

A REVIEW OF THE ARCHEOLOGY AND ETHNOHISTORY OF THE MONACANS

L. Daniel Mouer
Office of Cultural and Environmental Studies
Virginia Commonwealth University

INTRODUCTION

When Captain John Smith captured a Mannahoac near the location of present day Fredericksburg in 1609 (Smith 1910a), that Indian confessed to knowing only three "worlds": those of his dreaded enemies the Powhatan and the Massowameakes, and his own world, that of the Monacans. Today we know the "world" of the Massowameakes - presumably the Iroquois league - quite well. Our knowledge of the Powhatan "world" has improved a lot over the past century. But we know the Monacans hardly at all. In this paper I will argue that there is much yet that we can know and that much of what we think we know may be mistaken.

The approach taken in this paper has been to discuss aspects of Monacan language and ethnic affiliations, society, subsistence economy, and warfare, primarily from the perspective of historic documents. Archeological evidence is marshalled where appropriate. I have concluded the paper with a discussion of Late Woodland material culture and have attempted to interpret the archeological patterns in terms of both culture history and social and ecological inference. My aim all along has been to be critical of the secondary historic sources, and to examine some of the dogmas concerning the Monacans in light of both primary historical and archeological evidence.

Our knowledge of the Monacans has been enhanced considerably by the writings of Mooney (1894), Fowke (1894), and especially David Bushnell (1930, 1935). Archeological evidence helpful in furthering our understanding of the Monacans and their ancestors has come from the works of Holland (1963, 1978, 1979), especially in Albemarle County; MacCord through his excavations at Wingina (1974), Bolton (1964), Windsor (1971), Hertzler (MacCord and Livesay 1982) and numerous other tests and collections; and from Winfree's (1972) survey at Monacan Farm in Powhatan County.

Between March 1978 and April 1981 this author conducted a research program aimed partly at establishing archeological evidence of Monacan material culture, social organization and economy. This program consisted of an extensive review of historic sources, and archeological surveys and excavations in the James River valley from 20 miles below the falls to Nelson County. In addition, regional collections housed at the VRCA and the Smithsonian were studied for comparison. At VCU, we now have fairly extensive collections from Henrico, Goochland, Powhatan, Chesterfield, and Fluvanna Counties, with smaller inventories from Cumberland, Orange, Albemarle, and Louisa Counties. Many of the collections were made with systematic controls and include paleobotanic and carbon dating samples, stratigraphic tests for ordering ceramic sequences, etc.

Unfortunately, the unexpected withdrawal of federal funding from the James River survey has left most of the information from this project undescribed, unpublished and unknown. I am pleased to have been invited to participate in this symposium so that I can take this opportunity to put forward some ideas concerning the history, ethnohistory and archeology of the Monacans and the Late Woodland of the James River drainage in the Piedmont. Most of the archeological ideas explored in this paper cannot be easily substantiated until such time as the James River survey material is properly analyzed. I offer these comments as hypotheses which await the tests of evidence.

MONACAN LANGUAGE AND ETHNIC AFFILIATIONS

In this paper I use the term "Monacan" principally to refer to those five tribal territories described and mapped by Smith (1910a, b), namely the settlements of Mowhemcho, Massinicack, Rassawek, Monasuchapanough, and Monahassanough. In some cases, I have use the term more

generically to include the confederates of the Monacans, the Mannahoacs, and the possible descendants of these groups as they appear in later sources. These latter include the Saponis, Tutelos, Mahocks, Stegarakis, etc. These groups are often referred to collectively as the "Piedmont Siouan speakers" and sometimes as "Northern Piedmont Siouan speakers" to distinguish them from Mississippian influenced groups of that linguistic stock found throughout the Piedmont of the Carolinas. The idea that the Monacans were speakers of Siouan languages should not be considered firmly established, however.

A fairly persuasive argument has been offered by Mooney (1894) that the Monacans were speakers of Siouan languages, and this has become widely accepted (cf. Bushnell 1930). A lengthy argument against this conclusion has been offered by Miller (1957). Mooney reached his conclusion largely through the Tutelo wordlist gathered by Hale at the end of the 19th century, and from the early 18th century Saponi wordlist of Fontaine (Alexander 1972).

Hale elicited the name Yesang as a generic term for "people" from the last Tutelo living in New York. Mooney plausibly found this term to be the root of the name Nahyssan, used by Lederer (1672) to name the larger group to which the local group Sapon was affiliated. (Lederer referred to Sapon as a town of Nyhassan.) This term was also viewed by Mooney as the root of Monasuchponough, one of the five Monacan "towns" listed by Smith (1910a, b). Furthermore, Saponi was viewed as the root of Monasuchaponough, another of the Monacan "towns". Hale's Tutelo informant could recount a very few words in his "native" language, which Hale found to be surprisingly like Blackfoot or Dakota. This latter data may not be trustworthy, however. Fontaine's word list from the Saponis at Fort Christanna contains terms of Siouan, Algonkian and Iroquoian origins, in that order, with Siouan terms being by far the most frequent (Alexander 1972; but see also Miller 1957).

From this evidence it may well be safe to group the Yesang or Hyhassan (Saponi and Tutelo) as speakers of Siouan languages. It is likely that Mooney is correct in identifying these groups with the Monasuchapanough and Monahassanough, five of the Monacan tribal territories described by Smith from Algonkian informants. These groups inhabited the inner

Piedmont of the James drainage in the early 17th century. It is not so simple a task to infer the linguistics of the Monacan groups of the outer Piedmont, however.

In the earliest mention of the Monacans, they are referred to as Monanacah and are grouped together with the Rahowacah, possibly the same as those named Rassaweks or Russowameakes in slightly later narratives. Smith referred to Rassawek as the chief town of the Monacans. The name "Rassawek" has been translated as Algonkian for "people who dwell at the fork" (Holland, personal communication 1980). The rendering "Rahowacah" is very close to the mid-17th century term "Rickahockan" which was used for the Monacans in general, and is also a Chickahominy place name. These names, then, appear to be Algonkian renderings. Unfortunately, we do not know what name the Monacans or Rassaweks used to refer to themselves. The prefix Mona yields a clue in that it is similar to known Siouan place names. This term is not unambiguous, however.

The prefixes "Mo", "Ma", "Mona", etc. are reminiscent of the term moni used to name streams by the Saponi Indian who accompanied William Byrd of Westover in his dividing line survey (Byrd 1929 edition). While the majority of words from the Fort Christanna list may be Siouan, the Saponis by this time were a relict group of mixed composition, and there is no certainty of the language spoken by Byrd's guide and companion. The Christanna list, however, contains the word spelled money, meaning "water", and is felt to be comparable to Hidatsa, Ponca, Omaha, Dakota, Mandan and Tutelo terms (Alexander 1972). This seems to argue strongly for the Monacans as Siouans speakers as well.

Lederer (1672, edition of 1958:10) states that, among the Piedmont Indians (whom he lists are "Mahoc", "Nantaneuck", alias Nuntely, Nyhassan, Sapon, Managog, Akenatzzy and Monakin etc. One language is common to them all, though they differ in Dialects". Captain John Smith clearly points out that, while the Coastal Plain Indians speak a common language, the Piedmont Indians require translators among themselves as their languages are mutually unintelligible. This says little about linguistic affiliation but suggests quite a lot about interaction and organization, about which more is to follow.

In the list given by Lederer above, there is included a group called Mangoac and a similarly named group called Managog. Lederer states that their language family is the same as the Monacans, Sapons, etc. The term Mangoake appears as early as the Roanoke voyages (Lane 1946:138, in Binford 1964:12 *et passim*). Binford concludes that the Mangoakes of Lane's account, and early maps are Tuskaroras, a questionable claim in view of the fact that Smith mapped and described a group named Kuskarowoaks on the Eastern Shore. Mooney (1894) and Hewitt (1910, cited in Binford, 1964) believed the Mangoake to be the Nottoways, another Iroquoian speaking group. If the prefix Man is used in Iroquoian languages, which belong to the Macro-Siouan linguistic family, then the above discussion may not allow us to determine whether or not the Monacans were Siouan or Iroquoian speakers. To further confuse the issue, Monongahela, the name of a river in Western Pennsylvania, has the same prefix and is supposedly a Shawnee (Central Algonkian) word meaning "river with steep banks".

