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The year began with a most welcome visit from the Director of the Schmink Memorial Museum in Lakeview, Oregon. Miss Jenny Carroll, who has developed that historical museum for the past dozen or so years, spent January 3 - 6 with us. Another most welcome visitor was Dr. Leland Ferguson of the University of South Florida who spent January 16 - 17 with us. We are discussing the possibility of Dr. Ferguson joining our staff.

On January 19 - 21 we met with the staff of the South Carolina Electric and Gas Company for discussions about a proposal for archeological research to be done in the area to be affected by that company's Parr-Frees Project on the Broad River some 25 miles above Columbia. The Company was receptive and it appears that we will be able to proceed with the work, funded by the Company. This will be our first major cooperative effort between university research and private industry. We certainly look forward to this with enthusiasm.

On January 26 we met with the State Highway Department and their design contractors to discuss archeological research prospects along the several proposed routes of the planned Interstate 77 between Columbia and Rock Hill. We are developing a summary of what is known of that area and will be recommending surveys along the route that is eventually selected. It is rewarding to know that one of the criteria for selection of a route is the consideration of archeological resources.

The Historic Preservation Review Board met at the Citadel in Charleston to review and nominate an additional number of historic and prehistoric sites to the National Register for Historic Places. I am especially pleased to be able to sit as a member of that Review Board representing archeology and to have Mr. Henry Boykin, an outstanding historic architect from Camden representing his field. The other members are all perceptive and astute historians from the South Carolina Archives and History Commission.

As usual there were numerous talks given by the Institute staff on both radio and television and to civic and service clubs throughout these two months. We also gave several guest lectures to Dr. Carpenter's geology class in February. On the 25th of February we participated in the annual meeting of the South Carolina Museum Trustees Association at the Columbia Science Museum.

On February 10 the famous Dr. S. E. Babcock Collection was transferred from the Caroliniana Library to the Institute for cataloging and preservation. This large collection of projectile points and some other artifacts was gathered by Dr. Babcock from the area of Chester and Lancaster Counties in the late 19th century.

The Tennessee Valley Authority appointed me along with Dr. John Otis Brew of Harvard and Dr. John Corbett of Washington, D. C. to be a board of consultants on archeological matters on the T.V.A. projects. On January 23 - 25 we had our first assignment to review the work needed before completion of the Tellico Reservoir on the Little Tennessee River near Knoxville. Much archeology is being done there by Dr. Ted Guthe and his staff from the University of Tennessee and there is much more that must be done. This is the heart of the Overhill Cherokee country.

Robert L. Stephenson
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
EXCAVATIONS AT PINCKNEYVILLE
SITE OF PINCKNEY DISTRICT 1791-1800

by Richard F. Carrillo

From November 15 to December 20, the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, in cooperation with the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism and the Union County Historical Commission, engaged in archeological excavations at the site of Pinckneyville, located in Union County. The purpose of the archeological and historical research was to provide the Union County Historical Society with a workable framework upon which to establish a feasible masterplan for interpretation of the site.

The town of Pinckneyville was established by an act of the South Carolina Legislature in 1791 to serve as a judicial district seat for the present counties of Chester, Spartanburg, Union and York. The district was in existence for nine years. Pinckneyville was presumably named for Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, a member of the prominent Pinckney family in Charleston.

The site is located approximately sixteen miles northeast of the city of Union on a relatively flat plateau above the floodplain of the Broad River. Approximately 3/4 of a mile to the east, the Broad River merges with the Pacolet River.

The archeology was conducted with the part-time assistance of students from the University of South Carolina-Union Regional Campus. The work was restricted primarily to the area owned by the Union County Historical Society. Presently, in this area, a remnant of an old road is to be seen leading to the Broad River. Historically, this road is referred to as the "Ferry Road". A brick structure, which was used as a storehouse, is located on the west side of this road. A portion of another brick structure, situated on the east side of the old road remnant, has been referred to as "the old jail", but proved to be probably the remains of a large dwelling house. Several features were found including chimney bases of possible domiciliary structures, and cellar holes. One of the latter was stone filled. These features were located, mapped, and their upper portions excavated, but due to the exploratory nature of the project, none was extensively excavated.

The artifacts recovered during the excavation indicated a wide temporal spectrum ranging from the late 18th to the mid-20th century, based on the ceramics. Creamware and pearlware were found which represented the types used during the Pinckney District period. Other types found include white and yellow glazed earthenwares and alkaline glazed stoneware. A few sherds of ironstone and porcelain were also recovered. Other artifacts found include cut nails and other iron objects, and miscellaneous brass and copper fragments.

The interpretation derived from the archeological and historical research was that the portion of the site owned by the Union County Historical Society comprises the northeastern portion of the former town site of Pinckneyville. It had been previously assumed that this area was the main portion of the town with the "storehouse" being interpreted as a courthouse, and the partially standing structure as a jail.
COLONO - INDIAN POTTERY FROM CAMBRIDGE, SOUTH CAROLINA
WITH COMMENTS ON THE HISTORIC CATAWBA POTTERY TRADE

by Steven G. Baker

(Ed. Note: Mr. Baker has been employed as a field assistant on the Institute staff for work with Stanley South at Ninety-Six. In the course of this work he developed the nucleus of the following paper on Colono-Indian pottery. Now a graduate student in the History Department at U.S.C., he is pursuing Catawba and Colono-Indian pottery as a thesis subject.)

INTRODUCTION

"Colono-Indian" pottery as defined by Ivor Noël Hume (Noël Hume 1958) has become the focus of increasing interest among archeologists and ethnologists. Noël Hume intended "Colono-Indian" to serve as a blanket descriptive term for Indian pottery of the colonial period that exhibits definite European influences in its manufacture.

"Colono-Indian" pottery is used in this paper as a broad descriptive term as it was originally intended by Ivor Noël Hume (1962). It is here used to imply an aboriginally produced unglazed ware which shows demonstrable European influence in its manufacture. The term by itself is not intended to imply any particular cultural association or significance. Although the term "Colono" could be narrowly construed to imply the historic period prior to the American Revolution, it is felt to be descriptive enough and well enough established in the archeological literature to be retained for general descriptive purposes covering the entire historic period. It is felt to be a more favorable term than "historic aboriginal transition ware" which is sometimes used. As will be demonstrated in this paper, the "Colono-Indian" phenomenon is in large measure the result of change in Indian pottery making due to the serious economic factors facing remnant Indian groups in the historic period.

