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THOUGHTS AND RECORDS FROM THE SURVEY OF
PRIVATE COLLECTIONS OF PREHISTORIC ARTIFACTS
THROUGHOUT SOUTH CAROLINA:
A SECOND REPORT

Tommy Charles
Collecting prehistoric artifacts has a long history in North America. As a former collector and amateur archeologist, James L. Michie observed the effects of collecting on sites. His concern for the depletion of artifacts from many sites throughout the state and the destruction of the sites themselves led to the submission of a proposal in 1978 to the South Carolina Department of Archives and History for a statewide survey to document prehistoric artifact collections held by private citizens and to record the sites from which they were collected. The proposal was accepted and funded by an Historic Preservation Grant from the United States Department of Interior under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, through the South Carolina Department of Archives and History. Matching funds were provided by the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina. Thus began what is believed to be the first statewide survey of private artifact collections in the United States.

Tommy Charles began the survey on October 1, 1979. The cooperation of the professional and amateur archeologists throughout the state helped make the effort an immediate success. In May 1980 the survey was discontinued due to lack of historic preservation funds. A report detailing the survey results was published in the Notebook (Charles 1981). This first effort at a statewide collection survey demonstrated not only the need for such documentation but also clearly revealed several research questions that could be approached from such a data base. So as the collection survey drew to a close there were hopes that it would be possible to continue the work as additional funds became available.

The decision to continue the collection survey came about rather suddenly. Although the possibility existed, the funding was by no means certain until several days prior to the starting date of June 1, 1982. This second phase of the survey, like the first, was funded by an Historic Preservation Grant from the United States Department of Interior under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, through the South Carolina Department of Archives and History with matching funds from the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

The goals of the second phase of the collection survey remained essentially the same as those of the first survey: (1) to determine what classes of artifacts have been removed from prehistoric sites, document these data, and record the associated sites; (2) to set up a file containing information on what has been collected, where this material was collected, who presently holds the collection and a determination of the availability of these collections for future research; (3) to form a better relationship between the professional and the amateur archeologists of our state, encouraging cooperation in the preservation of our remaining archeological sites, demonstrating the value of the proper recording of artifacts and providing opportunities in archeology through the Archeological Society of South Carolina. The additional time also provided an opportunity to expand our data base in several counties that had been less productive during the first survey.
The data from the second phase of the survey do not differ dramatically from the first phase. The longer any such study continues, the fewer major changes in the content of the data will be seen; that is, fewer unusual artifacts will continue to be found. However, the data base will become far more reliable as it is expanded and research done with this data base can be more meaningful.
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INTRODUCTION

As the first phase of the collections survey drew to a close, I kept my fingers crossed in hopes that last minute funding would be found so that it might be continued uninterrupted. This was not to be. So I turned my attention to other duties at the Institute and waited anxiously to see if the project, which I felt was incomplete, could ever be continued. This wait lasted exactly one year.

When informed of the decision to continue the survey, there was less than a week before the starting date of June 1, 1982. I was informed that there was funding for only eleven weeks in the field and four weeks to complete the report. My "modus operandi," so elaborately worked out in my head over the past year, was immediately scrapped for a much shorter version. The priorities remained the same, my efforts simply had to be telescoped into a shorter time frame. Schedules had to be less flexible, with less chance of revisiting a missed appointment if it meant backtracking a long distance. With the future of the survey uncertain after these eleven weeks in the field, I decided to work six days a week in hopes of being able to visit some of the collectors that could only be reached on weekends. This worked out quite well and a number of collections and sites were recorded that otherwise could not have been.

If this were to be the last phase of the survey, I wanted to get at least a minimal amount of data from as broad an area of the state as possible. To accomplish this, I spent less time with some collectors and visited fewer sites. More photographs were taken per collection than during the first survey. Artifact types and raw materials were used in recording a collection based on a percentage of their occurrence in the collection. If a collector picks up everything from a site, I take this percentage from the scrap box because there is less discrimination or bias than is likely to occur in frames or showcases where artifacts are selected for their aesthetic appeal.

It would have been impossible to record a large number of sites in this length of time if each site had to be visited. This is an area where the observant collector is a great help. Relying on their knowledge of the sites they collect, the majority of the sites were recorded by using a topographic map for site location and by taking notes on site information in order to complete the site form at a later date when more time would be available. Sites that seemed to warrant special attention were visited. Many of the sites reported here were entirely recorded by collectors I had visited during the previous survey. Many of these collectors now regularly monitor and record sites in their area of the state.

Not all of the collectors I had hoped to see were available during the time of the survey. Still others were seen on the spur of the moment, individuals that I had not known until introduced by another collector or someone in that vicinity. Considering there was little time to plan a detailed schedule, contact individuals, and coordinate field trips, the survey ran smoothly and efficiently.
THE COLLECTOR'S POTENTIAL

South Carolina has enough variety in its archeological resources to satisfy almost anyone wishing to do research, from Paleo-Indian's uncertain arrival to historic occupation. From the mountains to the sea, it is a land of archeological abundance and diversity. No area of the state seems to have been lacking in the necessities of life required by these prehistoric people. The sandhills of the Fall Line region, as sterile as they may appear, have many excellent sites. Swamps, when drained and cultivated, often reveal substantial sites. I know of no prehistoric sites in South Carolina that rival those of the Mississippi Valley or perhaps some other areas of the country for size or density of occupation, but in South Carolina almost every piece of dry ground (and much that is not) is a potential site, no matter how small it may be.