The linguistic picture is even more confused when one considers the Mahoc who lived along the James in the inner Piedmont at the time of Lederer's visit. A modern place name - Mohawk Creek, in Goochland County - reminds us of Lederer's visit to Mahoc in 1670. Rights and Cumming (1958) consider the name a substitute form of Mannahoac. Swanton (1952) believes that Mannahoacs, formerly situated on the Rappahannock River, were forced south into the James River piedmont by Susquehanocks before 1656. The parallel between the name Mahock and that of the historically known Mohawks of the Iroquois is interesting, if not conclusive. The parallel is even more inviting when it is noted that just downriver from Mohawk Creek in Goochland County is Genito Creek. The term Genito is found throughout the early 18th century literature as a synonym for Seneca in Virginia (see Lawson 1709:33). This suggests a possible Iroquoian language for the Mahocks.

As will be demonstrated below, material culture does not allow us much room to distinguish these linguistic groups either. It appears that the linguistic affiliation or affiliations of the Monacans is unresolved, and a more detailed analysis of extant place names may provide the only answer. Until such work is completed, it cannot be taken as fact that

the Monacans spoke Siouan languages, and generic terms like "Piedmont Siouans" should be used with caution.

MONACAN SOCIETY

The Monacans were described by Smith (1910a) as a warlike and barbarous people from information gained by their perennial enemies, the Powhatan. I have addressed the question of their "barbarity" in an earlier paper (Mouer 1980) and, in summary fashion, below under subsistence and warfare. Some aspects of Monacan social organization have been covered more fully in a paper published by the ASV in 1981 and in a more recent paper prepared for publication in an Academic Press volume scheduled to appear later this year (Mouer, *in press*). It will be appropriate to quickly review some aspects of that discussion here.

The name Monacan was applied to different levels of organization and different scales of society in the early historic records. At times the term applies to all of the Piedmont from the James drainage to the Rappahannock. In other contexts, including Smith's history, the term is applied only to the groups living along the James, and is used in complementary opposition to the term Mannahoac, which term refers to the groups living in the Piedmont on the Rappahannock. It is interesting to note that the Mannahoac captured by Smith referred to his own "world" as that of the Monacans. This world he placed in opposition to the social worlds he called Powhatan and Massowameake. Lederer uses the term to apply strictly to a single settlement in the outer James Piedmont, perhaps the Mowhemcho of Smith's earlier narrative. This settlement, in turn, is called the Manakintown in turn of the 18th century documents concerning the French refugee settlement there (e.g. Brock 1886, Michel 1916).

This confusion in the scale of the group or territory to which the name Monacan should apply is probably an artifact of segmentary lineage organization in which spheres of affiliation can vary with certain circumstances usually having to do with warfare (Sahlins 1961, Bohannon 1954, Rappaport 1967, Vayda 1961). It is interesting to note that this form of organization is most typically associated with shifting agriculturalists, pastoralists and other tribally organized societies which move their

residences periodically, and whose regional populations are at or near the carrying capacity of their environment and technology. We cannot say for certain what sort of social organization the Monacans had, but the naming evidence is supported by the archeological diversity that is found in Protohistoric contexts in the Piedmont (Mouer 1978, 1979). References to Monacan "kings" in much of the early literature may indicate that a "big-man" system of prestige allocated status existed. There is little evidence for ascribed ranked social statuses, however. The most compelling evidence for at least incipient ranking among the local groups is Smith's (see footnote 1) reference to the various allies paying tribute to the Monacans.

The segmentary pattern is mirrored in late archeological collections in the Piedmont, as well as in other interior riverine valleys such as those of the Shenandoah Valley and the Southwestern portions of the state, and in the Ridge and Valley and Piedmont sections of Maryland and Pennsylvania. The pattern I refer to consists of parallel lines of development of distinct material culture traditions which share general decorative motifs and which yield evidence of intra-regional exchange or mating networks between localized, relatively autonomous groups. This situation can be contrasted to that of the Coastal Plain in which a relatively uniform circum-Chesapeake material culture can be demonstrated (Mouer 1979, although Thurman, in an oral comment on this paper, disagreed on the degree of "uniformity in Late Woodland Chesapeake Bay material culture").

Intra-regional variation in pottery in this latter zone is largely decorative. For instance, Binford (1964) suggested that decorative motifs could be used to separate drainage-based social groups in the southeastern Coastal Plain of Virginia. In contrast to this, late ceramics from the Piedmont and western portions of the state share a limited repertory of decorative motifs, but vary significantly in features of vessel manufacturing technology.

Following the arguments of Wobst (1977) we may expect that this reflects a higher level of interaction at intermediate social distance in the Coastal Plain. This observation is strengthened by an expansion of the numbers of motifs and frequency of decoration in the protohistoric times, coincidental with the

formation of more complex regional social systems. Decorative behavior in the Piedmont on the other hand follows a number of well-established traditions and suggests reinforcement and maintenance of an open network among local groups which are relatively autonomous.

Technological divergence, on the other hand may indicate low rates of inter-societal interactions on these networks. This pattern of open, long distance, low density interaction fits the segmentary lineage hypothesis well. A possible trend towards homogeneity in ceramics in the latest prehistoric period may reflect the rise of a confederation of lineages in the face of predatory expansion of neighboring groups.

SETTLEMENTS AND SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

An organizational hierarchy of sorts probably existed among Monacan settlements at the beginning of the 17th century. This was no doubt quite different from the functional hierarchy apparent in the Powhatan settlement system, however, and was apparently related to the communication advantages afforded certain locations rather than to advantages in resource access or military strength (Mouer 1981). Bushnell (1930, 1933) has addressed the locations of settlements of the Monacans within the James drainage. Some of his conclusions require rethinking, however. In this section, I will address our knowledge of the Monacan "towns" discussed by Bushnell, as well as some of the villages visited by Lederer.

Newport, in 1608, visited the towns of Mowhemcho and Massinicack, both on the south bank of the James in present day Powhatan county. The first town is generally taken to have been in approximately the same location as that called Monacan by Lederer, and known as Manakintown when it was inhabited by Huguenot refugees in 1699. There is no reason to believe that the settlement remained in exactly the same place for nearly 100 years. No Indian sites located in the James River Survey contained sufficient refuse accumulation or midden development to convince this author that they were settled for periods longer than a generation at most. However, it seems reasonable from the historic descriptions of the area to accept that the strip of lowgrounds

between Bernard and Norwood Creeks, along the James, was a major focus of settlement.

This strip, along with Sabot Island, and the lowgrounds on the opposite bank, is the first extensive tract of floodplain to be met on the James travelling west from Tuckahoe Island at the head of the Falls. Undoubtedly houses, hamlets and a village or two were to be found in this area throughout Woodland times. This tract is similar to other tracts thought to have been inhabited by Monacans, in that there are several thousand acres of contiguous bottoms, numerous narrows and shallows in the river suitable for fishdams and weirs, and surrounding high grounds to afford a variety of resources and some protection from military incursions.

A number of Late Woodland sites have been explored in this tract, including some which contain materials felt to be protohistoric. The major concentration of these latest materials found to date, however, appears to be near the mouth of Norwood Creek at a site (44Po7) first reported by Winfree (1972). Near this site, the author and his associates located the remains of what appears to be a possible stone mound. This mound may be the "large pyramid of stones" reported by Lederer (1958: 19-29).

