherd illustrated by Wauchope
is that the lines that make up the rectangles are slightly curved. The paddle used in the case of the Coosawatte sample also contained a definite curvilinear element that, due to the extreme over-stamping, made the entire sample appear to have a curvilinear motif at first examination. The lands and grooves which form the decoration are quite irregular and range in width from 2 to 4 millimeters. In short, the paddle used in this case was poorly carved and indifferently applied.

The exterior surface color of the sherds in this category range from reddish buff through shades of grey to black. Firing clouds are evident on a number of the sherds. Interior colors exhibit a similar range, but a few pieces have a reddish brown interior. Smoothing or burnishing is evident on the interior surfaces of all the sherds, and the average thickness is approximately 6 millimeters. The majority of the sherds in this sample are grey in cross section, but a few examples are reddish buff or black. All of the sherds were tempered with small amounts of medium sized grit.

It was not possible to establish the vessel shapes present in the sample with any degree of certainty, but the large sherds in the sample point towards the presence of at least one large globular jar.

Type II Complicated Stamped (12 Sherds)

The Type II complicated stamped sample consists of 12 sherds which are decorated with a rectilinear complicated stamped design. The paddle used to decorate these sherds was well made and carefully applied. The design consists of regularly spaced parallel lands and grooves that are isolated into panels by widely spaced vertical lands. One sherd contains a well executed check stamped motif that was apparently placed on one corner of the paddle. The care and craftsmanship of these sherds contrasts sharply with the sloppiness of the Type I decoration. The remaining descriptive attributes of these sherds are the same as those given for the Type I complicated stamped sample.
Simple Stamped (2 Sherds)

The decorative motif on these two sherds differs sharply from the designs in the remainder of the sample; but the sherds conform to the paste and color characteristics established for the previous two types. The simple stamped design consists of close-spaced straight lands and grooves that average 2 millimeters wide. These examples are similar to simple stamped types illustrated by Wauchope (1966: Fig. 228).

Check Stamped (4 Sherds)

This sample consists of four very poorly decorated check stamped sherds. The sherds in this sample are small and the stamping is poorly applied. The paste and surface color characteristics established for the Type I complicated stamped example also hold true in the case of this sample.

Plain (10 Sherds)

This sample of ten sherds exhibits smoothed exterior surfaces and is identical in every other way to the Type I complicated stamped sample.

Burnished Plain (3 Sherds)

These sherds exhibit burnished interiors and exteriors and both surfaces are grey-black. These sherds appear to be fragments of a small bowl, perhaps a casuela type. The paste characteristics conform to the type description given for the Type I complicated stamped sample with the exception that all of the sherds are grey-black in cross-section.

Coarse Plain (17 Sherds)

This sample consists of sherds with a roughened surface, and many of the sherds probably fit into the Type I complicated stamp or the check stamped categories. The sherds in this sample reflect the full range of surface colors and paste characteristics present in the whole ceramic sample.
Red Painted Plain (2 Sherds)

These rather unusual sherds exhibit well-demarcated red painted exterior surfaces and grey to black interiors. The sherds are grey to black in cross-section and the red additive on the surface is well marked in the cross-section view. The tempering agent is sparse amounts of sand. These sherds mend, and may have originated within an earlier component of 9Mul04.

Unidentifiable (39 Sherds)

This sample consists of sherds which were too small to identify by decoration or surface finish.

APPENDIX 2: TRASH STRATUM TRADE MATERIALS

Glass Beads (47 Specimens)

Type 1: Red seed beads with light green interiors

This bead type is represented by thirty-two specimens which measure from 1.5 to 2 millimeters long with a diameter of up to 2 millimeters.

Type 2: Black Tubulars

Eleven black tubular beads were recovered from the trash stratum. These beads range from 5 to 7 millimeters long and have an average diameter of 2 millimeters.

Type 3: Light Blue Translucent Tubulars

This type is represented by two examples which measure 8 millimeters long with a diameter of 2 millimeters.

Type 4: White Seed Bead

A single white seed bead which measured 2 by 2 millimeters was recovered from the trash stratum.