For all our wealth of resources, we are not blessed with an abundance of deep, stratified, well-preserved sites. None have been found that separate our many artifact types into well-ordered temporal sequences. Acid soils have robbed most sites of organic material that can be dated, with the exception of the shell middens along the coast. For the most part, South Carolina is a land of lithic and ceramic scatters located on thin and eroded soils that have been collected for some two hundred years. The very nature of our prehistoric sites have made positive statements by archeologists difficult indeed. History, however, was not planned with archeologists in mind. And if the puzzles of the past were easy to decipher, archeologists would not be needed.

Why attempt to solve a puzzle when so many of the pieces are missing and more are being removed daily? We are not dealing with a two-piece puzzle, where if one piece is lost the whole picture is destroyed, but one of many thousands of pieces. If the loss of artifacts, and in many cases the destruction of entire sites, meant that nothing more could be learned of our past, then we would be wise to turn our labors to other tasks. This is not the case, however. There is still a very large number of sites throughout our state, many in excellent condition. The erosion that has destroyed so many of our upland sites has buried and protected many lowland sites, keeping them safe from all disturbances except our expanding population, which dictates new roads, factories, dams, etc.

Artifact collections available for research are abundant. Most of these have been collected from the more shallow or eroded sites that have been cultivated for years. Few of these sites would have yielded much in the way of undisturbed conditions and even less in the way of organic material that might possibly have been dated. Excavating this particular type of site will in all probability yield far fewer artifacts for analysis than are already available in private collections. The analysis of properly recorded collections can still give us a large portion of the knowledge that was available from this type of site, such as artifact types, their use and function on a given site or area and how this may differ from other parts of our state, and raw material distribution and site settlement patterns, all at a fraction of the cost of an excavation. While
this method will never be as rewarding as a properly excavated undisturbed site, it can economically allow us to sample a far greater number of sites, thereby increasing our data base to a degree not otherwise possible.

Once recorded, the data from these collections will be available indefinitely, even if the collection is lost. Without these data, the artifacts and information from the most carefully excavated site will remain problematical in relationship to other sites.

This is not intended as an endorsement of wholesale collecting. A site with some integrity and that is afforded some protection is best left that way. This has not always been the case in the past and there is no reason to believe it will change in the future. Prehistoric artifacts are unfortunately like stamps or any other collectible items; the scarcer they are, the greater is the effort to obtain them. The professional community should provide instruction to collectors on ways to properly document their activities. The collection survey has been attempting to do this and results have been positive. However, the survey is a short-term project. What is needed is a full-time, long-range commitment to this endeavor. It is critical to monitor our archeological resources more consciously than we as scientists have done in the past. Without the aid of the amateur, this will be virtually impossible.

During the past two months I have learned of four sites that were completely destroyed for fill dirt. None of these had so much as a casual observation by an archeologist. There are no laws to prevent this, and perhaps there never will be, but we need to get the amateur archeologist and other concerned citizens of South Carolina involved to a degree that the likelihood of this kind of site destruction will be held to a minimum.

Collectors today want to know more about what they are finding. They are becoming interested not only in casual stories of Indian life but in technical data: flintknapping, the identification of raw materials, artifact types, etc. To this end they are educating themselves. They are besieged with every piece of literature concerning early man. These may be brochures that offer to buy or sell artifacts, magazines that are of general interest and are slanted to the acquisition and display of artifacts, clubs, etc. Still others are on mailing lists that offer excellent books for the serious student of archeology. With this availability of literature and increased knowledge in archeology, some collectors are becoming quite good at analyzing their collections and are recording them in great detail. A few have advanced their skills and knowledge to the professional level and are amateurs only in the sense that they do not earn their livelihood doing archeology.

Sammy T. Lee and A. Robert Parler, Jr. of Orangeburg, South Carolina, have turned from collecting to serious research in the southwestern portion of South Carolina. Working in close association with the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, they have conducted several excavations. One of these, the excavation of the Cal Smoak Site in Bamberg County, has been published as a monograph: Anderson, David G., Sammy T. Lee, and A. Robert Parler, 1979, "Cal Smoak: Archeological investigations along the Edisto River in the Coastal Plain of South Carolina," Archeological Society of South Carolina Occasional Papers 1. Their
work is excellent, a real asset to the professional community. Their level of competency was not reached overnight but by years of study and volunteer labor on excavations done by professional archeologists to learn proper excavating techniques. Currently, Parler is excavating a site on the Edisto River in Orangeburg County. This site has excellent potential to aid our efforts to understand more about the temporal aspects of the point types of the Coastal Plain. Point type "G" and a point that is Gary-like in appearance are occurring there in the same level with Thoms Creek punctate ceramics (Charles 1981). If this proves to be a good association, a date of 2,500-3,500 B.P. can be given to these points because this is the time range for the Thoms Creek punctate pottery (Griffin 1945).