An assemblage of early nineteenth century Colono-Indian ware was recovered from the historic town of Cambridge, South Carolina during excavation in 1971 by the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology of the University of South Carolina. The site of the village of Cambridge (Fig. 1) is located in Greenwood County, two miles southeast of the contemporary town of Ninety Six. The site is part of that larger complex of historic sites, generally known as Ninety Six, which dates through the French and Indian War to the end of the American Revolution. The town of Cambridge (38GN2) grew up on the site of the Ninety Six fortifications following the end of conflict in 1782. It thrived as the seat of the District Court for the large Ninety Six District and as an upcountry trading center until the first decade of the nineteenth century when it began to decline and finally passed out of existence in mid-century.
Excavation of a cellar ruin dating within the early years of the Cambridge occupation yielded an unusually large amount of household refuse which had been deposited as fill in the period from about 1800 to 1820 (Baker 1972). The fill of the cellar contained profuse amounts of early pearlwares and more limited amounts of late creamwares, both generally indicative of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Glass and miscellaneous items tended to cluster in the late eighteenth or first decade of the nineteenth century. Of the more than 20,000 artifacts recovered from this feature there are none which are now known to date any later than about 1820. Portions of ten different aboriginally manufactured vessels and lids were recovered and all of them reflected Colono-Indian attributes. A fragment of a possible imitation of a European kaolin pipe was also recovered from this feature (Fig. 3c). Portions of another two or three vessels from a nearby feature brought the total number of individual pieces to thirteen. This paper will describe the wares recovered from Cambridge and explore the stimulus for their production, as well as their role within the historical period of aboriginal ceramic manufacture and trade in the Southeastern United States, as seen in both archeological and ethnographic documentation.
DESCRIPTION AND DOCUMENTATION OF THE COLONO-INDIAN POTTERY FROM CAMBRIDGE

All of the Cambridge ceramics of aboriginal manufacture appear to be Catawba as described by Holmes (1903), Harrington (1908), and Fewkes (1944). They are exclusively of an untempered paste, which sometimes contains heavy amounts of vegetal matter. The vessels are either burnished or simply smoothed and occur predominately in the shape of shallow, flat-bottomed bowls (Fig. 2). Lids (Fig. 3), a footing, plugged loop handles, and a trivoted pot expand the basic assemblage to include many common elements of the Colono-Indian ware. Additionally, a few highly burnished, smother-fired sherds (Fig. 4d) record the presence of another documented Catawba ware.

The term "Catawba" has been used in this instance to denote that group of Indians who were, in a collective sense, known as Catawbas. In this capacity we can imply Indians who were culturally heterogeneous, but who still represented a socially meaningful category in the historic period (Hudson 1970: 28). The Catawbas absorbed the survivors of many remnant tribes in the historic period and "Catawba pottery" may reflect several new native as well as European influences. We cannot, therefore, automatically assume any direct line to the pottery of the pre-contact Catawba ancestry.

The pottery, while in broad terms appearing to be very homogeneous, can be broken down into three minor typological categories. These categories all include simple smoothing and burnishing but differ from one another in the nature and preparation of the paste, and in the method of firing.

Ethnographic sources indicate that Catawba potters have long recognized at least two distinct types of clay (Fewkes 1944: 73-75 and Harrington 1908: 402). These are respectively referred to as pan and pipe clay. The first type is referred to also as "blue clay" which according to Fewkes is a "relatively dry and compact, coarse-textured variety, containing a natural admixture of sand and usually mica." The pipe clay is "fine in texture, somewhat stiff, relatively moist, and well nigh free of sand, yet often containing minute particles of mica." According to both Fewkes and Harrington, pottery vessels were traditionally made of a mixture of both these clays. Besides the standard paste composed of both "pan and pipe clay," the paste of the Cambridge vessels sometimes contains large amounts of organic material (Fig. 4e). The standard clay mixture, the highly organic paste, and the use of a very fine clay, presumably the "pipe clay", in the finely made smother-fired ware establishes the three minor categories of paste evident in the materials from Cambridge.

There may or may not be cultural significance to the presence of the organic matter in the paste. Although it is documented (Holmes 1903: 55) and sometimes occurs in clay that has apparently been prepared and carefully cleaned of other impurities, it is not possible to say more about it at this time. Its occurrence may be unintentional.

Holmes (1903: 55) described Catawba potting from the notes made by Dr. Edward H. Palmer who observed it on the reservation in South Carolina.
in 1884. This reference is one of the earliest known accounts of Catawba ceramic technique and says, in part, that a light porous clay was used which contained a large percentage of vegetal matter, and that the basic building technique involved the use of annular rings. The surfaces of the vessels were polished with a small burnishing stone and there were at least two methods of firing. One of these involved covering the vessels with burning bark which produced shades of brown mottled with grays and blacks. He further mentioned that "when the potters desire they produce a black shining surface by covering the articles with some inverted receptacle during the baking process." This latter method of firing is typically known as smother-firing and is apparently a peculiarly Catawba feature in the Southeast, even though it has occasionally been unconvincingly ascribed to the Cherokees (Holmes 1903: 53).

The following quote clearly describes smother-firing in Catawba pottery making.

Mr. James Mooney, of the Bureau of American Ethnology, described to the author [W. E. Myer] the following method which he had seen the Catawbas use in making their finest black ware: After the vessel or other object has received its final shape, and before it is baked, it is given a high polish by much rubbing with certain very hard and smooth stones or mussel shells with edges properly shaped by grinding. Over these unbaked, highly polished objects selected fragments of oak bark are piled, and the heap is then carefully and closely covered with a large inverted unbaked pottery vessel...Over this unbaked pot a large amount of oak bark is piled and then set on fire. This produces considerable heat and bakes the large inverted vessel. The penetrating heat finally sets fire to the oak bark fragments underneath it, which, being shut off from a full supply of air, burn after the manner of charcoal and produce a strong, penetrating black, which reaches to a great depth into the ware, thus producing the beautiful color. The glossiness arises from polishing. (Myer 1928: 522 as cited by Fewkes 1944: 91)

Another description of Catawba smother-firing as practiced in South Carolina in 1908 has been provided by Harrington as follows.