Type 5: Black Seed Bead

This type is represented by a single example which measures 2 by 2 millimeters.
Copper Artifacts  (8 Specimens)

This category includes a bead made of rolled sheet copper that measures 1.7 millimeters long with a diameter of 3 millimeters. The second readily identifiable ornament is an earring that was made by bending a thin piece of sheet copper into a circle and bending one end to meet at a point at the center of the resulting semicircle. Other possible ornaments include two strips of sheet copper that measure 2 centimeters long by 5 millimeters wide and are roughly rounded on one end. The remaining two small copper specimens are twisted strips of unknown function. All of the copper specimens were apparently cut from one or more copper trade kettles. Two large copper strips were also recovered from the trash stratum. Both examples are incomplete, but the largest strip measures 7.2 by 1.5 centimeters wide. The other strip measures 1.7 centimeters long by 1.8 centimeters wide. Both strips are squared on one end. Also, both strips are extremely thin and that measurement could not be accurately taken.

Lead  (1 Specimen)

A single lead shot which measures 5 millimeters in diameter was recovered from the trash stratum.

Iron  (6 Specimens)

Six small pieces of badly deteriorated iron were recovered from this stratum. One of the specimens may have been a nail fragment, but all of the specimens are too thoroughly oxidized to clean or identify.

Glass Sherds  (2 Specimens)

Two very small scraps of olive green glass were recovered as a result of water screening. Both specimens may have been bottle glass, but neither was large enough to clearly indicate the associated vessel type.
Flint (1 Specimen)

A very small flint scrap was also recovered from the water screening. This item is included under the trade goods since it was a light colored fine grained type that is often associated with imported gun flints.

European Ceramics (1 Specimen)

A single sherd of light colored plain creamware was recovered from the trash stratum. A second sherd from the same vessel was found in the disturbed soil of the adjacent bulldozer cut. The vessel form appears to have been a small mug. South has assigned a median date of 1798 to this ceramic type (date range of 1775-1820).

APPENDIX 3: ASH STRATUM ARTIFACTS

4 Type I Complicated Stamped
1 Cartersville Plain
1 Unidentifiable
1 Type 3 Rim
1 Deer Bone
1 Bear Bone
Historic Demography and Ethnographic Analogy
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Early European visitors and later settlers in the Southeastern United States left a rich, if sometimes uneven, record of the indigenous peoples. They encountered groups which they noted to contrast in sophistication, power, and wealth. What we now designate as the Southeastern culture area was not at that time a homogeneous entity by any criteria of native constituents or external observers. Modern anthropologists, however, have felt that the inhabitants shared sufficient distinguishing characteristics to justify use of the region as an analytical unit of cultural coherence.

If Southeastern archaeologists are to employ ethnographic analogies pertinent to particular studies, they must somehow discriminate the most appropriate or relevant passages about historic groups. Some writers (Ascher 1961; Dozier 1970; Chang 1967) have maintained that the most valid analogies are those in which the ethnographic group has a demonstrably close historical link (or is closest in time and space) to the archaeological manifestation being analyzed. Others, notably Binford (1967a:1967b), have argued for the equality of interpretive insights from universal ethnographic sources as long as a testable relationship between material culture and human behavior is suggested. While a reliance on descriptions by explorers, traders, and colonizers acknowledges shared features throughout the Southeast, the nature of the historic record legislates caution.
Whatever the inherent biases, aboriginal descriptions by European observers in the Southeast constitute an invaluable resource for understanding the area's archaeological societies. For purposes of analogy, however, Southeastern societies during historic times should not be relied upon for literal applications or consulted as uncontested authority. Instead they should be regarded as representing a variety of cultural alternatives interrelated by common origins and associations. These alternatives are therefore closely linked to those elected in prehistoric times by various groups in differing locations within the region. Such dramatic forces of change were abroad in the colonial period, however, that the full range of previous social forms cannot be expected to appear in the historic record, and concomitantly it must be recognized that many of the historically observed forms were in response to unprecedented external conditions.

Perhaps the most important factors to be considered in assessing historic ethnographies are the effects occasioned by drastic population decrease. It is difficult to comprehend the magnitude of loss of human life among the vulnerable New World populations. Undoubtedly no similar phenomenon exists in world history outside the period of European colonial expansion. When unexposed groups on the American continents and other isolated areas were confronted by Old World diseases, the result was uniformly decimation.

The timing and scope of disease inroads are better documented for other parts of the New World. The Spanish settling large areas to the south were quite interested in population decline with its implications for conquest, resources, and administration. It is known, for example, that Cortez conquered an Aztec empire in the midst of a raging epidemic (Crosby 1972:48), and that one-third to one-half of all the Indians on Santo Domingo were killed by the first smallpox epidemic in 1519 (Crosby 1972:47). It is also clear that population decline in native groups continued for a long period of time, causing abandonment of formerly inhabited locales and a chronic labor shortage.