While the contribution to archeology by amateurs may be less visible, it by no means indicates they are less desirable. Bits and pieces of data from many people can sometimes reveal patterns and limits of certain prehistoric activity that no single site can give. For instance, collections are revealing a noticeable decrease in the percentage of unifacial tools relative to bifacial tools north of the Fall Line and in the eastern portion of the state, in spite of an abundance of Early Archaic bifaces occurring in these areas with which the unifacial tools are normally associated. In the lower Santee River basin, a lanceolate biface was found which was somewhat similar to the Guilford point so common in the Piedmont. This biface, however, does not appear to be Guilford. It is totally different from the Guilford from the standpoint of manufacture. It is probably the most common artifact in the region and is almost always made of orthoquartzite, the most commonly used raw material in the region. Analysis of collections from this area of the state shows that where this raw material is not found neither is this lanceolate point. Does raw material have any influence on artifact type of "style?" In lower Marion County, collections contain the largest Guilford points I have seen anywhere in the state. It is not uncommon to see points of this type measuring four to six inches in length. Most are made of what appears to be local metavolcanic stone that is probably obtained from the Pee Dee River in cobble form. This material is not unlike other metavolcanic stone so common in the eastern region of the state. Then, why the great increase in size of this particular artifact in this particular area? No other artifacts of stone exhibit such a difference.

It is obvious that the amateur archeologist can make a significant contribution to the understanding and preservation of the archeological record of South Carolina. Collecting artifacts from the surface of archeological sites can have various impacts (Cable, et al. n.d.). The collection survey has demonstrated the importance of well-documented collections from small localities and the recording of these collections to reveal regional patterns of artifact distribution, raw material use, and settlement.

Collections are allowing us to see many subtle differences that we were unaware of only a short time ago: differences between the riverine and inter-riverine sites, and raw material preferences of the various cultures throughout prehistory. They reveal new data to help solve old questions, to reinforce or alter previous theories, and to generate new questions.
PALEO-INDIAN POINTS

Paleo-Indian points continue to be found throughout South Carolina, but they are still rare when compared to the occurrence of other point types. As yet, no site in South Carolina can be identified as a good Paleo-Indian site, with in situ fluted lanceolate points associated with bones of extinct animals, such as mastodon, or with other Paleo-Indian campsite features. All of the Paleo-Indian sites, so far identified, consist of little more than isolated deposits of one or more lanceolate points mixed with later materials.

During this phase of the survey two sites have been recorded that produced several Paleo-Indian points. One site recorded in the southwestern coastal area has produced four Paleo-Indian points and another site in the eastern coastal area has produced two. These are well-documented finds. It is possible that other points have been found at these sites by previous collectors that I have not located yet. The site located in the eastern coastal area had been destroyed, the dirt being used to build a road into a swamp. This site was located on the property of a timber company and to my knowledge no survey of the property was done before the site was excavated for fill.

I had the opportunity to see artifacts from three additional sites that had been destroyed for fill dirt in recent months. One of these was said to have produced a Paleo-Indian point. No archeological survey or salvage work was conducted in any of these areas. Although the site in the southwestern coastal area is cultivated yearly, it is in relatively good condition. The field is fairly level and has deep topsoil, affording some protection. There are other sites in the state that have produced multiple artifact finds, but only these two were recorded during this phase of the survey.

The distribution of the Paleo-Indian points was almost evenly divided between the Piedmont and the Coastal Plain. Fourteen were recorded in the Piedmont, sixteen in the Coastal Plain, and three along the Fall Line. As yet, I see no pattern in terms of the type of site that would be most likely to produce these artifacts. They are found in a wide variety of environments: on sites adjacent to spring heads, creeks and branches, swamps and bays, and miles from major streams or right on them. None of these environments produces these artifacts in abundance.

Local raw material seems to be the predominant choice wherever Paleo-Indian points are found, Coastal Plain chert in the southwestern coastal area, metavolcanic or quartz in the Piedmont or eastern portion of the state. However, points of the various raw materials are not restricted to a particular locale. Paleo-Indian points of Coastal Plain chert are found throughout the state and those of the metavolcanics and quartz from the Piedmont are found throughout the Coastal Plain.

The thirty-three Paleo-Indian points recorded on this most recent survey bring the total from the two surveys to one hundred three. To this
number can be added more than one hundred Paleo-Indian points recorded by Michie several years ago. With a relatively small percentage of collections throughout the state having been analyzed and with collecting activities accelerating rapidly, I have little doubt that this total will increase in coming years. Given the scarcity of these ancient artifacts, we will never have more than a minimal number to work with. The evidence for understanding our earliest citizens is certainly sparse, making it necessary to record and protect this information as diligently as possible.

Archaic Period

The age and scarcity of paleo artifacts have made them among the most prized artifacts in any prehistoric collection. This lack of paleo artifacts, and sites that have produced little in the way of cultural remains except the points themselves, have given archeologists little information with which to form opinions about South Carolina's earliest inhabitants. However, with the coming of the Archaic period, drastic changes occur: the artifact volume increases dramatically, definite site settlement patterns become established as well as differences in lithic technology. Few paleo artifacts are seen in any one collection, but artifacts from the Archaic period could be said to be the "backbone" of most prehistoric collections in South Carolina. This period has supplied the overwhelming majority of Indian artifacts to collectors. This may be somewhat debatable in the southwestern counties of the Coastal Plain. In this area the typology and chronology of lithic artifacts have not been as well established as those of the Piedmont and the eastern Coastal Plain region. Trying to place many of the point types there into the Archaic or Woodland period will remain a guessing game until good, deep sites are found and properly excavated. The work of Hanson at the Barnwell Nuclear Plant in Barnwell and Aiken counties, and Robert Parler and Sammy Lee in Orangeburg County may give us new insight into the proper chronology of some of these point types.