I was informed that when uniform shiny black color is desired, the ware, after the preliminary heating, is embedded in bits of bark in a larger vessel of clay or iron, which is then inverted upon the glowing coals and covered with bark. After one or two hours the firing is complete and the vessels have acquired a brilliant black color which seems to penetrate their very substance. (Harrington 1908: 405)

Fewkes suggested a date in the last quarter of the nineteenth century for this manner of firing among the Catawbas and pointed out that
the method is neither practiced nor remembered by the contemporary Catawba potters. Fewkes' dating and interpretation of this practice is not correct, however, both because of new information and Fewkes' own self-contradiction. Much earlier smother-fired wares have not only been recovered from Cambridge, but also from Camden, South Carolina (Fig. 1) in a late eighteenth century context (Strickland 1971). It was further observed as an important element in the potting tradition by Dr. Palmer in 1884 as mentioned previously (Holmes 1903: 55). Thus it was, indeed, an important aspect of the pottery making in the late nineteenth century but was important much earlier as well. Contradictory to his other comment, it was also commonly known at the time he wrote. From Fewkes' own description of the firing of pipes and small vessels (Fewkes 1944: 91) it is clear that the Catawbas were familiar with the basic concept of smother-firing. It was commonly used in the production of their jet black pipes which are still made today. Harrington also noted this method of firing in the making of pipes (Harrington 1908: 405). Smother-firing is certainly one readily identifiable attribute of Catawba pottery and should receive the most intensive analysis in the future.

As mentioned, Catawba smother-fired ware has been recovered in a context of about 1780 by Robert Strickland (Strickland 1971) in the excavation of the Cornwallis House at Historic Camden (38KE1), South Carolina (Fig. 1). The ware appears identical to that recovered from Cambridge. It is made of very fine "pipe" clay and the vessels have footrings, flaring rims, and traces of red paint decoration. Rounded lips on flat-bottomed bowls of mottled burnished ware made from clay coarser than that of the jet black smother-fired ware, are also present. In all respects, the assemblage from Camden appears to conform to the wares found at Cambridge and helps to support identification of the Cambridge materials as Catawba.

Fewkes (1944: 71) has adequately demonstrated that the Catawba pottery tradition is relatively intact despite some, more recent, innovations. He pointed out that archeological sites ascribed to the Catawba and dating to the early eighteenth century yield sherds of a "mottled polished ware which in construction, surfacing, and firing closely resemble the modern Catawba product." He saw similarities to the older materials in form, textural quality, surfacing, firing, and construction technique. The general range in form of Catawba pottery collected between 1876 and 1886 and illustrated by Holmes (1903: 143-144) shows predominately flat-bottomed forms (Fig. 5). In the words of Holmes regarding both these and other specimens from earlier homestead sites: in addition to resembling the forms of Whites "all are flat-bottomed, have the thick walls and peculiar color and polish of modern Catawba ware, and are well within the Catawba habitat."

At this stage in our study we should not make much comment on the subject of evolution of vessel form within the historic period. It is, however, easy to see some of the major differences between the very modern wares available today (Fewkes 1944) and the late nineteenth century specimens illustrated in this paper (Figs. 5 and 6). Noel Hume has suggested that in Virginia, squared and flattened lips, such as we have in some of the Cambridge materials, do not seem to be found in contexts any earlier than the second half of the eighteenth century (Noël Hume 1962: 7).
COMPARATIVE EXAMPLES AND HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT
OF COLONO-INDIAN POTTERY

Fewkes (1944: 107) demonstrated that Catawba pottery making at the
time of his study survived along traditional lines, was commonly practiced
and, with the exception of form, changes due to modern influences were
slight. Our ability to relate the ethnographic works of Fewkes (1944),
Holmes (1903), and Harrington (1908) directly to the Colono-Indian forms
which have been described by Noël Hume (1962) and South (1962 and 1971),
as mainly derived from archeological contexts, is limited, however, without
looking for a moment at the Pamunkey Indians of the Tidewater region
of Virginia.

Speaking of a smooth ware which is attributable to the historic peri-
dod in the Pamunkey region, as opposed to earlier Algonkian wares, Frank
G. Speck made the following classic description of the material which has
now come to be called Colono-Indian.

The ware is characterized by being very smooth, hard,
and fine grained, the clay free entirely from sand and
grit, yet full of powdered mussel-shell. Its color is
light brown or uniform drab or gray. No incised or
depressed decorations are found in the body. A few rims
only show any attempt at embellishment, which then con-
sists of fine impressions or dents, sometimes of finger-
marks. Next is the most important thing: numerous
angular bottoms, parts of curved handles or lugs, legs
and knobbed lids, together with evidence of flat bottoms
and the exclusive lipped rim style (Fig. 102), are in-
dications of a modification in form, bringing them into
 correspondence with the common European forms. Here
then is the secret, and, comparing this material with the
historic Pamunkey ware, we are forced to conclude that
the later archeological material is transitional, form-
ing the link between the pre-European and the modern
pottery. (Speck 1928: 402-404)

We need not go into more detailed discussion of the Pamunkey material
except to cite the difference in the tempering in order to see the paral-
lels with the Catawba descriptions. Holmes (1903: 152) illustrates vessels
which are attributed to the last surviving pottery making community of the
remnant Pamunkeys of King William County, Virginia. The vessels shown (Fig.
6) were collected by Dr. Dalyrimple of Baltimore in 1878 and certainly re-
semble the material of the Catawbas in general form and grosser attributes.
Holmes stated that the vessels showed no evidence of utilization and that
the ceramic styles were even then probably heavily influenced by a market
oriented to the curiosity hunter. We do not yet know to what degree the
Indians relied upon their trade wares in their own households. Harrington
was able to find only a very few vessels which had seen "actual service"
among the approximately fourteen Catawba households which were actively en-
gaged in pottery making in 1908 (Harrington 1908: 399-402).

Some of the most extensive colonial archeology has been conducted
in Virginia and this is the reason for our present concern with the
Pamunkeys. In 1962 Noël Hume published his paper "An Indian Ware of the Colonial Period." In his paper he summarized most of the recognized regional occurrences of the Colono-Indian ware and pointed out that most of the materials had been found on sites of White occupation in contexts ranging from around 1700 at Clay Bank, Virginia to the late eighteenth century at the Travis House in Williamsburg. He tentatively identified this ware as the eighteenth century antecedent of the Pamunkey material of the nineteenth century which we have already described. He attributed its inspiration to economic interests on the part of the Indians who probably produced it for sale or barter within a basically White economy. He suggested that the presence of Negros on the sites might be the common denominator for the occurrence of the ware and postulated it was for the use of this group that it was ultimately intended (Noël Hume 1962: 5).