In the Southeast, documentation for population loss between late prehistoric and contact times is much less exact. There is evidence that epidemics were already well under way in the interior by the time of the first detailed accounts
by the members of the De Soto expedition in 1540. In the province of Cofachiqui on the Savannah River, people were short of food and dispersed from their homes as a result of a great pestilence in the previous year (Garcilaso de la Vega 1951:298). Later on, in the impressive town of Talomeco, the Spanish found all five hundred houses deserted, and four of the large ones filled with the bodies of the dead (Garcilaso de la Vega 1951:314-315; 325).

It is not very clear as to the origin or extent of the epidemic encountered by De Soto. The possibility of continental spread from group to group in the twenty or so years since the Mexican conquest can never be documented. That there were a number of opportunities for the introduction of disease by explorers is a matter of record. Ponce de Leon in 1513 is accepted as the discoverer of the Southeast mainland, and he returned there in 1521 to unsuccessfully attempt a colony. The expedition of Cordoba in 1517 stopped briefly to fight some Indians in Florida; between 1521 and 1526, Ayllon contacted Indians and unsuccessfully attempted a colony in South Carolina (Quinn 1971:80-86). Giovanni da Verrazzano for France in 1524 sailed along the Southern coastline and met several Indian groups (Quinn 1971:58-68). Men of the Panfilo de Narvaez expedition, including Cabeza de Vaca, wandered along the Florida coast in 1528 before putting to sea and being shipwrecked off the Texas coast.

Any or all of these adventurers and perhaps others from unrecorded shipwrecks could have introduced the European disease which was emptying towns by the time of De Soto. There is specific mention of disease among the Spaniards of Ayllon (Quinn 1971:86) and Cabeza de Vaca (1907:33). In any case, it is apparent that population loss to disease began early and had many years to progress before the next set of detailed descriptions following De Soto. The results of the loss from fifty or one hundred years of disease can hardly be overstated. For example, in The Columbian Exchange, A. W. Crosby (1972:44) gives 30 percent as the mortality rate in an unvaccinated population during a first epidemic of smallpox.

After De Soto, there were substantial opportunities for additional introduction of disease until the late seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries when
records become abundant. The French attempted to colonize the Southeastern coast from 1562 to 1580 (Quinn 1971:163). The effects on population can be illustrated by the words of a Spanish captain who could not give a reliable estimate for the villages of Apalachee and Toasa because "... they die daily (Boyd 1948:188)." Likewise, Thomas Harlot of the English Roanoke colony in 1587 wrote of the surrounding Indian villages, "within a few days after our departure from everies such towns, that people begin to die very fast, and many in short space... (Quinn 1955:378)." By the early 1700's, there are widely spaced records of epidemic disease among the Southeastern Indians, such as Lawson's (1952:5, 24) from North Carolina groups and St. Cosme's (Shea 1861:72, 81) and Gravier's (Shea 1861:150) from the Mississippi Valley.

To a decline in population from disease can be added the loss from disrupted economies and starvation, raiding for slaves, and frequent warfare. Firearms added to the potential destruction of human life in warfare. Hostilities were often encouraged by colonial administrations, both against rival Europeans and between Indian groups. The magnitude of loss at times can be measured by the warning given to the Natchez by the French captain De Richebourg. In reminding the Natchez of the fate of the offending Chacchioumas, he pointed out, "... that they ought to remember that in 1704... our allied nations had been let loose against them... so that from 400 families which they had formerly counted they had been reduced in less than two years to 80 (Swanton 1911:200)."

Much of the literature which is frequently cited for late prehistoric parallels deals with the Natchez and their neighbors along the Lower Mississippi. By about the beginning of the eighteenth century when the major observers were in the area, population reduction was in a current state of rapid progress. For instance, in 1704 one Frenchman reports the unanimous opinion of the Natchez that in previous centuries their numbers were much greater. He notes that in the six years of French contact known to him, their numbers had been reduced by one-third (Swanton 1911:39). Other French sources affirm the loss (Swanton 1911:39-45). By the time, then, that descriptions are available
for the most complex example of Southeastern historic societies, not only is depopulation a contemporary phenomenon, but there have been 160 years of potential decline since the time of De Soto.