The work of Bettye J. Broyles (1971) at the St. Albans site in Kanawha County, West Virginia, and of Joffre L. Coe (1964) on several sites in North Carolina has done much to clarify the chronological position of many of the point types found in the Piedmont and eastern Coastal Plain sites of South Carolina. The lithic technology and artifact typology of these regions appear to have been greatly influenced from the north as opposed to those in the southwestern portion of the state, which appear to have been influenced from the west, and those in the southwest having more in common with artifacts from Georgia and Florida. Most of the sites in the southwest are multi-component as are their counterparts in the Piedmont and the eastern Coastal Plain. But with the exception of Paleo and some of the Early Archaic bifaces and tools and the small triangular points of the Late Woodland and Mississippian periods, little can be offered except opinions about the temporal place of the many point types found there.

The Middle Archaic period is a real Pandora's box in the southwestern Coastal Plain. What is seen in a collection is no more confusing than what is not seen. Throughout the Piedmont almost every hilltop is a site, and almost all of these will have a Morrow Mountain and/or Guilford component.
And while most of these are multi-component, more than a few are almost pure Morrow Mountain and/or Guilford sites, or at least predominantly so. These two artifact types have been collected by the countless thousands and still they are easily found on sites today. They are by far the most common artifact type found in the Piedmont. Moving east they decrease proportionately in relation to other point types, but they are still quite common throughout the Pee Dee and Santee River drainage district almost to the coast. West of an imaginary line from Columbia to Charleston and south of the Fall Line from Columbia to Augusta, Georgia, these point types are seldom found, especially the Guilford. When found, it is most often made of quartz, indicating an origin in the Piedmont. (A small stemmed point of quartz is commonly found on the lower reaches of the Edisto River and in the vicinity of the Four Hole Swamp that flows into the Edisto in Dorchester County. It is made from small very smooth, quartz cobbles that appear to be water-worn and local in origin. It appears to be Woodland.) Questions arise as to the many point types found throughout the southwest Coastal Plain. Which, if any, were contemporary with the mid-Archaic of the rest of the state? Why are the dramatic differences in point types and lithic technology in regions separated by only a few miles? Why did the differences last for such a long period of time? Could the climate and/or natural resources possibly have been so different as to culturally separate these regions? It is difficult to believe such supposedly small mobile groups of people living in an area with few natural barriers would be isolated to such an extent, or strong enough to resist at least some influence from contemporary neighbors for a period over 2,000 years. Yet, assuming this area was occupied, at least from the standpoint of lithic tool types and their technology, and to some degree site selection, this appears to have possibly happened.

The selection of lithic raw material for certain point types during the Archaic period is most interesting. Throughout prehistory, Coastal Plain chert was the primary material chosen by prehistoric man in the southwestern counties of the Coastal Plain. This is not surprising considering the large chert outcrops in the limestone formations that underlie that portion of the state and the scarcity of other types of stone.

From the eastern Piedmont to the Atlantic Ocean and down almost to the Santee River, the predominant lithic raw materials are several varieties of metavolcanic stone. These materials seem to be common in cobble form from the major streams and possibly from local outcrops where these streams cut through the Fall Line. Although no quarry sites have been found, large amounts of debitage with cortex have been found scattered on sites in the vicinity of the Fall Line, indicating a good possibility of nearby quarrying activity. These two areas of the Coastal Plain are separated by a narrow strip along the Santee River where the predominant lithic raw material is a fine-grained sandstone, like material known as Ortho-quartzite. This seems to be especially true of the lower reaches of the river. The use of this material is not restricted to any particular period of South Carolina prehistory, but appears to have been acceptable to all the people that inhabited this narrow strip.

Following this river north into the area of Lake Moultrie and Lake Marion, the use of this material continues but decreases rapidly. As one moves north toward the Fall Line, the diversity of raw material increases.
remarkably. Here perhaps more than anywhere in the state can be found almost any lithic raw material available in South Carolina. This area seems to be the geographical "hub" for lithic materials in the state.

It appears that the natural boundaries of much of the state's lithic raw material come together here. Most of the major river systems of the Piedmont are funneled into this area, joining to become the Santee River. These rivers have their origin in the mountains and Piedmont of North and South Carolina and apparently bring many kinds of lithic material downstream from those regions in cobble form. This possibility, along with the local fossil chert quarries and the Ortho-quartzite available to the immediate south, the chert that comes from the southwestern counties of South Carolina, and the metavolcanics from the east, make this area somewhat unique in South Carolina. The choice of lithic raw material for the manufacture of points and/or tools in many places was limited to what was available locally. In the Coastal Plain of South Carolina, this is predominantly chert in the southwest and metavolcanic stone in the east. Perhaps a thorough analysis of enough collections would reveal a pattern of preferred lithic quality and intentional selection in these homogeneous regions during certain periods as opposed to others where selection was less critical. To determine this, an analysis beyond the scope of the survey in these areas where the material is so homogeneous would have to be taken. However, in the Piedmont, with its diversity of lithic material, the selection of one material in preference to another is more readily apparent. There the Palmer points and associated tools such as unifacial scrapers are most commonly made of white bull or vein quartz. Occasionally the clear or smoky quartz crystals were used in the manufacture of these artifacts. This quartz is most often of superior quality, indicating the inhabitants' preference for quartz over other locally available stone. The second choice of the "Palmer" people was rhyolite or welded tuff, both very fine materials, but not as available as quartz.