Earlier, Speck had stated a similar view that prior to the Civil War the Pamunkey women abandoned potting for their own use and began to produce marketable wares. One of his informants, a Mrs. Alice Page, could remember this marketing of the wares.

She remembers in her girlhood how the women constructed clay pots, milk-pans, and stewing jars, and carried them to the trading stores in the country, bearing the crockery upon their backs in cloth sacks and exchanging it for small wares, groceries, or cash. The coming of the railroad strangled the Pamunkey potter's trade by placing within the reach of the countryside the tin and crockery ware of commerce. (Speck 1928: 409)

One of the first mentions of Indian pottery being traded in White/Indian economic transactions is suggested by a reference in "Bacon's Laws" of June 1676 which were cited by Stern (1951: 44).

Provided also that such neighbour Indians friends who have occasion for corne to relieve their wives and children, it shall and may be lawfull for any English to employ in fishing or deale with fish, canies, bowls, matts or baskets, and to pay the siad Indians for the same in Indian corne, but noe other commodities...

(Bening 1809-23: Vol. 2, p. 305)

Bacon's law indicates a dependent status for the Virginian's "neighbour Indian friends" and clearly suggests the early importance of trade pottery and other items in the livelihood of the peaceful remnant Indian populations.

Stern suggested that a "non-utilitarian" function may have been creeping into Indian pottery production as early as 1686 as evidenced by a quotation that he took from the journal of an individual named Durand who visited Portobago village on the Rappahannock in 1686 (Stern 1951: 45). This reference probably refers to the "settlement" class of Indians mentioned in "Bacon's Laws". In regard to the Indian women the quotation said in part, "They make also pots and vases fill them up with Indian Corn and that is the price..." (Bushnell 1937: 39-42).
In addition to the samples of the Pamunkey wares from the Virginia area cited by Noël Hume (1962), Stanley South reported untempered Colono-Indian pottery from both Brunswick Town and Bath, North Carolina (South 1962). South gave the name "Brunswick Burnished" to the wares from Brunswick Town. He also recovered some sherds from the Citadel Campus in Charleston (1962a) which closely resemble the burnished sherds from North Carolina. Fairbanks (1962) has reported a Colono-Indian milk pitcher from the Aucilla River in Florida. This vessel was attributed to a late eighteenth or early nineteenth century Seminole manufacture and it was suggested by Fairbanks that it might have been made as a result of Seminole acculturation to European and American ceramic traditions and not as an item simply for the White trade. More recently, Stanley South has recovered burnished, untempered pottery suggestive of European forms from a post-1760 context at Charles Towne on Albermarle Point (38CH1). He suggests the vessels may imitate a chamber or iron pot as well as North Devon Gravel-Tempered Ware (South 1971: 102).

William Kelso (Kelso 1968: 14) found suggestions of Colono-Indian materials at Fort King George, Georgia in a seventeenth century context. In 1954 Sheila K. Caldwell (Caldwell 1954: 16) observed what seems to be extensive seventeenth century European influence in "red filmed earthenware" at the Spanish Mission Site at Darian, Georgia. This component is part of the Fort King George Site discussed by Kelso. The ware described by Caldwell is certainly a result of the Spanish Missionary effort and this instance of the Colono-Indian phenomenon presents intriguing questions additional to those now seen for the Catawbas and the Pamunkeys. The acculturation process under the Spanish colonizers is too large a question to enter into in this initial discussion, but important comparative material for Georgia and Florida can probably be found in the histories of the pueblos in the Southwest and Mexico as suggested by Robert Ehrich (Ehrich 1965: 13) and Hale G. Smith (Smith 1956: 105).

In Georgia the presence of Colono-Indian pottery, other than in the Spanish Mission areas, is only weakly hinted at in Kasita Red Filmed vessels of the Kasita and Hitchiti of 1675-1725 (Haag 1940: 9). However, the Kasita Red Filmed vessels other than those associated with Spanish contact, may well have derived their elaborate forms from non-European traditions. At New Echota in Georgia (9G02) possible White influence has been noticed in Cherokee ceramics of the nineteenth century, but any case for Colono-Indian pottery among the Cherokee prior to their removal in 1838 has not been demonstrated (Baker 1971: 126-127).

After surveying the general status of Colono-Indian ceramics in the southeast and the history of Catawba pottery making, it is possible to suggest that the materials recovered from Cambridge are at least of Catawba inspiration and reflect the fabric of the pottery being produced by this group of people near the end of the eighteenth century. Joffre Coe's "Caraway Plain" (Coe 1952: 34) pottery may well be tied in to the mottled ware identified in the present paper. Both the "Pan River" and the "Caraway" series seem to share attributes with the Colono-Indian forms of the Catawbas (Coe 1952). Aspects of the Lamar Ceramic Tradition have been suggested in the history of Catawby pottery by both Coe (1961: 59) and Charles H. Fairbanks (1961: 64). However strong such Lamar influence may
ultimately prove to have been in the development of historic Catawba pottery, it has not yet been demonstrated and is not readily seen in the pottery of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Along these lines the possibility of a Catawba ceramic ancestry in the "Burk Series" (Keeler 1971) of the upper Catawba River valley requires more research.

THE STIMULI FOR THE PRODUCTION OF COLONO-INDIAN POTTERY

Development of the stimuli behind production of Colono-Indian ware and the associated entry of the potters into White oriented economic relations are beginning to be seen in certain patterns of similarity in the post-contact history of the groups who produced it, as opposed to those who supposedly did not. We can explore these patterns as they are now beginning to be seen, but we must consider such discussion as only initial inquiry at this time.

In regard to the locale of the eastern seaboard states, there is evidence to suggest that the Pamunkeys, the Catawbas, and perhaps the Seminoles produced Colono-Indian wares for sale in a White market economy. Other miscellaneous "settlement Indians" of several potential ethnic affiliations produced the wares also. There is, however, little evidence to suggest that the bulk of the Creek peoples or the Cherokees ever developed the common tendency to manufacture this ware. This is, of course, excepting the Indians who came under early domination by the Spanish, and the Cherokees of North Carolina who, after a market became available, revived their pottery industry in the nineteenth century with the help of the Catawbas.