Another Monacan village visited by Newport was Massinicack. Strachey (1953) stated that Massinicack was located 14 miles upriver from Mowhencho. This would place it in the vast stretch of lowgrounds that runs between the State Farm and the large bend in the river at Beaumont School for Boys. Bushnell favored a location on the Beaumont property near the mouth of Mohawk Creek. He did not conduct any survey in this vicinity, however. Our tests along the western bank of the creek demonstrate significant remains of the Late Woodland period in this location.

A Late Woodland village with numerous burials, said to have contained kaolin (English?) pipes is widely reported by local residents who saw the burials exposed after a flood several years ago. This site (44Po13) is downstream a short distance on the property of the Virginia State Farm. The author conducted an extensive survey of the State Farm property, including this site. Late Woodland materials gathered here are primarily from an earlier Late Woodland occupation of the James River phase, to be discussed below. Some protohistoric or

postcontact materials, including a single sherd of burnished Colono-Indian ware, were recovered, however.

Bushnell supposed that Massinicack and the Mahock of Lederer were one and the same settlement. Lederer, however, clearly described Mahock as being approximately 100 miles - not 14 miles - upstream from Monacan. He also gives a humorous story which recounts how he and his fellow travellers came to follow the compass, rather than the Monacan's instructions, due west in order to find Mahock. A due west strike from Monacan would have Lederer cross the James again in the lowgrounds between Wingina and Norwood. The stream confluence shown on Lederer's map is probably either the Rockfish or Buffalo River. His description and mapping of the Mahock vicinity, and of the River above this place, match the Wingina-Norwood location very well.

It appears that some of the Mahocks (or Mannahoacs) settled in what may have been the former territory of Monahassanough. This latter group was placed in the inner Piedmont. Bushnell identified the Wingina site area with the location of Monahassanough due simply to the quantities of artifactual material found there through the years. As with the Mowhencho and Massinicack localities there is an excellent combination of suitable fishing spots and extensive bottomlands in the Wingina-Norwood tract to suggest a focus of settlement. I have briefly studied Wingina site collections at the VRCA and can confirm that the majority of the ceramics are very similar to materials felt to be protohistoric from other sites in the inner Piedmont. Attributing archeological remains from the Wingina site to either the Monhassanoughs (Nahyssan) or Mahocks (Mannahoacs) would be entirely premature given our current archeological knowledge, however.

Smith places the settlement of Monasuchapanough on the left bank of a major tributary flowing from the north. This, Bushnell (1930) has reasoned, is the Rivanna River. A large site in the vicinity of Charlottesville has been traditionally identified as Monasuchapanough by archeologists (see Holland 1978) since its exploration by Bushnell (1930). Jefferson excavated a mound which apparently stood on the opposite bank of the River. Since Jefferson (1964) was aware that an old Indian town had stood on the river in this

location, it has been assumed that this town was identical with Smith's Monasuchapanough.

It should be kept in mind that this Indian town was probably occupied no later than the first decade of the 18th century. Bushnell feels that it had been abandoned much earlier due to the fact that Lederer made no mention of it and found the namesake town of Sapon on a tributary to the Roanoke, probably Otter Creek. Beverley (1702) stated in 1702 that there were no longer any Monacans "left in these parts". Smith's information is at least 100-150 years older than Jefferson's. Thus, there is no reason to assume that the Indian town referred to by Jefferson was Monaschapanough, or any other Monacan site. By the turn of the 18th century there were probably Mannahoacs, Stegaras, Shawnees, Senecas, Oneidas and dozens of other groups moving through the Virginia Piedmont. There is even less reason to ascribe the mound excavated by Jefferson to the Monacans. Attempts by Bushnell, Holland and most recently by Boyer to locate Jefferson's mound have all proven disappointing. Our best hope for determining the location and cultural affiliations of Monasuchapanough and Jefferson's mound is through more intensive archeological survey and excavation.

Smith's (1910b) map shows Rassawek, the "Chief habitation" of the Monacans, in the confluence of the James and a tributary flowing from the North. As I have mentioned above, Holland has translated "Rassawek" or "Russowameake" as meaning "people who dwell at the fork". Most writers have assumed this tributary river to be the Rivanna. Bushnell (1930) felt that the confluence of the James and Rivanna, lying in Fluvanna County and historically known as "Point of Fork" was, indeed, the location of Rassawek. He found little artifactual evidence but suggested that the lowgrounds along the south bank of the Rivanna would have been a suitable location for this town.

In 1980, a large cut across the Point of Fork was made to lay a gas pipeline. This work was monitored by our archeological crews who were, at that time, engaged in intensive study of sites on Elk Island. No Indian remains were found on the banks of the Rivanna, but the north bank of the James was quite a different story. Under nearly six feet of sterile flood

deposits, bulldozers uncovered a sequence of separate cultural levels extending through a section nearly 10 feet in depth. At least six distinct midden layers, each separated by alluvial deposits, were counted and mapped. All were of the Late Middle Woodland through Late Woodland periods.

A large number of features were exposed as well. These included pits filled with charred hickory nuts, refuse pits, and the possible section of a semi-subterranean house with successive "floors". Pottery from these "floors", and from trash pits dug into the floors, was of four distinct ceramic traditions. The most prevalent was a hard, grey, well-made cord-marked pottery with fine sand temper and undecorated rims (Clements or Vincent Series?). Another was the type Rivanna Scraped, an early Late Woodland variant of the Albemarle Series (Evans 1955). A fabric impressed ceramic with similarities to Dan river types was also common. The last type, found in minor quantities, was Dan River Net and Knot Roughened. A single radiocarbon date was recovered from a pit containing the Albemarle pottery. This date was approximately A.D. 1050. This pit contained a small fragment of maize cob and numerous charred seeds of Chenopodium.

Adjacent to the pipeline cut, for nearly one-quarter of a mile along the river bank, there was found a series of Woodland sites. Surface materials, including numerous bits of human bone, was collected. These surface materials appeared to be considerably later than those found in the pipeline cut. Most of the ceramics were best classified in the Montgomery or Potomac Creek Complexes. This material, especially the Potomac Creek - related pottery, is thought to be from the Protohistoric period. Less than one-half mile down stream on the James, there is a large expanse of lowgrounds which has also produced quantities of late artifactual materials. These include nearly an entire vessel of highly decorated Potomac Creek pottery which is owned by a local farmer.

Nearby, on Elk Island, Gerald Fowke (1894) located an impressive site with materials from a wide variety of time periods. This find led the present author to begin work on Elk Island over a three and a half year period. Here was found a large possibly palisaded village site containing late ceramics and a few artifacts of

European materials (a gunflint and chipped wine bottle glass artifacts). The Stoneman Site, opposite the head of Elk Island contained a sizeable Protohistoric component, but no post-contact materials.

Rassawek was probably a large tribal territory with a number of residential foci which changed slightly every generation or so. More work is needed on Elk Island, at Point of Fork, and in the intervening lowgrounds. Work conducted to date suggests that a proper and thorough study of this area will provide a phenomenal archeological record of the Monacans and those who preceded them in the Piedmont country.

Piedmont Late Woodland settlements in the James River valley are, for the most part, compact clusters or linear arrangements of houses along the banks of rivers near stream confluences and on large islands. Protohistoric sites, if correctly identified as such, tend to be somewhat larger, more highly nucleated, and in the case of 44Go40, 44Go60 and 44Go30 appear to have a dense, circular core of debris. The late materials at the Stoneman Site (44Go40), are spread along two or three miles of river bank, but distinct concentrations are noted. Towards the center of this linear distribution is a large, dense approximately circular concentration (44Go40) which has yielded the latest materials, but no evidence of trade goods. 44Go30, nearby on Elk Island, appears to be very highly nucleated. When discovered, the site was marked by a distinct black circular midden stain which covered approximately three quarters of an acre. Surface collections from this site contain a gun flint and some possibly flaked wine bottle glass.