Moving south and east below the Fall Line, the lithic choice of the Palmer people shifts to the stones available in those areas. This might be expected, but even so, of the few quartz bifaces found in collections, most will be predominantly Palmer. This is especially true along the Fall Line near North Carolina and the upper Pee Dee River area. There the apparently superior metavolcanic stones are the overwhelming choice of raw materials found in all point types, but quartz Palmers are common there and represent the greatest percentage of the total quartz artifact assemblage in the area. Kirk points in the Piedmont are most often made of metavolcanic stone as are the Stanley points. However, quartz and various tuffs are sometimes used in their manufacture. The various bifurcate points, Lecroy, Kanawah, etc., found most often in the eastern portion of the state, are almost always more of the local metavolcanic material. In the Piedmont, they will often be made of good vein quartz as well as metavolcanic stones. These points become rarer in the western Piedmont and practically unknown in the southwest Coastal Plain. Those found near the upper Savannah River are often made from Ridge and Valley chert or a very good grade of honey-colored chert of unknown origin.

It was during the Morrow Mountain I and II and Guilford periods that the greatest preference of quartz occurred. It is not uncommon to find sites where quartz was the sole choice of raw material for these artifact
types even though other point types from the same site would be made of a number of various types of stone, all available locally. No other Archaic point types in the Piedmont exhibit this preference for a particular type of raw material, with the possible exception of the Palmer point. Even the Palmer point is far less common than the Morrow Mountain or the Guilford point.

During the Savannah River phase of the Late Archaic, the Indians showed little regard for type or quality of lithic material. It seems they used the most locally available stone. This disregard for quality is reflected in the very poor craftsmanship of their artifacts. It is not uncommon to find these artifacts made from half-a-dozen different types of stone from the same site. It was during the Early Archaic period when the corner or side-notched point was being made that perhaps the Indians most consistently selected raw materials for quality. Throughout the state, regardless of the type of stone selected, it was, as a rule, superior to the average. These notched points were seldom discarded without being resharpened at least once, or perhaps several times. This practice was not limited solely to the Early Archaic period but it appears to have been consistently done during this time. Paleo points also show a high degree of selectivity, but due to their small number, no comparison was made.

Resharpening techniques varied in different regions of the state. In the southwestern counties of the Coastal Plain, this was done in a manner that left the blade of a point beveled, giving it a twisted appearance. Almost all of these notched points were resharpened in this manner. In the Piedmont, where most of the notched points were Palmer or Kirk corner notched, this changes drastically. Approximately 50% of the Palmer points are beveled and practically none of the Kirk are beveled. The beveling method is seldom seen in the eastern part of the state. There the points are resharpened bifacially, or equally, on both sides of the blade, leaving the blade flat but making it more narrow and/or shorter. This process continues until the artifact is discarded or lost.

The Early Archaic period was also the time of the greatest use of unifacial scrapers and flake tools. This use was not uniformly consistent throughout the state. The southwestern Coastal Plain has a very high ratio of unifacial and flake tools relative to bifaces. This ratio drops somewhat in the Piedmont, and traveling east into the Coastal Plain, the ratio appears to drop drastically. There is certainly no scarcity of Early Archaic artifacts in either the Piedmont or eastern Coastal Plain and I have no idea why this decrease in a certain tool type is seen. The Edgefield scraper, a large, hafted, unifacial tool of the Early Archaic period, and quite common in the southwest portion of the state, is seldom found east of the Santee River or north of the Fall Line. The unifacial tools of the southwestern Coastal Plain also tend to be somewhat larger than those in other parts of the state. I think this is a cultural rather than a raw material choice, bifaces made of the various metavolcanic stones are usually as large as the chert bifaces. Quartz bifaces tend to be somewhat smaller. This is probably related to the raw material, because quartz is more difficult to work with than either cherts or metavolcanic stones.
Woodland Period

There are a large number of lithic artifacts in South Carolina whose chronological placement has not yet been determined. The inability to accurately judge if certain lithic artifacts belong in the Woodland period or not is not likely to improve until stratified sites containing this information can be found and properly excavated. While analyzing collections during the survey, these artifacts of uncertain chronology were placed in an "undetermined type" classification, feeling it better to make no judgement rather than a wrong one. The undetermined type represents a substantial portion of many collections recorded, particularly in the Coastal Plain. When we have the knowledge to properly analyze these artifacts placed in the undetermined type, many may prove to belong in the Woodland period. Most of the lithic artifacts recorded as Woodland during the survey were placed in that category based on the technological characteristics of that cultural period.