Creek and Cherokee pottery seems to have retained traditional attributes until late in the historic period. Sears implied this for the Georgia groups (1955) and Brian Egloff (1967) has suggested that Qualla Series ceramics, as a traditional form, were produced by the historic Cherokees until the period of removal in the 1830's. As late as the 1880's traditional Qualla pottery (a basically Lamar tradition ware) was still made by at least some Cherokees (Dickens 1971: 23). Among the Creeks traditional wares were still manufactured as late as the Civil War in the post-removal environment of Oklahoma (Quimby and Spoehr 1950: 251; Schmitt and Bell 1954; and Willey and Sears 1952: 6). In the nineteenth century the Indian territory would have provided little economic stimulus for pottery change such as the Catawbas and the Pamunkeys received. The degree of Cherokee acculturation prior to removal would not seem to have required economic dependence on pottery making, as they were economically self-sustaining from their agricultural pursuits soon after the loss of the fur trade and their frontier isolation (Fogelson and Kutsche 1961: 98-100). Pottery making appears to have died out fairly fast among the Cherokees. The histories of the Creeks and Cherokees are subsequently, quite divergent from those of the Pamunkeys and Catawbas for whom we have good documentation of their manufacturing this tradeware.

Lurie has intensively explored the subject of Pamunkey acculturation (Lurie 1959) and provides a chance to view the historical patterns leading to manifestations such as Colono-Indian pottery. According to Lurie (1959: 58) significant cultural disorganization was evident by 1687 among the Pamunkeys and other remnant Virginia Indians. In keeping with the Indians' "prophecy of destruction," Indian culture was ceasing to exist as
a definable entity, even though remnant groups did maintain their social identities and tribal names. Those Pamunkeys and Mattaponies left in Virginia by the eighteenth century were forced to abandon nearly all native traditions and habits in order to exist in the world of the Whites. Lurie (1959: 59-60) stresses the magnitude of the problem of simple physical survival for these people after the breakdown of native social and religious mores. For the Virginia Indians the utter defeat by the close of the seventeenth century had laid the foundations of the modern adjustment to the White man's culture.

In reference to the Virginia Indians Lurie made the following comments which are important in understanding the occurrences and absences of Colono-Indian pottery.

Their primary technique of adjustment to European civilization, at least as documented in the Virginia tidelands region, was, with few exceptions, one of rigid resistance to alien ways which held no particular attractions except for disparate items. Their culture simply disintegrated under the strain of continued pressure placed upon it. In contrast, the tribes further inland, by their more flexible adaption to Europeans, achieved a social and cultural continuity which is still impressive despite many material innovations from European and American civilization. (Lurie 1959: 60)

Hints of two contrasts for the production of Colono-Indian ware as suggested by its documented occurrences can be seen in Lurie's quote and may explain the suggested dichotomy in Creek and Cherokee as opposed to Pamunkey and Catawba pottery making. Of course, as a White market became available to the Cherokees of North Carolina they did finally develop a pottery industry because of the onset of cultural conditions similar to those experienced earlier by the Catawbas and Pamunkeys. The post-contact history of the Catawbas, while less well documented than that of the Pamunkeys, was roughly similar and they shared much the same fate as most all the Indians in the area of the first White colonizations.

Except for a short period at the start of the Yamasssee Uprising the Catawbas had always had a firm alliance with the English colonists of South Carolina. Smallpox epidemics in 1738 and 1759 wiped out nearly one-half of the population and deterioration was so fast that they were not at all historically prominent by the late eighteenth century. In 1763 the Catawba reservation was established in the vicinity of the Catawba River in northern South Carolina (Fig. 1). Their population was only about two or three hundred by 1784. They had assisted the American forces during the Revolution and fled to Virginia when South Carolina was overrun by the British, thereby mixing to some degree with the Virginia groups. By 1822 the Catawba population had swelled to nearly five-hundred and in 1840 they again settled on their small reservation in South Carolina. It is at this time that a sizable portion of the population went to live with the Cherokees. Even though most of the migrants soon returned to South Carolina, this is the probable source of Catawba inspiration in

The Catawbas remained a distinctive people even when most of their aboriginal cultural patterns were gone and much of their history has been spent in performing petty services for the Whites, particularly those who had been detribalized (Hudson 1970: 56). John Smyth visited the Catawbas in the early 1780's and noted that the women were raising gardens and making baskets, mats, and pottery to trade to the Whites (Smyth 1784 Vol. 1, 194) for small trifles. By 1839 there were only about eighty-eight Catawbas left and as the century wore on one of their only means of holding on to any part of their identity was in making and selling Indian objects. At the end of the century old men were making bows and arrows for sale to Whites and pottery making was still of great importance.

Until well into the twentieth century it was an absolute necessity for Catawba women to make pottery to obtain clothing and part of their groceries (Hudson 1970: 59-75). M. R. Harrington correctly attributed the "remarkable" survival of potting, as he had observed it among the Catawbas, to the rigorous pressures of economic need and the "excellence" of the ware itself (Harrington 1908: 399). At the time Harrington visited the Catawbas, pottery making constituted the chief support of the tribe and was the main occupation of nearly every household. Pottery making today is still important to the livelihood of a few older people.

THE HISTORIC CATAWBA POTTERY TRADE

We know very little about the early Catawba pottery market or of the role accorded the wares by Whites and others who traded for it. One source of information on this subject is William Gilmore Simms who was an early nineteenth century writer of historical romance and poetry. He also compiled a textbook for teaching South Carolina History (Simms 1840) and was particularly concerned with providing portraits as "true to the Indian as our ancestors knew him at an early period, and as our people in certain situations may know him still" (Simms as cited by Barre 1941: 7). Simms' interest in the Indian stimulated him to travel among the Indians in order to gather background material for use in his historical romance stories of South Carolina. His works reflect sound historical background out of which he fabricated his romance. Examples of this can be seen in his short story "Loves of the Driver" (Simms 1841) and The Yamassee (1964). Both romance, but set in basic fact. As opposed to The Yamassee, "Loves of the Driver" derived its background from Simms' own period in which he had actually observed the Catawbas as subjects of his story. "Loves of the Driver" is set in the Catawba pottery industry of the early nineteenth century and the first chapter is exclusively devoted to Simms' memories of the Catawbas and their pottery.