Upland sites near the heads of streams, or along spurs which divide drainage suggest that, at various times during the Late Woodland period, there were non-transient settlements in such localities. Lindberg (personal communication) has made collections of Late Woodland and Protohistoric points and ceramics from a number of these sites in Albemarle, Louisa and Orange Counties. A recent test (MacCord and Livesay 1982) of Hertzler site, 44Po3, suggests the possibility of a small settlement occupied for a considerable length of time, either continually or seasonally. The Odell Site, 44Hn51, (VCU field notes and Odell, personal communication) on the South Anna River contains materials similar to those from

Hertzler. This site represents a long term occupation of no more than two or three family houses.

These smaller, permanent or semi-permanent sites on low order streams and uplands may be seasonal hunting camps or they may indicate the movement of hamlets into more marginal agricultural lands. This latter pattern is similar to that found in recent times in the forest horticultural cultures of Borneo, New Guinea and Amazonia and would indicate a transition from what Harris (1972) calls "pioneering" swiddening to a more intensive, saturated pattern. The latter could be caused either by local population growth or, more likely, by the expansion of some more powerful groups at the expense of more marginal ones. Competition for prized riverine bottoms is common among tribal horticultural societies and often is seen as a prime cause in the evolution of pan-tribal segmentary lineages and confederacies (Sahlins 1961). Increased intra-regional competition could also explain the increased nucleation of settlements and the emergence of a more coherent material culture tradition in Protohistoric times.

From the close proximity of nucleated settlements such as 44Go30, 44Go40, 44Go60, 44Fv19-24 and possibly others on or near Elk Island, some tentative conclusions can be drawn. Either these represent a closely packed cluster of settlements or, more likely, they represent different "generations" of one or two villages which were moved from time to time within a confined area. This pattern of spatial autocorrelation between villages of nearly the same time period is found throughout the Piedmont section of the James from Early Woodland times onward. It can be found in the James River phase sites in the Sabot-State Farm area, and in the Elk Island tradition sites on Elk Island.

It is suggested that this pattern is typical of shifting cultivators who rotate fields within a somewhat circumscribed territory of lowgrounds. There is probably some synchronization of scheduling between the move towards new swiddens and the need to rebuild houses or palisades made from perishable materials. Periodic floods would also necessitate the rebuilding of villages and such events may have offered the opportunity to move towards newly cleared fields.

SUBSISTENCE ECONOMY

For some reason, discussions of the Monacans in a number of historic and archeological works have been riddled with inaccuracies, nonsense or, at best, unsubstantiated assertions concerning subsistence. For instance, in her otherwise excellent history of Goochland County, Agee (1962) states that the Monacans and Mannahoac were "very barbarous and subsisted chiefly by hunting and gathering wild fruits". This statement appears, almost verbatim in a number of other works, including Mooney's (1894) classic monograph, Couture's (1980) Powhatan County history, and Winfree's (1972) report on his Monacan Farm survey. Its ultimate origin is Captain John Smith (1910a) who actually stated that the Monacans and Mannahoacs had allied with them numerous smaller groups, some of whom lived on smaller streams and whose subsistence was largely dependent on wild resources (note 1).

Couture (1980), also misreads a statement by Michel (1916), who visited the Hugenots at Manakintown in 1702. The Hugenot traveller stated that the Indians brought pottery filled with corn to the French refugee settlement, but Couture reads the statement as implying that they brought empty pots seeking to have them filled with corn (note 2). From this he infers that the Monacans had forsaken farming for the life of hunters and gatherers.

The historians have clearly ignored statements such as that by Strachey (1953), who accompanied Newport to the Monacan country in 1608, and who stated that corn was more widely grown above the Fall Line than in Tidewater (note 3). At any rate, we now have reason to believe that horticulture, even if only of non-domesticated plants, was of great economic importance as early as 1000 B.C. in the Monacan country (Mouer, Ryder and Johnson 1981). Maize has been recovered from a trash pit dated to approximately A.D. 1050 from the Point of Fork Site (44Fv19). Squash, beans and sunflower seeds have been identified in midden and pit features of the Shockoe Slip phase (a "Piedmont" tradition) at the Shockoe Slip and Reynolds-Alvis Sites. The latter site provided a date in the 10th century. We have no reason to believe other than that the Monacans were riverside farmers like all the other non-coastal Woodland Indians dwelling along the major streams of Eastern North America.

Site catchment analyses of a number of favorable locations in the Piedmont section of the James River suggest that spring may have been the limited season so far as the annual subsistence round was concerned (Mouer 1982a). Even with a well developed economy based on mixed agriculture and hunting/gathering, starchy tubers and anadromous fish would have provided the bulk of spring foods, along with the remaining stores of nuts, meal and dried meat from the previous seasons. Anadromous fish were never so plentiful in the Piedmont as in the Coastal Plain. The starchy tubers of swamp growing plants such as Tuckahoe (*Peltandra*), Arrowhead (*Sagittaria*), lotus and cattail species are also vastly more prevalent in the swamps of the inner Coastal Plain than in the Piedmont.

It is probably for this reason that "Piedmont" archeological materials are frequently found in sites of the Chickahominy Swamp and near the Falls of the James. An early Late Woodland village of Piedmont folks was established at the Shockoe Slip site in present day downtown Richmond (44He77). Salvage excavations at this site revealed several burials and a rich midden filled with bones and scales of sturgeon and shad, as well as remains of yellow perch, terrestrial species such as deer and racoon, and large avian species which are not yet identified. These, along with the seed remains mentioned above, suggest that this was not simply a spring fishing camp. A sizeable protohistoric "Piedmont" component has been found in one of the westernmost known sites in the Chickahominy swamp, the Upham Brook Site Complex (44He158-161), for which a report is currently in preparation. This site was probably only a seasonally visited base for exploiting the plant resources of the swamp.

When Powhatan complained to the Jamestown colonists that Monacans invaded their country every fall, the natural conclusion to be drawn was that the Piedmont Indians were competing for the deer and nuts harvested there by the Powhatan. This conclusion was apparently reached by Turner (1981) who suggested that a buffer zone existed between the territories of the two groups which enhanced the preservation of deer for both groups. It is certain that the Monacans hunted during autumn in this zone, as attested by Smith's encounter in the Fall Line zone on the Rappahannock with the five Mannahoac "kings" who were engaged in a communal hunt nearby (Smith 1910a).

The "buffer zone" hypothesis has been reviewed in a recent paper (Mouer, in press), and I will only summarize here that the idea that Monacans required deer from this zone is questionable. Competition for the Fall Line had probably been fierce throughout the Late Woodland Period (Mouer, in press, and 1982). The Monacans may have been attempting to move into the prime agricultural grounds of the Powhatan elite in the inner Coastal Plain. At the least, they were probably attempting to assure that a possible earlier intrusion by Algonkians into the outer Piedmont was not repeated, so that prime fishing and swamp harvesting locations would remain open to them. This earlier intrusion, termed the James River Phase, is represented by a number of sites near the head of Sabot Island and on the State Farm. The material culture of the phase is nearly identical with that of the Coastal Algonkians between A.D. 1100-1400, and a number of sites contain "trade sherds" of decorated Townsend ceramics.

Bushnell (1930) photographed impressive stone fishdams just above the Falls of the James. These were listed as "Indian fishdams" on an early map and are attributed by Bushnell to the Monacans. Very little archeological survey has been done to date in this section of the James. This author suspects that the Monacans fished here after the prime spots at the base of the Falls had been taken over by the Powhatan, who maintained a palisaded village overlooking the Falls. Two probable Algonkian fishing camps (44He184 and 44He185) have been recently excavated on Four Mile Creek, a few miles below the Falls. The evidence from these suggests the use of bowfishing and, perhaps, dip nets. Further downriver, the Powhatan used large seines and haul nets. There is little reason to suspect that the less productive traps at the top of the seven mile long Falls would have also been maintained by the Powhatan. It is hoped that future testing in this area will resolve the question of the builders of these dams.