Why this uncertainty with lithics from the Woodland period and even some of the Middle and Late Archaic artifacts from the Coastal Plain? Paleo artifacts are reasonably consistent from the standpoint of form and technology throughout North America. Even though there is greater variability in form and technology in the Early Archaic, they are still quite consistent over large areas of the country. Therefore, information gained from the excavation of a Paleo or Early Archaic site in Florida or West Virginia, for example, would in all probability yield information applicable to those periods in South Carolina. The situation is similar to the growth of a tree, with the trunk representing Paleo man and the first few large limbs representing the Early Archaic period. As the tree grows the limbs fork into an ever increasing number of smaller branches, or archeologically speaking, into an ever increasing divergence of artifact types and technology, yet being confined to more local areas. Certain artifacts or types of technology may be limited to a particular river valley or even a few counties. Therefore, the excavation of a Woodland site in the Pee Dee region of South Carolina may or may not reveal information useful in analyzing artifacts from the Piedmont or southwestern counties of the Coastal Plain.

Many artifacts in these collections belong to the Woodland period. Ceramics are the largest and most visible components of the Woodland period artifacts. Broken potsherds are scattered on prehistoric sites throughout the state. Many of these are insignificant bits of pottery, so weatherworn as to be difficult to identify other than that they are ceramics of prehistoric origin. Others are so well preserved as to appear recently made, their many designs remaining sharp and clear. Few people collect these broken sherds and most of those that do collect only the best preserved and marked pieces, and not necessarily a complete sample of all types occurring on a site. This discrimination against ceramics is a serious flaw in the collecting habits of many hobby archeologists. If a site is being collected or otherwise destroyed, then the ceramic component should be given equal treatment with the lithic component, and as diligently recorded with type samples along with the rest of the artifacts from the site.
Occasionally an unbroken pot or bowl is found; these are often finely made and beautifully decorated. These vessels are becoming increasingly rare today and are highly prized by collectors and museums. What a sight it must have been to walk through an Indian village and see such beautiful pieces in daily use. In addition to the many fine ceramic urns and bowls, there were various other baked clay objects. These baked clay objects exhibit a wide range of shapes, decorative motifs and sizes. Some are simple, round, clay balls that have been fired. These are slightly larger than a golf ball. Finger impressions of children or small adults are often seen on them. Children apparently played a big role in the manufacture of these artifacts. Other more elaborate baked clay objects occur throughout the lower Coastal Plain. One of the more common forms is a pancake-like disk of approximately four to six inches in diameter. This will often have a hole through the center, decorated with anything from plain to various kinds of punctate marks and sometimes scalloped edges.

Another kind is the tube- or spool-shaped form such as sewing thread is wound on. It will often have a hole extending lengthwise through the center of the artifact (Fig. 1).

Figure 1: A spool-shaped artifact with a hole extending lengthwise through the center.

The various forms of these ceramic artifacts are too numerous to detail here, but all forms are decorated in much the same manner as the ceramic pots. This may be punctate, fabric or cord impressed, plain or finger pinched. Their function is uncertain but it is thought that they
might serve as boiling stones in areas where stone was scarce (South 1976; Ford and Webb 1956). This would account for the holes in a large number of them, allowing them to heat these objects in a fire and then remove them with a stick inserted in the hole and place the object in a pot to facilitate cooking.

Ceramic discoids are quite common in collections and are usually found on Mississippian sites. These are small round disks that have been made of sherds from broken pots or bowls. This is accomplished by simply grinding the edges until they are rounded. These are thought to be some sort of game pieces or counters. Stone discoids occur but are not nearly so common as ceramic discoids. The stone discoids are often highly polished, which makes them quite beautiful. Normally, these are much larger than their ceramic counterpart and may be an inch or two in thickness and as much as six inches in diameter. The surfaces of these may be flat, convex or highly concave, very symmetrical overall, and exhibit a high degree of craftsmanship. These are said to be game pieces and supposedly were used by the Cherokee in a game called "chungke." The game was supposedly played by a person throwing or rolling the chunky stone while other players hit it with a spear or arrow. This game was probably widespread because these stones are found over a large part of the eastern United States.

Gorgets, or pendants, were very common. Although few have survived intact, many fragments are seen in collections. These are often made of argillite, ground very thin, and highly polished (Fig. 2). The craftsmanship that made them so thin also led to their destruction because they are very fragile and the slightest blow from a hard object such as a plow will shatter them.

There are other items of polished stone seen in collections, but the use or function of many of these is unknown. One such artifact is a small cone-shaped stone (like half of an egg). This is usually highly polished. The flat side or base will often have a grooved or indented spot in the center (Fig. 3). It may be made of hematite, argillite, steatite, fossil bone, or perhaps other kinds of stone.

Another puzzling artifact is a small piece of stone three to four inches long, and an inch or less in diameter. This may be square or round and the ends may be sharpened into a point, flattened, or squared. Most of these will have a small groove incised around the center (Fig. 4) and are often made of micaceous shist or some other soft stone. Another artifact of unknown use is a round flat stone ranging in size from approximately one inch in diameter to several inches in diameter. These have been altered very little from their natural state and were probably taken from a stream in the form of a cobble. The only alteration is in the form of a small shallow groove ground into the perimeter of the stone (Fig. 5). These have been called net sinkers, but with some weighing less than one ounce, it is doubtful that they would be practical for such a purpose.

Grooved axes and celts are seen in many collections throughout South Carolina but seldom in large quantities. There seems to be fewer of these artifacts in South Carolina than in some other areas of the eastern and midwestern United States. Of those seen, most occur in the Piedmont collections with the greatest concentrations apparently associated with
Figure 2: A pendent made from argillite.