Simms stated (1841: 121) that in the early nineteenth century the Catawbas, on their way to Charleston from the interior, camped along the Edisto and Ashley Rivers and made pottery for trade before coming further down the coast. Simms' account is particularly useful as it indicates something of the role Indian pottery played in the White household and the demand for it.
Their productions had their value to the citizens, and, for many purposes, were considered by most of the worthy housewives of the past generation, to be far superior to any other. I remember, for example, that it was a confident faith among the old ladies, that okra soup was always inferior if cooked in any but an Indian pot; and my own impressions make me not unwilling to take sides with the old ladies on this particular tenet. Certainly an iron vessel is one of the last which should be employed in the preparation of this truly southern dish. (Simms 1841: 122)

The accuracy of Simms' discussion of the Catawba pottery trade is verified by the following reference which supports his statements about Catawbas traveling to Charleston in order to market wares.

Mr. Phillip E. Procher, formerly of St. Stephen's Parish, who lived to be more than ninety years old and died in Christ Church Parish in 1917, told me that he remembered frequently seeing the Catawba Indians in the days when they travelled down from the up-country to Charleston, making clay ware for the negroes along the way. They would camp until a section was supplied, then move on, till finally Charleston was reached. He said their ware was decorated with colored sealing wax and was in great demand, for it was before the days of cheap tin and enamel ware. This may account for the smooth, fresh fragments I have found on what are evidently old sites of negro quarters. (Gregorie 1925: 21)

Simms and Procher do much to expand our knowledge of the pottery market which appears to have included not only the housekeepers of Charleston and other towns, but the Negros of the interior countryside as well. The view of itinerant pottery makers as indicated by both Simms and Procher portrays the nineteenth century Catawbas as something akin to "tinkers of the backcountry."

The market for Indian pottery probably did cut across class and racial lines and would have included Whites, Blacks, and Indians, the full range of South Carolina's plural society.

Catawba pottery excavated at Camden, South Carolina from a context of about 1780, shows bits of red paint on the rim of one Colono-Indian bowl. Besides the quote from Gregorie (1925: 21) the use of colored decoration in Catawba trade pottery is also referred to by Simms in "Loves of the Driver."

Wanting, perhaps, in the loveliness and perfect symmetry of Etruscan art, still they were not entirely without pretensions of their own. The ornamental enters largely into an Indian's ideas of the useful, and his taste pours itself out lavishly
in the peculiar decorations which he bestows upon his wares. Among his first purchases when he goes to the great city, [Charleston], are vermillion, umber, and other ochres, together with sealing wax of all colors, green, red, blue and yellow. With these he stains his pots and pans until the eye becomes sated with a liberal distribution of flowers, leaves, vines and stars, which skirt their edges, traverse their sides, and completely illuminate their externals. He gives them the same ornament which he so judiciously distributes over his own face, and the price of the article is necessarily enhanced to the citizen, by the employment of materials which the latter would much rather not have at all upon his purchases. This truth, however, an Indian never will learn, and so long as I can remember, he has still continued to paint his vessels, though he cannot but see that the least decorated are those which are always the first disposed of. (Simms 1841: 122)

The "liberal distribution of flowers, leaves, vines, and stars" which Simms mentions suggests the decorative stimulus which could have been provided by many of the hand painted polychrome pearlwares of the early nineteenth century (Noel Hume 1970). The shape of Colono-Indian vessels often copies the prototypes very closely and there is no reason to doubt that the potters might not have also attempted to copy painted and other decorative elements also. The vessel illustrated in Fig. 7 of this paper conveys some attributes of the polychrome painting mentioned by Simms, but shows no resemblance to any European motifs. Simms' remarks do, however, raise further speculation about the degree to which European wares may have been copied.

The Colono-Indian pitcher shown in Fig. 7 was recently recovered from a privy hole in Charleston by a private excavation project called to the attention of Dr. Charles H. Fairbanks of the University of Florida (Fairbanks 1972). This vessel could easily be Catawba and probably dates to the eighteenth century or the very early nineteenth century at the latest. We have little ethnographic evidence of painted Catawba pottery other than the quotes of Simms and Gregorie. Although the motifs on the pitcher are not those described by Simms, it still does much to convey the significance of his remarks and is a fine example of the degree of refinement Indian potters had attained in production of the trade wares exchanged in South Carolina in the post-contact period.

A SUMMARY OF THE COLONO-INDIAN PHENOMENON

In conclusion, it is amply clear that the phenomenon of Colono-Indian pottery is only just beginning to be understood. Although it now appears to have been stimulated by certain observable acculturational patterns, Colono-Indian pottery production is not to be treated as a peculiarity of any one tribal group or even cultural area. After some probable early initial experimentation and imitation of European pottery
and iron vessel forms by the innovative potters, the full scale and sustained production of the Colono-Indian pottery was foremost, though certainly not exclusively, dependent upon economic considerations for its stimulus. The importance of economics in stimulating major ceramic changes has previously been recognized by both Foster (1965) and Shepard (1965: vii).

What has typically been seen as nothing more than "poor Indian" attempts to emulate the "more appealing elements" of the White potter is not such a simple substitution of new modes for older ones, but represents syncretic processes of acculturation leading to the incorporation of a new role and meaning for ceramics within the society. The direct imitation, in pottery, of metal and other exotic artifacts such as discussed by Walter Trachsler (1965) is of minor importance to the overall Colono-Indian phenomenon. The phenomenon was, at least among the Catawba, Pamunkey, and miscellaneous scattered "settlement" Indians, an attempt born of the dire necessity to enter more efficiently into the White world. We have the beginnings of the modern "Indian Pottery" manufacturing which ultimately led to the tourist productions so well known today. The ceramic assemblage recovered from Cambridge documents an early and vital stage in the evolution of this craft as it involved the Catawbas.

Noël Hume (1962: 12) was essentially correct in his interpretation based on the Pamunkey materials, but the market was considerably larger than that provided only by the Negro quarters. The vessels may have been preferred in the kitchens of many Indian, Negro and White homes and certainly were not of the "inferior" quality accorded them by Noël Hume (Noël Hume 1962a: 172). Because of the wares' apparent popularity for specific culinary purposes, as well as its low cost, Colono-Indian pottery can be expected to occur fairly consistently in the excavation of historic habitation sites throughout the more southerly eastern seaboard states.