Relentless pressure from the Monacans on the inner Coastal Plain is almost certainly one of the prime reasons for the rise of the Powhatan chiefdom. This is illustrated by the apparent abandonment of a permanently inhabited Algonkian village (44He3) sometime between A.D. 1300-1400, probably coincidental with the takeover of inner Coastal Plain hunting territories by elite core lineages of the

Powhatan chiefdom (Mouer 1982, in press). These elite groups, whose territories bordered on that of the Monacans, practiced war games in companies of several hundred men (Smith 1910a) and probably maintained their status partly through a pseudo-feudal military "protection racket". This militant elitism was undoubtedly tolerated because of the role played by these groups in maintaining the critical inner Coastal Plain hunting grounds relatively free of Monacan occupation.

In summary, the historic record appears to support the notion that the Monacans were a confederacy of segmentary lineage social groups or "tribes" which subsisted on a typical Woodlands economy of mixed maize-beans-squash horticulture and hunting/foraging. Individual settlements apparently were moved frequently but within a small radius such as those described for Early and Middle Neolithic villages in the Danube Valley.

MONACAN WARFARE

Because so many extant descriptions of the Monacans describe them as a fierce, warlike people, it is important to take note of the historic and archeological evidence for this aspect of Monacan culture. The author has covered this subject in considerable depth elsewhere (Mouer, in press), so I will only touch on the highlights here.

It is evident from historical documents that the Powhatans feared the Monacans and felt the need to defend their borders from Piedmont intrusions. Chief Powhatan was able to rise a fairly large army to protect his borders when needed, and his westernmost frontier town, the village of Powhatan at the Falls of the James, was palisaded and situated on a hilltop for defense purposes.

Conflicts over the inner Coastal Plain, particularly the Falls fishing zone and the Chickahominy swamp, date back to at least the Middle Woodland/Late Woodland transition. Piedmont groups (Shockoe Slip phase, see below) controlled the Fall Line and the swamp at this time (10th century A.D.). Shortly into the Late Woodland (1100-1300), the Coastal Algonkians of the Henrico phase (see Mouer 1982b) and the James River phase (see below) gained control over this area, and a parcel of the outer Piedmont portion of the James as far west as the State Farm.

By the end of the prehistoric period, a buffer zone had arisen between the Piedmont and Coastal Plain (Turner 1981; Mouer in press), and the area was used for seasonal exploitation by both the Powhatans and Monacans. With the exception of the observation that the most powerful groups of each regional society emerged adjacent to the Fall Line (Mouer 1981, 1982b, and in press), and that the Powhatans considered the Monacans a threat, there is little evidence for actual warfare. The nature of the conflict had probably become a "cold war" or "detente" situation mutually advantageous to both regions. Complex social organizations (a confederacy in the Piedmont and a chiefdom in the Coastal Plain) had emerged at least partly through the needs of defense and aggression.

From 1607 to 1656, there is not a single incident reported by the Colonists of warfare between the Monacans and Powhatans. In 1656, a party of some 700 Indians identified as "Richaherians" moved into the Fall Line buffer zone and asked the Colony for shelter from marauding Senecas. The remnant of the Powatan chiefdom at Pamunkey disapproved of having their enemies so near and, being at peace with the Colony, asked to have the intruders removed. A joint army of Pamunkeys, under Chief Totopotomoy, and Colonial militia under Colonel Edward Hill of Shirley, was dispatched against the "Rickaherians" camped at the forks of the Pamunkey River - not downtown Richmond as some have claimed (see Dabney 1976:5). Both Hill and the Pamunkey chief were killed in the fray, and their combined force was routed in a bloody battle. Lederer (1958:16, 22) identifies these "Rickaherians" as Moahocks and Nahyssans.

The ability of a tribal confederacy to field a large force is evident in the size of the Piedmont group which appeared at the Falls, as well as in the size of Seneca raiding parties. While no evidence has been found for the numbers of Senecas that appeared in Virginia throughout the 17th and early 18th centuries, war parties of the Iroquois League in their homeland often numbered over 1,000 men.

We can surmise that the Monacans were prepared for, and capable of, warfare on the scale that was typical of much of Eastern North American Indian society in the 17th century. There is, as yet, no evidence that these groups were predatory in the sense that the Iroquois

were predatory after the development of the northern fur trade.

THE MONACANS FROM ARCHEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

The Monacan country has not been archeologically studied with the intensity of many other areas of Virginia. Only a handful of site excavations have been conducted along the James River between the Fall Line and the Blue Ridge. There are virtually no stratigraphic sequences or well-dated sealed components of the Late Woodland period reported in the literature. The discussion that follows is based primarily on a very informal analysis of surface collections from more than 40 Late Woodland components. This analysis has afforded the observation of spatial associations of certain types of pottery and points, as well as other potentially diagnostic artifacts and lithic preferences.

The associations of these materials have been partially confirmed by multivariate statistical techniques. It should be noted that archeological association does not necessarily imply that these materials were used or deposited by the same groups. Many of these are deflated multicomponent sites. The association of materials may often be created by the reoccupation of the same series of sites by two or more groups. However, most of the sites included in the present discussion have only a single major ceramic component or, if more components are present, these were easily separated by controlled surface collection methods.

The James River valley is surrounded by regions whose Late prehistoric sequences are more precisely known. The Potomac drainage, with its Luray and Montgomery Complex materials in the Piedmont, and Potomac Creek and Townsend in the Coastal Plain lies to the North. South is the Roanoke drainage with the well-known Clarksville/Dan River Series, Vincent/Clement and Badin/Yadkin ceramics. The Coastal Plain of the James has the classical Townsend Complex preceded by both Mockley Cord Marked and Stoney Creek Fabric Impressed ceramics in the Middle Woodland II period. The Great Valley, Alleghenies and southwest Virginia are the domains of the Radford, New River, Keyser and the various types defined by Holland (1970) for the part of the state that falls in the Tennessee drainage.

Evans (1955) defined the major ceramics series for the James River Piedmont as the Stony Creek and Albemarle Series. His descriptions and comparative collections are of considerable value, but the type names have become rather useless due to the subsequently widespread practice of assigning sherds to types solely on the basis of temper (Mouer 1978). The range of variation included in the Stony Creek Series by numerous authors would allow the inclusion of ceramics as divergent as Elk Island Cord Marked (Mouer, Ryder and Johnson 1981), dated to nearly 1000 B.P., and the very different widespread fabric impressed pottery of southside Virginia and the Piedmont James which, in its latest versions possibly dates as late as the 14th century A.D. Likewise, net-impressed pottery containing large quantities of coarsely crushed quartz, dating to the end of the Middle Woodland I period would be classified as "Albemarle" as readily as would the Shepard Cord Marked pottery of the 10th-14th centuries A.D. For this reason, I have chosen to avoid Evans' type names, although I have certainly not thrown away my copy of his valuable book.

It is not the intention of this paper to provide a series of new formal typological descriptions. I have had to rely, however, on some type constructs which do not appear in the literature. Many of these will be described more fully in a work currently being prepared (Mouer et al, in preparation). The author requests the reader's indulgence in using classificatory names which have not been formally presented. Below I have presented some preliminary complex and phase descriptions. These are for the benefits of others working in this area and will serve, hopefully, as benchmarks for comparison. These descriptions do not account for the wide range of artifact variation found on late sites in the James River Piedmont. The associations described herein are to be taken as working typological constructs, and cannot substitute for formal, descriptive types verified by excavations, carbon dates, etc.

LATE WOODLAND IN THE JAMES PIEDMONT

Richmond Complex.

In the Piedmont section of the James, it is possible to trace the development of the Late Woodland directly from a tradition which is

widespread in the closing centuries of the Middle Woodland II period. The characteristic ceramic complex is typified by simple, direct-rimmed, slightly globular vessels which are moderately thick in cross section. The clay body is a fine, well-sorted clay that is tempered with coarse sand, detrital grit or, most commonly, with coarsely crushed quartz or granite. Pots are fired in a relatively closed fire, and a substantial portion appear to be smudged purposely on either the interior or exterior surfaces.