Figure 3: A polished cone-shaped stone.
Figure 4: A stone artifact made from micaceous shist.

Figure 5: A stone artifact with a shallow groove ground into the perimeter of the stone.
riverine sites, or sites not too far removed from a riverine environment. The greatest numbers of these are seen in collections that were collected several decades ago. Several elderly collectors have mentioned how easily visible axes and celts were after plowing a field. Their size made them far more visible than other artifacts, even without rain exposing them. As a boy, I saw numerous axes used as doorstops in farm homes. People picked up axes who did not otherwise collect Indian artifacts. Because of their high visibility these artifacts are quite rare, and collectors today find very few.

Woodland artifacts of bone and shell were probably quite common in South Carolina, but few have survived our acid soils. Seldom are they seen in collections, but they do occur. The artifacts most often seen are bone pins, awls, and arrow or spear points made from the tips of deer antler. Artifacts made of shell are most commonly seen in the form of beads, and on rare occasions, in the form of hoes or choppers made from welk shells. None of these artifacts are common and all are very fragile and deteriorate rapidly once removed from the ground. If they are to survive it is imperative that they be chemically treated to prevent further deterioration. Hopefully, the proud owners of these rare artifacts will understand that this treatment is a necessity. If they will either loan or donate these fragile artifacts to the Institute or the State Museum, this curation can be properly done, thereby preserving them so that future generations might see and enjoy them.

The Woodland period is interesting not only because of the number and diversity of artifacts, but also the settlement pattern of this period is equally intriguing. The differences in site distribution between the Piedmont and the Coastal Plain are rather striking. In the Piedmont, the majority of the Woodland sites are most often located in riverine environments, or near large rivers and streams. This is a marked contrast to the Coastal Plain where sites are widely scattered over both riverine and interriverine areas. The Piedmont sites seem to be fewer in number but larger in size.

Another noticeable difference between these two regions is the distribution of ceramic types. Most types that occur in the Coastal Plain are also found in the Piedmont. However, the density and distribution of these types are different. Fiber tempered pottery, the earliest known type of ceramic in North America, is quite common in the lower Coastal Plain but it is seldom found north of the Fall Line. The same is true of punctate pottery, although it is more common in the Piedmont than fiber tempered pottery. Deptford check stamped, cord and fabric impressed, and simple stamped are seen in greater quantities than the earlier fabric tempered and punctate pottery, but these types are not nearly so common in the Piedmont as in the Coastal Plain. The predominant ceramic types of the Piedmont are chronologically later than the previously mentioned types. Some of these are incised and burnished wares, or forms decorated with various complicated stamp designs. These types are also found throughout the Coastal Plain, where they are found on isolated sites. They are not as predominant in the Coastal Plain as they are in the Piedmont.

The almost insignificant amount of earlier ceramic types found in the Piedmont compared to the Coastal Plain seems to indicate a much later
arrival of ceramic technology in that region. Perhaps the steatite bowls and pots were sufficient and continued in use long after ceramics had become common in the Coastal Plain.

Mississippian Period

Most of the private collections in South Carolina contain few Mississippian artifacts. This is not totally surprising because there is a marked scarcity of the large Mississippian sites that are so common in the Midwest and even in the states of Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee in their mid-southern regions. The Mississippian period is not without representation in South Carolina. Indeed, there are several large sites in South Carolina, a few containing mounds of impressive size. However, even the largest of these sites is smaller and less complex than most of the sites in the Midwest and South. As a rule, most of the Mississippian sites in South Carolina are found in the major river valleys and floodplains. When found in interriverine environments, they are normally represented by small scatters of pottery sherds. Most of the evidence from these sites indicates that they may never have reached the population density or social complexity exhibited by the Mississippian villages to the west. Whether this is true or not remains to be demonstrated.

The exotic artifacts that characterize the Mississippian in the Midwest and South are very rare in South Carolina. The most common artifacts found on South Carolina's Mississippian sites are ceramic potsherds. However, few collectors save these potsherds and therefore there is little information in collections to represent these Mississippian sites. The chronological position of small, triangular arrow points in South Carolina remains uncertain and many that are collected may be Late Woodland. The "exotic" of the artifacts found in South Carolina are the burial urns. A large number of urns have been found eroding from riverbanks and shorelines along several large man-made lakes in South Carolina in recent years. Several burial middens have been excavated for these fine pieces and few or no records were kept. Most of these artifacts have disappeared. Large numbers of these artifacts have been sold (many out of state) or broken. Therefore, they are rare in most private collections. There are tales of a monolithic ax being found in York County several decades ago, but there are no records to verify this account.

During the survey, a chert blade (10 1/2 inches in length) and two "birdstones" were recorded, along with good information on the artifacts' provenience. Neither one of these artifacts was found in a mound or burial site and both of the "birdstones" were broken, one by plowing activities and the other by grading a dirt road. These three artifacts were perhaps the most exotic of the lithic artifacts of possible Mississippian culture that I saw during the survey.