On a more subjective level, the strength with which the Catawba pottery tradition has endured the tremendous cultural stresses applied after White contact demonstrates the steadfast yet supple role which this craft has played in yet another Indian society. Among the Catawbas today, production of pottery is of central importance in their mythology and conceptualization of their own origins (Hudson 1970: 115).
KNOWN ATTRIBUTES OF CATAWBA INSPIRED COLONO-INDIAN POTTERY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mottled Ware</th>
<th>Smother-Fired Ware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untempered except for possible intentional inclusion of grass and other vegetal material (Holmes 1903: 55).</td>
<td>Untempered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paste is a variably fine to coarse micaceous clay.</td>
<td>Paste is a very fine micaceous clay. Apparently &quot;pipe&quot; clay described by Fewkes (1944: 73).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paste documentation</td>
<td>Paste documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a mixture of coarse &quot;pan&quot; and fine &quot;pipe&quot; clay (Fewkes 1944: 75).</td>
<td>-&quot;pipe&quot; clay described by Fewkes (1944: 73).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-porous clay with abundant organic matter (Holmes 1903: 55).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface is simply smoothed to highly burnished.</td>
<td>Surfaces of vessels are very highly burnished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface color ranges from orange/buff to black and blue/grey. (Although firing is generally very thorough and hot, it does vary considerably and results in a variety of colors.)</td>
<td>Surface color is jet black and glossy where it is not worn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel construction is known by annular ring building and modeling is also suspected.</td>
<td>Vessel construction is suspected to be by annular ring building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel construction is known by annular ring building and modeling is also suspected.</td>
<td>Vessel construction is suspected to be by annular ring building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoration by painting is possible.</td>
<td>Decoration by painting or staining is known in red color at least.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps painted and stained with sealing wax in polychrome florals and gaudy motifs during the early nineteenth century (Simms 1841: 121; Gregorie 1925: 21).</td>
<td>Roulett impression and geometric incising is documented (Harrington 1908: 404).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Forms</td>
<td>Vessel Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Colono-Indian vessel forms.</td>
<td>Forms seem to be more delicate, (i.e. small footringed bowl thus far observed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pots, pans, skillets, lids, handles, flat-bottomed bowls, pouring spouts, etc. Imitation or elaboration of nearly any White derived vessel form or decoration can be expected. (Comparative reference is Noël Hume 1962: 10 and South 1962.)</td>
<td>Pots, pans, skillets, lids, handles, flat-bottomed bowls, pouring spouts, etc. Imitation or elaboration of nearly any White derived vessel form or decoration can be expected. (Comparative reference is Noël Hume 1962: 10 and South 1962.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related Formal Pottery Types

"Brunswick Plain" by Stanley South (South 1962); "Caraway Plain" by Joffre Coe (Coe 1952 and 1964); "Burk Series?" (Keeler 1971).
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FIGURE 2

Colono-Indian vessel shapes and profiles from Cambridge, South Carolina (38GN2) with conjectural vessel reconstructions. (See following pages for detailed descriptions.)
Colono-Indian vessel shapes and profiles from Cambridge, South Carolina (38GN2) with conjectural vessel reconstructions. Item:

a. vessel form - small triveted pot (probable)
   rim form - inwardly curving and flat
   surface treatment - smoothed and lightly burnished
   paste - micaceous clay with occasional small quartz fragments and some organic matter
   surface color - mottled grey to bluish black
   reference - probable Catawba manufacture and inspiration (Fewkes 1944; Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800

b. vessel form - flat bottomed bowl (probable)
   rim form - straight and flat
   surface treatment - smoothed and lightly burnished
   paste - micaceous clay with occasional small quartz fragments and abundant organic matter
   surface color - mottled reddish buff to bluish black
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944; Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800

c. vessel form - flat bottomed bowl (probable)
   rim form - straight and tapered
   surface treatment - highly burnished
   paste - micaceous clay with little or no grit and no organic matter
   surface color - dull orange to mottled greys and bluish black
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944; Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800

d. vessel form - flat bottomed bowl (definite)
   rim form - inward curving and flat
   surface treatment - burnished
   paste - highly micaceous clay with occasional small fragments of quartz and very light organic matter
   surface color - dull orange to mottled greys and bluish black
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944; Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800

e. vessel form - flat bottomed bowl (probable)
   rim form - straight and flat
   surface treatment - highly burnished
   paste - highly micaceous clay with occasional small fragments of quartz, no organic matter
   surface color - even buff to brown
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944; Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800
Figure 2 (Continued)

f. vessel form - shallow flat-bottomed bowl (definite)
   rim form - unknown, probably flat
   surface treatment - burnished
   paste - micaceous clay with occasional fragments of quartz, no
         organic matter
   surface color - dull orange to mottled bluish black
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944;
                Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800

   g. vessel form - fragment of plugged loop handle of pitcher or mug
      rim form - unknown
      surface treatment - lightly burnished
      paste - micaceous clay with occasional small quartz fragments
      surface color - buff to brown
      reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944;
                  Harrington 1908)
      date of manufacture - circa 1800

   h. vessel form - flat-bottomed bowl (definite)
      rim form - flattened
      surface treatment - burnished
      paste - micaceous clay with occasional small quartz fragments, light
             organic matter
      surface color - buff to bluish black
      reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944;
                  Harrington 1908)
      date of manufacture - circa 1800

   i. vessel form - footring portion from bowl (definite)
      rim form - unknown
      surface treatment - smother-fired and burnished
      paste - fine micaceous clay, grit or organic matter rare or absent
      surface color - uniform glossy black where surface is not worn (Fig. 4d)
      reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture, smother-
                  fired, manufactured in "pipe clay(?)" (Fewkes 1944;
                  Harrington 1908)
      date of manufacture - circa 1800

   j. vessel form - shallow bowl with rounded, gently flattened base (definite)
      rim form - unknown
      surface treatment - highly burnished
      paste - micaceous clay with occasional small quartz fragments and no
             organic matter
      surface color - grey mottled with bluish black
      reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944;
                  Harrington 1908)
      date of manufacture - circa 1800
Figure 2 (Continued)

k. vessel form - bowl (definite)
   rim form - inward sloping and tapered, finger impressions evident
     in shaping lip
   surfact treatment - burnished
   paste - micaceous clay with occasional small fragments of quartz
     and very light organic matter
   surface color - even brown to buff
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944;
     Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800 ± 30 years

l. vessel form - bowl (probable)
   rim form - slightly outward flaring
   surface treatment - smoother fired and burnished
   paste - very fine micaceous clay with no grit or organic matter
   surface color - uniform black
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration, smoother fired, manufactured
     in "pipe clay (?)" (Fewkes 1944; Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800 ± 30 years

m. vessel form - bowl (probable)
   rim form - strongly outward flaring
   surface treatment - smoother fired and burnished
   paste - very fine micaceous clay with no grit or organic matter
   surface color - uniform black
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration, smoother fired, manufactured
     in "pipe clay (?)" (Fewkes 1944; Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800 ± 30 years