The knowledge that population loss, however great, has occurred does not solve the problem of the archaeologist seeking ethnographic analogies. In order to clarify the relationship between historic descriptions and the prehistoric record, the impact of population loss on Southeastern societies must be confronted. This issue is a complex one that promises no final solution in the immediate future. Some suggestions, at least, can be made for starting points.

There is always a danger of oversimplification in isolating a single variable for emphasis. Population decline from disease or even from a combination of factors is not the only force acting on aboriginal Southeastern culture patterns. Some of the others will be discussed later. Population loss is drastic and dramatic, however, and a literature focusing on population change has already been generated.

Social concomitants of change in population parameters have attracted a good deal of attention and comment in the anthropological community. A culmination of recent thought can be seen in the volume *Population Growth: Anthropological Implications*, edited by Brian Spooner (1972). This set of papers was stimulated by the work of Ester Boserup (1965) linking population increases to changes in agricultural technology. Boserup argues that societies do not adopt more labor intensive agricultural methods until forced to by increasing population pressure on a more or less stable territorial base. Although a denser population can be supported using intensive practices, the return per unit of labor is lower.

There are discussions in the Spooner book which point out exceptions and complications to the Boserup hypothesis, but this theoretical framework proves to be a fruitful one with applications in a great variety of situations. The most attractive feature of Boserup’s model is its thorough, integrated, and logical structures. Because it so clearly relates population growth as the independent variable to agricultural intensification, it can be used to generate
testable predictions about the direction of change.

While very convincing documentary evidence can be invoked to support population loss from late prehistoric levels, Boserup’s model relates change to the relative ratio of population to land. In other words, if desirable uncultivated land were abundantly available at prehistoric population levels, loss of population might not have a correlated effect on agricultural intensity. It is difficult to demonstrate the existence of population pressure on land resources at the time of early contact, but there are hints that this situation was sometimes the case.

In 1560, Tristan de Luna’s attempt to colonize the Southeast for Spain was in progress. Fray Domingo de la Anunciacion and others sent out to reconnoiter Coosa (in Alabama) observed, “As to making a settlement, it appears to us that the country is not so well suited for it as we thought... inasmuch as the Indians have the good part of it occupied, if a settlement were to made it would be imperative to take their lands from them (Quinn 1971:93). In direct contrast to this attitude is that taken 136 years later in a French document which describes the country of the Lower Mississippi as being "not extremely well peopled with savages (Swanton 1911:39).""

Boserup’s model cannot be taken as an unquestioned template for historical changes in the Southeast, but it does furnish suggestions on ways to begin projecting backwards the implications of population loss. Indeed, Boserup and other agricultural economists such as Colin Clark (1963; 1967) and Pierre Gourou (1966) discuss instances in developing nations of return to less intensive methods when the ratio of population to land decreases. Archaeologists working with late prehistoric remains should at least consider the possibility that ethnographic analogs are missing for the most intensive kind of cultivation practices.

De Soto’s chroniclers do not go into great detail about methods of agricultural production, but it can be seen that even in 1540, the loss of population was having an effect. The natives of a Cofachiqui village could not immediately furnish supplies because an epidemic in the previous year had disrupted cultivation (Garcilaso de la Vega 1951:298).
If population change can be related to agricultural intensification in the Southeast, the implications for archaeological interpretation are important at a number of levels. Even at the most direct level of analogy, artifact functions in historic times could be influenced by a context of simplified or less intensive techniques. Subsistence strategies and emphases could be different than in prehistoric systems. Settlement patterns as articulated with food production could also be altered from a time of population pressure.

A number of writers have related changes in population density to kinds of warfare on a regional scale. Marvin Harris (1971), Robert Carneiro (1970) and Napoleon Chagnon (1970) are among these. Warfare under conditions of low population to land ratios does not have as its goal the acquisition of land. When growing populations have no room for expansion due to natural or social barriers, warfare is carried out for expanded access to the basic subsistence resource: land. In the light of this reasoning, analogies based on late historic Southeastern warfare (even exclusive of warfare engendered by Europeans) might fail to fit late prehistoric conditions.