Although the survey has recorded several fine Mississippian sites and a number of burial urns, little has been learned to advance our knowledge of this time period from the analysis of private collections.
There are many fine collections of historic artifacts in South Carolina. Often these are acquired by the same people that collect prehistoric artifacts. However, others collect items of historic vintage only, so the groups do vary. Historic artifact collections vary in size and diversity from perhaps a few bottles or buttons to large numbers of truly fine relics. Furniture, glassware and bottles, tools, military items such as swords, buttons, bullets, etc., books, documents and letters are only a partial list of items in collections of historic artifacts, in which museum quality items are common.

Among the many methods of acquiring these artifacts are buying the artifacts in antique shops and flea markets, scouring the countryside for them, and finding relics in attics, barns, and basements. Sometimes these items will be restored and kept by a collector, but the vast majority find their way into the marketplace. This source seems to be rapidly drying up, and items that could be purchased cheaply a decade ago now command prices that seem to be out of proportion to their value. Excavating old privies and garbage dumps has yielded many fine examples of early American artifacts, particular glassware. Excavating privies in Charleston and other old towns along the coast was quite popular several years ago. A number of enterprising souls made a living excavating these privies, dividing the proceeds with the property owner. Modern technology has made the finding of previously hidden artifacts relatively easy. Electronic metal detectors and scuba diving equipment have opened up a whole new world for the collector, and the number of those collecting as a result has increased dramatically. A natural dumping place for early settlers, the rivers of our state, have produced some truly outstanding historic artifacts. Dugout canoes from the rice plantations, fine old bottles and even guns and cannons are found in our rivers and coastal waterways. With the use of a metal detector, almost anyone willing to put forth the effort can acquire early American artifacts such as buttons, coins and other metal artifacts from the thousands of old home sites throughout the state.

The recording of the many fine collections of historic artifacts in South Carolina was beyond the scope of the present survey. However, I feel this would be a most worthwhile project, and one that should be considered in the not-to-distant future, lest the artifacts start to trickle away or change hands so many times that their origin is lost and becomes meaningless, as has been the case of so many prehistoric collections.

Other Activities

The short duration of the survey did not allow time for activities other than recording sites and artifacts. During the first phase of the survey, seven schools were visited for talks and slide presentations about American prehistory. After the survey had ended, requests still came to
the Institute for this service. Even now, requests are coming in for the next school term. Hopefully, conditions will permit us to continue this service; it has certainly been one of the more pleasant and rewarding aspects of the survey.

Summary

It was good to get back to the collections survey again even on such short notice and for a short period of time. While visiting old friends, and making new ones, I never cease to be amazed at the wealth of history in our state, and the apparent increased concern of our citizens for the preservation of South Carolina's heritage.

Even though time was not available to do all I would have liked, I feel good about what was accomplished. Our data base has been expanded, a new chert quarry was located and recorded, and the names of collectors not previously known to the Institute have been added to our files. Thirty-four collections have been recorded. One hundred twenty-three sites were recorded, several of national register merit. Encouragingly, forty-two of these sites were recorded by collectors contacted during the first survey, almost two years ago. The survey is having some positive effects on at least some collectors and without their help much less would have been accomplished. They have already become working partners in the effort to learn more about our prehistory. As the number of our prehistoric sites continues to decrease, the importance of those amateur archeologists choosing to work with the Institute will be magnified. A collector does not have to be a highly trained archeologist to be a part of the Institute's efforts to better understand our past. Simply being a good observer and having the willingness to record and share these observations with us can increase our knowledge dramatically, at little cost to the taxpayer. The opportunity for the exchange of information, mutually beneficial to the professional and amateur archeologist alike, has never been greater. Let us make the most of it.
### APPENDIX A

**Sites Recorded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sites Recorded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>331-332 (Abbeville County)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>120-121-135* (Allendale County)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>636 (Beaufort County)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>110 (Chester County)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>158-159-160-161-162-167-168-169* (Chesterfield County)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>77-78 (Calhoun County)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>14-15 (Dillon County)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>64-65-66-67-68-69-70-71-72-73-74-75-77-78-79-80 (Dorchester County)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>131 (Fairfield County)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN</td>
<td>344-345 (Greenwood County)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>22-95-96-97-98-99-100-101-102-103-104-105 (Hampton County)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>120 (Horry County)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>76-77-78-79 (Jasper County)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KE</td>
<td>82-84-85-86-87 (Kershaw County)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>34-39-40-41-49-50-51 (Marlboro County)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>98 (McCormick County)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>151-152-160 (Richland County)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>-46-47-48-49-50-51 (Spartanburg County)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>37-38-39-40* -41-42-43 (Sumter County)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

A PHOTOGRAPHIC SAMPLE OF ARTIFACTS RECORDED IN THE SURVEY
Steatite pipe

Clay pipe
Ceramic disk

Elongated clay artifact with a hole extending lengthwise through the center.
Grooved ax

Grinding stones
Ceramic bowl

Ceramic vessels
Perforators, drills

Bifaces that have been reworked into scrapers
Microblades

Hardaway side notched point
Fluted point

Fluted point
Crystal Suwannee point

Fluted point
Large Guilford point

Point made from red glass during the contact period.
Early Archaic notched point

Early Archaic notched point
Lanceolate points

Crystal quartz points
Glass trade beads

Catawba ceramic vessels
A collector's display of artifacts

A collector's display room of artifacts
A display of artifacts

Rock shelter
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