The pottery is typically hard and has an irregular fracture. Surface treatment is applied while the clay body is plastic and consists of plain plaited fabric, twined fabric, thong or root stamp, or brushed/scraped surfaces. Coarse cord-marked surface treatments are found in what appeared to be early phases of the complex. The rim is often brushed with criss-crossing strokes over a previously smoothed surface. The lip is plain and rounded or, in a minority of cases, folded outward and smoothed. Among published descriptions, the characteristics ceramics are most similar to the "Albemarle" ceramics described by Stephenson (Stephenson, Ferguson and Ferguson 1963) at Accokeek Creek, Hercules Series, described by G. Smith (1971) and Hell Island (see summary by Artusy 1976).

Obtuse angle pipes, smoothed discoidal stones and small pointed butt or quadrangular celts are found. Points are typically large or medium triangles, although Jack's Reefs, made on imported jasper or chalcedony, are found in minority quantities on many sites of the period. One burial of the period contained six very fine large triangular points and five antler tine points. The same burial contained a contracting stem knife (Savannah River-like) and hammerstone placed on the sternum. This complex is associated throughout its range with a high percentage usage of jasper and, to a lesser degree, chert.

This association of material culture is termed the Richmond Complex. One phase, Shockoe Slip, has been dated to the 10th century at the Reynolds-Alvis Site. The entire complex probably dates from the 7th century, but the Shockoe Slip phase appears to be a 10th-11th century manifestation. Richmond complex materials continue to co-exist through much of the Late Woodland in the Piedmont alongside new complexes.

Montgomery-Potomac Creek Complexes.

Phase designations for the continuum of Montgomery and Potomac Creek related materials in the Piedmont of the James have not yet been worked out, except for what appears to be one of the latest phases, Black Branch. A continuum between Richmond and Montgomery is clearly evident in the similarities of pottery technology. However, surface treatment and decoration differ considerably. Shepard cord marked is the predominant type, although some sites show high percentages of fabric impressed or fabric roughened pottery with the same decorative motifs. These include appliqued rim strips decorated with stab-and-drag diagonal punctates, or with "corded" horizontal or vertical plats. Another popular treatment, which is reminiscent of Danville and Clarksville ceramics is the appearance of pinched fillets or bosses on the rim strip. This rim is usually welded to the body with deep punctate gashes. Below the rim strip, restricted neck jars are frequently decorated with corded horizontal bands. Clearly, the use of the term Montgomery may have to be abandoned in favor of a local designation, but similarities to the Montgomery complex of the Potomac drainage are obvious.

The Black Branch phase designation is used to cover the material association most likely to represent protohistoric occupation throughout most of the outer Piedmont section of the James. The ceramics most frequently found are closely similar to Potomac Creek and Moyoane although, again, fabric impressed and simple stamped minorities may be more common here than to the north. Decoration is neither as common nor as elaborate as in Potomac Creek sites of Tidewater Maryland and northern Virginia. Those ceramics which are decorated, however, show a reduction in the percentage of folded or appliqued rim strips typical of the Montgomery phases, and an increase in the amount of corded and pseudo corded motifs.

All phases of the Montgomery-Potomac Creek Complex continuum are characterized by small quartz crystal points, either of Clarksville type, or of small, assymetrically barbed serrate types named Franklin Spurred by G. Smith (1971). Obtuse angle pipes are common, although rouletting and/or dentate stamping has not been identified. Palisaded villages may be common throughout most of the later half of

the Late Woodland. Evidence on burial types is scanty but points to the possibility that extended burials were typical.

James River Phase

This phase has been discussed briefly above. Typical ceramics are variants of the Townsend series, fired in an oxidizing fire in an upright position, and left untempered or "tempered" with small amounts of fine sand, with very scant quantities of crushed quartz, rather than with shell. Shell tempered sherds apparently made in coastal plain clays have been found in a number of James River phase sites. Decoration is moderately common, restricted to the area just below the rim, and consists of incised diagonal and chevron motifs. Typical points are quartzite medium triangles. The distribution of James River Phase sites appears to be restricted to the State Farm and Sabot Island locations. Based on incised decorative motifs and the rarity of small points, the tentative dating of the complex is early Late Woodland.

MINORITY COMPLEXES

Dan River Complex

Ceramics similar to Dan river and Clarksville are frequently found on sites, although not as major components. Dan River related ceramics were associated in trace quantities with Montgomery Complex ceramics at the Point of Fork Site. A single date of the mid-11th century was returned from a pit containing small amounts of charred maize, along with wild seeds (principally Chenopodium). This date is probably accurate for the Montgomery materials (both cord and fabric impressed) but seems too early for Dan River. However, Dan River dates from Bessemer and Buzzard Rock suggest a possibly early development of the complex in western Virginia.

Luray Complex

Keyser cord marked pottery has been found on a number of sites, typically in association with Montgomery/Potomac Creek materials. These sherds are always a small minority.

New River Complex

A protohistoric association between Potomac Creek-like materials and minor numbers of shell tempered sherds more likely of the New River or southwest Virginia Mississippi-influenced cultures has been noted. A child burial at the Stoneman site contained burnished shell-tempered pottery. Similar materials have been found in small quantities on a few other late sites.

A Note on "Stony Creek"

This is not the proper place for an extended discussion of the "Stony Creek" problem. However, it should be noted that sand tempered, oxidation fired fabric impressed (and, possibly, cord impressed) ceramics exist throughout the inner Coastal Plain and Piedmont in Late Woodland and late Middle Woodland contexts. Separating these from earlier "Stony Creek" ceramics is often only possible by noting the extent of weathering, or the coarseness of the paste. The "Stony Creek" ceramic types form an indigenous tradition that is very widespread on the James, and south of the James. A proper account of regional culture history will not be possible until the temporal, functional and spatial distributions of these ceramics are better understood.

Seriation studies, such as those of Holland (1978) are not warranted by the data, as temper type is clearly not a temporal diagnostic in this area. The appearance of several apparently parallel ceramic traditions in the Middle James means that it is unlikely that a clear-cut temporal sequence, with one pottery series following another, will never be found. Rather than attempting to force the data into an uncomfortable sequence, we should be attempting to explain the phenomenon of spatially overlapping ranges over the long period of Middle Woodland II through Late Woodland.

MONACAN MATERIAL CULTURE

Only one site with fairly strong evidence for post-Contact occupation has been located in the piedmont of the James River valley. This site appears to have been a palisaded village and contained a few pieces of worked bottle glass and a gunflint of "French" chalcedony. The dominant material culture association is that of the Black Branch phase. Other sites

which are presumed late due to such considerations as cross-typing of pottery and the presence of numerous small points invariably contain a ceramic complex similar to Potomac Creek. There are variations between areas and, perhaps, between phases, in frequencies of surface treatments.

Cord-impressed or twined fabric impressed surfaces are always dominant, but fine plaited or woven fabric impressed surfaces are relatively common on sites further west (Fluvanna, Nelson, Albemarle, Orange and Louisa Counties). In the outer Piedmont (Goochland, Cumberland and Powhatan Counties) and related sites of the inner Coastal Plain, simple stamped or brushed surfaces are a common minority. The pottery can be tempered with fine sand, coarse sand, detrital grit, crushed quartz, or combinations of these. Well-rounded nodules of coarse sand are perhaps most common. Typically, however, the particle sizes are well sorted between clay body and temper. Temper particles typically protrude through the surface. Body walls range from moderate (ca. 9-10 mm) to very thin (3-4 mm), with thin walls more common than not. The pots are typically fired in a reduction atmosphere, and shades of grey or grey-tan are common. Other objects which may date to this period include cylindrical pestles made of garnet shist, ground discoidals (which Lederer noted the Monacans used as "counters"), and ground mica-shist objects of unknown function.