Figure 3

Colono-Indian vessel shapes and profiles from Cambridge, South
Carolina (38GN2). Item:

a, b. object form - domed lid with plugged loop handle, perhaps imitating
   lid from an iron kettle
   rim form - strongly tapered at lip
   surfact treatment - burnished
   paste - micaceous clay with occasional small quartz fragments and
     no organic matter
   surface color - variable mottled greys and bluish black to orange
     and buff
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes
     1944; Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800

c. object form - fragment of smoking pipe, perhaps in imitation
   of European Kaolin pipes, yet may be a traditional form
   surfact treatment - lightly burnished
   paste - fine micaceous clay, no quartzite fragment or organic matter
   surface color - dark brown
   reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture, manufac-
     tured in "pipe clay (?)" (Fewkes 1944; Harrington 1908)
   date of manufacture - circa 1800
d,e,f object form - flat lid with plugged loop handle
surface treatment - smoothed and lightly burnished
paste - very fine, dense, inclusion free clay
surface color - orange mottled with bluish black
reference - probable Catawba inspiration and manufacture (Fewkes 1944; Harrington 1908)
date of manufacture - circa 1800

FIGURE 3

Colono-Indian vessel shapes and profiles from Cambridge, South Carolina (38GN2). (See preceding page and above for detailed description.)
Figure 4

Colono-Indian ceramics from Cambridge, South Carolina (38GN2). Item:

a. Domed Colono-Indian lid with plugged loop handle (See Figure 3a, b).
b. Flat Colono-Indian lid with plugged loop handle (See Figure 3d, e, f).
c. Colono-Indian bowl (See Figure 2h).
d. Foot ring portion of a smother fired Colono-Indian bowl which demonstrates color and high gloss achieved with the combination of heavy burnishing and this firing process.
e. Sherd from a Colono-Indian bowl which demonstrates the abundance of organic material which is sometimes found in wares that are now thought to be Catawba (See Figure 2b).
Figure 5

Historic Catawba trade pottery collected between 1876-1886 (From Holmes 1903: 144, Plate CXXVII).

Figure 6

Historic Pamunkey trade pottery collected by Dr. Dalyrimple of Baltimore circa 1878 (From Holmes 1903: 152, Plate CXXXVI).
Red and yellow painted Colono-Indian pitcher reportedly from fill of a privy hole in Charleston, South Carolina. Suggested date is 18th century. (Recovery of this piece was originally reported to Dr. Charles H. Fairbanks of the University of Florida. Photo courtesy of C. H. Fairbanks.)
The Society for Historical Archaeology held its fifth annual meeting in Tallahassee on January 13 - 15, 1972. The Institute sent the station wagon and five representatives of the University of South Carolina to the meeting. Stanley South, Dick Carrillo, John Combes, Dick Polhemus and I attended and participated in various parts of the program.

As Chairman of the Nominations Committee, I am pleased to report that the following are the newly elected officers:

Charles E. Cleland, of Michigan State University - President
Elect

Lyle M. Stone, of Michigan State University - Director

James E. Ayres, of Arizona State University - Director

Paul J. F. Schumacher, National Park Service - Director

The Department of Anthropology, Florida State University together with the Bureau of Historic Sites and Properties, Division of Archives and History, Florida Department of State, were excellent and most gracious hosts. L. Ross Morrell put an excellent program together and the attendance was good. It was a most worthwhile meeting.

The program included seminars on St. Augustine Archeology, Colonial Zooarcheology, Spanish Colonial Archeology, Underwater Archeology, Material Culture, The National Register and the Archeologist, British Export Ceramics, and five sessions on Current Research.

Friday afternoon a tour was conducted to the old fort of San Marcos de Apalachee. This was most interesting and informative. On Thursday evening there was a cocktail party followed by a tour of Research and Preservation Laboratories of the Florida Bureau of Historic Sites and Properties.

Returning to Columbia on Sunday, January 16th, the Institute group stopped by the site of Kolomoki to visit the mounds and see the area of this tremendous Mississippian site.

EXHIBIT AT COLUMBIA SCIENCE MUSEUM

An exhibit on the story of man in South Carolina was prepared by the Institute and installed in the Columbia Science Museum. This is a series of eight wall panels with art work, photography and artifacts. The first panel is a small text outlining the story of man's occupation of this area. The second is a larger panel exhibiting some of the tools of the archeologist. The next six are large panels (4' x 6') depicting, in sequence, (1) the Early Man Period, (2) the Archaic Period, (3) the Transitional Period, (4) the Early Farmers, (5) the Developed Farmers, and (6) the Historic Period.
The exhibit is expected to remain at the Columbia Science Museum for a year or so. It will then be renovated with new material or be made available for use elsewhere. Mr. Chris Craft, Director of the Columbia Science Museum, has asked the Institute for continued archeological exhibits in the Museum.

ARCHEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

This begins the third year of the Society. It was founded in January 1969 under the auspices of the Institute with James L. Michie as its Founding President. Meetings are held on the third Friday of each month, at 8:00 p.m. at the Columbia Science Museum, 1519 Senate Street, Columbia with guest speakers, movies, exhibits and other features. Anyone interested in any aspect of the archeology of South Carolina is welcome to membership at $5.00 for individual or $6.00 for family membership. Membership also brings you the NOTEBOOK, and the two society publications, "Features and Profiles" and "South Carolina Antiquities".

The January meeting featured George A. Teague of the Institute staff discussing "The New Approach to Archeology". The February meeting featured James Michie, past President, speaking on the subject of "Ancient Stone Tools of South Carolina."

Of significance to the membership at the beginning of the New Year is the change of the monthly dittoed announcement sheet to a fine looking, illustrated, monthly newsletter done by offset and called "Features and Profiles". Also "South Carolina Antiquities" will this year, under the new Editor, be revised from a quarterly to a semi-annual and the quality of articles, printing, and editing will be vastly upgraded.

Please send membership applications, dues, or inquiries to the Treasurer, Mr. J. Walter Joseph, Jr., 903 Wildwood Road, Aiken, South Carolina 29801 or they may be sent to the Institute.