Lewis Larson (1972) noted that the pattern of late Mississippian towns, combined with De Soto’s record of constant Southeastern warfare, argued for competition over land. He also noted that fortifications to a similar extent were absent both before and after this period (Larson 1972:391). Confirmation of this assumption of competition for land can be found in an early (1565) report of complaints by the inhabitants of Coosa to members of De Luna’s expedition that "Indians have entered their lands, demanded them and usurped them, and in so doing have caused them injuries and vexations... (Quinn 1971: 94)." Again, this is a different impression of the goals and forms of warfare than is presented by late seventeenth and eighteenth century accounts in which honor and revenge are emphasized as motives. Writers like James Adair (1930: 279) who in 1775 relates historic Indian settlement patterns to warfare may not be good sources for analogy if the warfare is of a different nature at this time.

In current archaeological literature, there is an increasing interest in reconstructing prehistoric social systems and defining social structure in the
There is a great body of theoretical discussion in anthropology concerning the relationship of population size to social structure from the point of view of relative complexity. It would be fortunate if these relationships could be applied to the historic record in order to project backward to the social forms of the past. The problem has largely been addressed by cultural evolutionists, however, and attention has focused on these factors only in the context of growth. Since populations seem clearly not to be growing in the historic Southeast, it is difficult to apply the principles of evolutionists to the historic record in order to derive those of prehistoric groups.

To summarize evolutionary thought in a very simplistic manner, it could be said that growing populations are correlated with increasing social complexity. The guidelines for the reverse case are seldom spelled out and there is a confusing number of alternative causal agents linking population size and complexity. For our purposes it is enough to say that the range of complexity might be expected to have decreased in historic times.

It is not difficult to understand how the relatively sudden population loss suffered by Southeastern societies could lead to the breakdown of complex systems. If social structure is viewed as a series of roles connected by well defined relationships, loss of a half, a third, or even a smaller proportion of the participants at any given time could drastically affect the operation of the system. In more complex societies, the roles are specialized and related to one another in a less redundant manner. Duties, obligations, and reciprocal relationships for any participant are not extended equally to all other members of the society, but are structured and restricted. When persons filling particular roles are suddenly removed, the rules of the society may not allow for a major reshuffling of personnel from among the survivors. The loss of the most specialized role-fillers and particularly of persons in positions of concentrated authority could lead to breakdowns in many societal functions.

The inability of authority figures to provide benefits in times of disruption and reduced surplus, their failures in dealing with Europeans, and a general inapplicability of traditional solutions to contemporary problems are factors which would have put pressure on centralized social structure. The Natchez,
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among the most complex society of detailed record, apparently were ex­periencing a breakdown in political structure at the time of French contact. In 1721, Father Charlevoix noted that the Natchez were dispersing from their towns to escape the impositions of the great chief who "has a right to take all they have... (Swanton 1911:206)." Similarly, there are complaints to the French by Natchez Suns that other leaders were usurping their power (Swanton 1911:202) and that their subjects would no longer obey (Hudson 1976:210).

If it is likely that the more highly developed expressions of precolumbian social complexity are missing from the historic record, it is also likely that the reverse case is true. Societies at the simplest or most egalitarian end of the scale of complexity may be represented historically in altered form. Groups exhibiting notable differences in scales of complexity were encountered at the time of earliest contact. The less centralized groups also were not untouched by subsequent events.

Fred Gearing (1962) presents evidence that the egalitarian Cherokee developed stronger and stronger political centralization as a response to the English policy of holding entire Indian groups responsible for the actions of individuals. Failure to control hostile acts against the English brought retribution against all Cherokees. The presence of an intrusive colonial power often occasions conscious efforts to bolster the authority of native leaders sympathetic to the colonial's cause. In this way there is a single focus for negotiations and a beachhead of influence. Adair (1930:279, 305) notes that the French subsidized eloquent headmen in order to benefit from their persuasive powers. Undoubtedly all the European rivals resorted to such methods. Contact situations involving trade which stimulate stratification in the less complex of two participating groups have been explored by Kent Flannery (1978:102-108). The centralizing processes seem applicable to some groups in the historic Southeast.

Cognizance of processes of increasing and decreasing complexity in historic Southeastern societies should in itself sound a note of caution regarding the application of ethnographic analogy. Edmund Leach (1954) has pointed out that much anthropological treatment of social structure has assumed a
state of equilibrium in the societies under study. "The demographic, ecological, economic and external political situation does not build up into a fixed environment, but into a constantly changing environment (Leach 1954:5)." Real societies are not in states of equilibrium and may simultaneously exhibit characteristics of more than one static structural form. Thus any real society may be at points between states, chiefdoms, tribes, and so forth. Analogies employing classificatory units of social structure entail affixing a static label on the historic society and then projecting it onto the prehistoric one. The label and its associated traits are in reality only an idealized version of either structure.