It should be noted that very few sites produce a "pure" component of Potomac Creek related pottery, without ceramics of the Montgomery, Luray, Dan River or New River Complexes also present. The indications suggest the possibility for mixed social compositions at many of these sites. Such a pattern of rather flexible group composition typified nearly all of the historic Indian societies of the interior of Eastern North America in the 18th century, and may have had considerable antiquity.

SUMMARY

Archeological evidence of several long-lived, parallel material culture traditions found throughout the region suggests that borders between various Piedmont social groups were fluid throughout most of the Late Woodland period. It is not until very late in the period

that large nucleated villages which had once been prevalent during the Early Woodland, reappear in the region. This is accompanied by the spread of a relatively uniform pottery tradition and evidence of considerable inter-regional exchange and/or exogamous pan-tribal lineages. This latter situation is perhaps best typified by the presence of so-called "trade" pottery minority wares on late Piedmont sites.

One question that has interested culture historians for decades now concerns the date and nature of the appearance of the historically known Piedmont groups into the region. Bushnell (1930) speculated that the Monacans and their allies were relatively recent arrivals from the Midwest. The linguistic proximity between upper Mississippi Valley/Northern Plains Siouan speakers and some Siouan languages of the Virginia Piedmont does suggest that these groups were separated at sometime within the last 1000 years of prehistory. However, there is no clear archeological evidence for an invasion or migration of Siouan speakers, or anyone else for that matter, given what little is known at present.

If any such "intrusion" into the progression of material culture is to be identified at all, it would have to be with the introduction of the decorative motifs and surface treatments on Late Woodland cord-marked pottery traditions (Montgomery/Potomac Creek), with their pseudo-collared and corded decorations. The appearance of this pottery complex into the James drainage is probably coeval with the introduction of maize agriculture. The Late Woodland cord-marked ceramic complex bears a clear resemblance to Late Woodland and Protohistoric Siouan ceramics from the upper Mississippi. Parallels are also apparent with the late Point Peninsula, Early Owasco, and even historic Seneca ceramics. These are traditionally associated with Iroquoian speakers in their Great Lakes/St. Lawrence heartland.

This Late Woodland ceramic tradition may never have completely replaced the extant traditions of the James Piedmont, with their similarities to the south and east. These latter include the cord or fabric impressed, sand-tempered wares of the distinctive "Albemarle"-like pottery of the Richmond Complex. In fact, a continuing tradition of the use of fabric impressed surfaces, even as a minority, contrasts strongly with the Roanoke drainage to the south (net-knot roughened wares) or the Potomac to the north (cord-marked wares).

Perhaps it is wise to devote less energy to seeking the Siouan migrations which Bushnell, Mooney and others were convinced that archeology would eventually reveal. Instead, we should, perhaps, recognize that the onset of Late Woodland was a time of fairly drastic changes in the Virginia Piedmont. Maize agriculture, new cultural traditions, and nucleated villages all appear at roughly the same time. These are probably followed after a few centuries by the rise of confederacies in the Piedmont, and perhaps by reaction, a chiefdom in the Coastal Plain. Here we have grist better suited to the archeologist's mill. And here we have a promise of important things to come from future research in this area.

In closing, I would just like reiterate that we still know little about the Monacans. Much work is needed in the fields of ethnohistory and linguistics, as well as in archeology. Much of what has been assumed in the past is ungrounded and should be discarded or treated as hypotheses to be tested. There are numerous sites in the Piedmont section of the James River which contain deep stratigraphic sequences or intact remains of Monacan and Late Woodland habitations. Until future excavations aimed at solving some of the current problems of Monacan history and archeology are undertaken in the Piedmont sections of the James, Rappahannock and Roanoke drainages, we shall remain ignorant of the Indian societies which inhabited nearly 50% of the state in the 17th century.

FOOTNOTES

1. Actually there is some cause for confusion here. In late 1608, Smith (p. 131 of the 1907 edition) wrote of intelligence received from his recent encounter with the Mannahoac:

"The Monacans he said were their neighbors, and did dwell in the hilly countries by small rivers, living upon rootes and fruits, but chiefly by hunting."

This was penned prior to Newport's trip to the Monacan country from information obtained from a Mannahoac informant through a Rappahannock interpreter shortly after the arrival of the Colonists in the country. Several years later, as he compiled his Historie, Smith (Ibid.:68) expanded on the above passage as follows:

"Upon the head of the Powhatans are the Monacans, whose chiefe habitation is at Rassawek, unto whom the Mohememchughes, the Massinnicacks, the Monahassanughs, the Monasichapanoughs, and other nations pay tributes. Upon the head of the River of Toppohannock is a people called Mannahoacks. To these are contributors the Taunxanias, the Shackonies, the Ontponeas, the Tegunateas, the Whonkenteaes, the Stegarakes, the Hessianungaes, and divers others, all confederates with the Monacans, though many different in language, and be very barbarous, living for the most part of wild beasts and fruits" (emphasis added).

While the exact interpretation of this lengthy sentence is open to question, it appears that the descriptive clauses are relative to the "divers others" and "many different in language". In other words, Smith is commenting on the extensiveness of the Monacan confederacy, noting that it even included groups which were different not only in language, but in lifestyle from the Monacans, Mannahoacks and other named groups.

This suggests that the confederacy consisted of large riverine groups with similar languages and cultures, and additional groups on smaller streams with dissimilar languages who, like many of the Indians inhabiting more marginal habitats in Amazonia, are more highly dependent on wild food resources.

2. Michel's statement is somewhat ambiguous. He wrote:

"The Indians often visit there, bringing game, rum and other small things. There is a good opportunity to trade with skins. They (the Indians) often bring pottery and when desired fill it with corn."

Considering the state of the gardens found by Byrd in 1701 (in Brock 1886:42-43), Beverley's note in 1702 that Byrd was continuing to furnish grain to the settlers, and the constant demand for support from the Colonial government in terms of grain supplies for the Huguenots throughout the early years of the settlement (Brock 1886),

it does not seem likely that the refugees were giving corn to the Indians. The statement can be more reasonably read to state that the Indians, when it was desired of them, brought not only pottery to trade but pots filled with corn.

3. Strachey (Hakluyt Edition of 1953:34), in a lengthy comparison of Piedmont and Coastal Plain wrote:

"Poketawes, which by the West Indians (our neighbors) call Maiz, their kind of wheat, is here (in the high land) said to be more plenty than below, and the Low-country fruicts grow here. It is supposed that the Low-Land, hath more Fish and Fowle, and the High-Land more number of Beasts"

4. Lederer (p. 20) writes:

"Here (at "Monakin") enquiring the way to the Mountains, an ancient Man described with a staff two paths on the ground; one pointing to the Mahocks, and other to the Nahyssans; but my English Companions, slighting the Indians direction, shaped their course by the Compass due West, and therefore it fell out with us, as it does with those Land-crabs, that crawling backwards in a direct line, avoid not the trees that stand in their way, but climbing over their very tops, come down again on the other side, and so after a days labor gain not a foot of ground. Thus we obstinately pursuing a due West course, rode over steep and craggy Cliffs, which beat our Horses quite off the hoof."

It took Lederer and his company from May 25 to June 3 to reach the James at Mahock. Here they found a sizeable tributary:

"which Major Harris observing to run Northward, vainly imagined to be an arm of the Lake of Canada; and was so transported with this Fancy, that he would have raised a Pillar to the Discovery, if the fear of the Mahock Indian, and want of food, had permitted him to stay."

REFERENCES CITED

Agee, Helen Barret
 1962 Facets of Goochland (Virginia) County's History. Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Alexander, Edward Porter (Editor)
 1972 The Journal of John Fontaine. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Artusy, Richard E., Jr.
 1976 An Overview of the Proposed Ceramic Sequence in Southern Delaware. Maryland Archeology 12(2).

Beverley, Robert
 1702 The History and Present State of Virginia. Edition of 1947 published by University of North Carolina Press; reprinted by Dominion Books, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Binford, Lewis R.
 1964 Archeological and Ethnohistorical Investigation of Cultural Diversity and Progressive Development Among Aboriginal Cultures of Coastal Virginia and North Carolina. Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Bohannon, Paul
 1958 Political Aspects of Tiv Social Organization. In Tribes Without Rulers, edited by John Middleton and David Tate, Routledge, London.

Brock, R. A.
 1886 Documents, Chiefly Unpublished, Relating to the Hugenot Emigration to Virginia and to the Settlement at Manakin-Town. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

Bushnell, David I.
 1930 The Five Monacan Towns in Virginia, 1607. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, 82(12), Washington, D.C.
 1933 Evidence of Indian Occupancy in Albemarle County, Virginia. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, 89(7), Washington, D.C.
 1935 The Mannahoac Tribes in Virginia, 1608. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, 94(8), Washington, D.C.

Byrd, William, II
 1929 William Byrd's Histories of the Dividing Line Betwixt Virginia and North Carolina. Edited by William K. Boyd, Publications of The North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Couture, Richard T.
 1980 Powhatan: A Bicentennial History. Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Cumming, William P. (Editor)
 1958 The Discoveries of John Lederer, with Unpublished Letters By and About Lederer to Governor John Winthrop, Jr., and an Essay on the Indians of Lederer's Discoveries by Douglas L. Rights and William P. Cumming. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Dabney, Virginius
 1976 Richmond, The Story of a City. Doubleday, Garden City, New York.

Evans, Clifford
1955 A Ceramic Study of Virginia Archeology. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 160, Washington, D.C.

Fowke, Gerald
1894 Archeological Investigations in the James and Potomac Valleys. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 23, Washington, D.C.

Harris, David R.
1972 Swidden Systems and Settlement. In Man, Settlement and Urbanism, edited by P. J. Ucko, R. Tringham and G. W. Dimbleby. Duckworth, London.

Holland, C. G.
1979 The Ramifications of the Fire Hunt. Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin, 33(4).
1978 Albemarle County Settlements: A Piedmont Model? Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarter Bulletin, 33(2).
1970 An Archeological Survey of Southwest Virginia. Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology, 12.
1963 C. L. Davis Farm (44Bk2), 1961-62. Archeological Society of Virginia Quarterly Bulletin, 17(4).

Jefferson, Thomas
1964 (Written in 1781; American edition first published in 1787). Notes on the State of Virginia, Harper and Row, New York.

Lane, Ralph
1965 Report to Sir Walter Raleigh. In The New World: The First Pictures of America, edited by S. Lorant. Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, New York.

Lawson, John
1707 (Edition of 1937) A History of North Carolina. Edited by F. L. Harriss, Richmond, Virginia.

Lederer, John
1672 (Edition of 1958: Refer to Cumming, William P., 1958). The Discoveries of John Lederer, In Three Several Marches from Virginia, To the West of Carolina, and Other Parts of the Continent: Begun in March 1669 and Ended in September 1670. London.

MacCord, H. A., Sr.
1974 The Wingina Site, Nelson County, Virginia. Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin, 28(4).
1971 The Windsor Site, Powhatan County, Virginia. Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin, 25(4).
1964 The Bolton Site, Nelson County, Virginia. Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin, 19(2).

MacCord, H. A., Sr. and James A. Livesy
1982 The Hertzler Site, Powhatan County, Virginia. Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin, 37(3).

Michel, Francis Louis
1916 Journey of Francis Louis Michel in 1701-2. Edited by William J. Hinke, Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, 24(1).

Miller, Carl F.
1957 Re-Evaluation of the Siouan Problem with Particular Emphasis on the Virginia Branches/Ocaneechi, Saponi, and Tutelo. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 164.

Mooney, James
1894 The Siouan Tribes of the East. Smithsonian Institute, Bureau of Ethnology, Bulletin 22, Washington, D.C.

Mouer, L. Daniel
In Press DMZ or Deer Park? Buffer Zones and Inter-Tribal Boundary Maintenance. In Frontiers and Boundary Systems. Edited by S. Green and S. M. Perlman, Academic Press, New York.
1982a Patches and Plains: Optimal Foraging and the Adoption of Sedentism in the Middle Atlantic. Delivered to the Annual Meeting of the Middle Atlantic Archeology Conference, Rehobeth Beach, Delaware.
1982b Beyond Exchange: Ceramics Composition and the Study of Social and Political Systems. Delivered in the symposium Pottery Technology: Ideas and Approaches, Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.
1981 Powhatan and Monacan Settlement Hierarchies. Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin, 36(1,2)
1980 Barbarians and Hillbillies: Social Perceptions and Regional Boundaries in the Late Woodland Societies of Eastern and Central Virginia. Delivered to the Annual Meeting of the Eastern States Archeological Federation, Albany, New York.
1979 . . . in Fruitful and Delightsome Land . . . Regional Ecology and Settlement Near the Falls of the James River, Virginia. Delivered to the Annual Meeting of the Middle Atlantic Archeology Conference, Rehobeth Beach, Delaware.
1978 Up Stony Creek Without a Cord-Wrapped Paddle: Ceramic Variation in the James River Piedmont and Coastal Plain, Virginia. Delivered to the Annual Meeting of the Archeological Society of Virginia, Arlington, Virginia.

Mouer, L. Daniel, Robin L. Ryder, and Elizabeth G. Johnson
1981 The Elk Island Tradition: An Early Woodland Regional Society in the Piedmont James River Valley. Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin, 36(1,2).

Mouer, L. Daniel, and others
In preparation. Archeology in Henrico: Investigations of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Virginia Commonwealth University, Vols. 2-6 (Survey and Excavations on Upham Brook, Chickahominy River and Four Mile Creek).

Rappaport, Roy
1967 Ritual Regulation of Environmental Relations Among a New Guinea People. Ethnology, 6.

Rights, Douglas L. and William P. Cumming
1958 Essay on the Indians of Lederer's Discoveries. In The Discoveries of John Lederer, etc. Edited by William P. Cumming, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Sahlins, Marshall D.
1961 The Segmentary Lineage: An Organization of Predatory Expansion. American Anthropologist, 63.

Smith, John
1910a The Generall Historie of Virginia, New England and the Summer Isles, 1624. In Travels and Works of Captain John Smith, edited by Edward Arber. John Grant, Edinburgh.

1910b A Map of Virginia with a Description of Its Commodities, People, Government, and Religion, 1612. In Travels and Works of Captain John Smith, edited by Edward Arber. John Grant, London.

Smith, Gerald
1971 Protohistoric Sociopolitical Organization of the Nottoway in the Chesapeake Bay-Carolina Sounds Region. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Missouri.

Strachey, William
1953 (Originally published in 1612). The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania, edited by Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund. Hakluyt Society, London.

Stephenson, R. L., Alice L. L. Ferguson and Henry G. Ferguson
1963 The Accokeek Creek Site: A Middle Atlantic Seaboard Culture Sequence. Anthropological Papers, 20, University of Michigan.

Swanton, John R.
1952 The Indian Tribes of North America. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 145, Washington, D.C.

Turner, E. Randolph
1978 An Intertribal Deer Exploitation Buffer Zone for the Virginia Coastal Plain and Piedmont Regions. Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin, 32(3).

Vayda, Andrew P.
1961 Expansion and Warfare Among Swidden Agriculturalists. American Anthropologist, 63.

Winfrey, R. Westwood
1972 Monacan Farm, Powhatan County, Virginia. Archeological Society of Virginia, Quarterly Bulletin, 27(2).

Wobst, H. Martin
1977 Stylistic Behaviour and Information Exchange. In For the Director: Research Essays in Honor of James B. Griffin, edited by Charles Cleland. Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Anthropological Papers, 61.