While there were many deleterious effects on Indian societies as a result of colonial contact, there were also products of Old World technology that native Southeasterners acquired eagerly. Among these were firearms and livestock. By 1700, both of these European introductions were standard features of Indian life and both had great potential for alteration of demography.

Horses, cattle, pigs, and chickens represented obvious advantages to the Indians. The New World provided a maximal environment for increase of these animals and many early writers mention phenomenal reproduction rates (Crosby 1972). De Soto gave pairs of hogs to Indian rulers and his men saw their offspring when retracing part of their route (Garcilaso de la Vega 1951:270). Whether or not the introduction was repeated later, wild hogs were hunted by groups in North Carolina by 1700 (Lawson 1952:4). Cattle were a regular feature of the Spanish mission environs, and were sold to Europeans in the Carolinas by Indians by at least 1663 (Hilton 1911:53). Horses were undoubtedly acquired much earlier, but they are known to have been an integral part of Indian property from the coast to the interior by 1700.

Food-producing livestock made raiding an attractive occupation. They represented portable wealth that moved under its own power. The horse made it possible to attack and return quickly and carry off large amounts of booty. These considerations must have influenced the historic forms of warfare, and settlement patterns as well. Livestock necessitated other adjustments in the subsistence sector. The Indians near the Spanish missions complained
about the damaging inroads on their crops by the livestock of the settlers (Boyd 1951:24). When Indians raised their own animals, they had to deal with the important problem of separating the animals and the crops, a problem previously unencountered.

Guns added a new dimension to aboriginal life. They too were widespread in the Southeast by 1700. They quickly became central and indispensable items, making their possessors dependent on European trade for the initial weapon and later ammunition. Guns brought a whole new dimension of warfare. Firearms were also an important element in the struggle between rival colonial powers which often took the form of Indian set against Indian.

The effects of firearms were surely great on subsistence patterns. Hunting could be carried on much more productively. Early historic times may well have witnessed an increasing emphasis on hunting over other subsistence activities as the success rate suddenly increased. The gun also figured in economies realigned toward European trade in furs and hides. Slaughter of animals for trading capital eventually led to depletion of animal populations. The extinction of the buffalo is the best known example, but thousands of deerskins, as well as fur pelts, were shipped from the Southeast. In the historic period then, a departure from prehistoric hunting patterns could be twofold: first, a greater emphasis due to increased efficiency in killing and second, depletion of animal resources for trade and for food supplies.

The purpose of this paper has been to explore some areas in which historic descriptions of Indian societies may depart from prehistoric patterns. Archaeologists must be aware of changes during contact times which would influence the applicability of literal and direct ethnographic analogies. The conclusion is not an argument against the utility of analogy for late prehistoric archaeology in the Southeast. Instead, a particular approach to analogy is urged.

As anthropologists, archaeologists have a body of theory with which to investigate patterned change. They should be able to suggest the course which change has taken as far as the analytical tools of anthropology have been developed to do so. The archaeologist has the advantage of knowing
some of the agents of change during contact times such as population loss and technological introductions. In order to make the best use of ethnographic analogy, he must set about defining the probable direction of change caused by these factors working upon pre-contact social systems. Many writers (e.g., Plog 1974) have pointed out that the chief contribution of archaeology to anthropology as a whole should be the diachronic study of culture change.

Social systems both in historic and prehistoric times were dynamic, changing entities. The variety of structural forms appearing in historic records can be taken as an indication of the variety of cultural alternatives which existed in the prehistoric Southeast. It cannot be assumed, however, that the range of forms in contact times represents all of the previous variety. Likewise, parts of historic Indian social structure arose in response to the novel presence of European intruders. The best uses of analogy will be those which allow for the presence of change and attempt to define its course.
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The following represents a list of references related to all anthropological research that has been done on the Georgia coast and its immediate environs. All sub-areas are represented - archaeology, ethnology, biological anthropology and linguistics. As the user of this guide will observe, many of the references, particularly those oriented towards field archaeology, are unpublished manuscripts. Hopefully future investigators in this region will be encouraged to publish more of their work with the revival of Early Georgia and regional publication outlets like it.
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