

## FOOTNOTES

---

<sup>1</sup>The names and locations of these tribes are shown on the end-papers map. Arranged in order of their locations from south to north, their names are: Witcheaugh, Hoya, Escamacu (St. Helena), Edisto, Touppa, Mayon, Stalame, Wimbee, Combahee, Kussah, Ashepoo, Bohicket, Stono, Kussoe, Kiawah, Etiwan, Wando, Sampa, and Sewee. At least ten other tribes were not indigenous: Yemassee, Guale, Natchez, Pee Dee, Winyah, Cape Fear, Westo, Shawnee (Savannah), Tuscarora, and Apalachee (cf. the Preface for reasons they were not included in this study).

<sup>2</sup>Rogel (1570: 328) says that for nine months of each year the Coastal Tribes moved as far as about eighty miles inland (cf. Edisto, 1570). They may have hunted even further inland.

<sup>3</sup>The Spanish refer to this tribe as the Escamacu in 1609 and 1671, but Hilton in 1663 calls their town St. Ellens and Sandford in 1666 calls it Port Royal. All later English references to them are as the St. Helena. The identity of the Escamacu and the St. Helena is most firmly established by Bluacacay's testimony of 1 August 1671 (cf. Escamacu in Part Two for a detailed discussion of the evidence).

The Escamacu or St. Helena were the second most important tribe of the Port Royal Region in 1562 and became the most important tribe when the Edisto moved north about the time of the Escamacu War (1576-1579). They seem not to have had a direct alliance with the Edisto in 1562, but the two tribes were on friendly terms and later became allies during that war. Their village in 1565 was probably just south of Bluffton. They also had another village which was called "Old Escamacu" in 1576 and was located about 32 miles north of Parris Island (Martinez 1577: 239 and see fn. 50 herein). Their village or villages were probably destroyed during the war.

Their chief settlement in 1666 was on the southwest side of Parris Island about a mile south of Ballast Creek. By 1671 they were living on St. Helena Island, possibly because the Westo burned their village about 1669. In 1684 they ceded their

lands between the Ashepoo and Edisto Tribes to their northeast and the Kussah and Wimbee to their southwest. This must have included Parris Island and the southern part of Ladies Island, as well as St. Helena Island (cf. 1706). In 1686 the Spanish raided their lands and again burned their village. The latest reference to them is in 1743, and a location is not given.

The locations for this tribe and the locations that are given in footnotes 4 through 29 for other tribes are summaries of primary sources and discussions in Part Two, which also contains all of the specific information that is known about each tribe.

<sup>4</sup>The Hoya lived on an island in the Port Royal vicinity in 1566. The island was probably near the Savannah River because their name is shown there on a map of c. 1595, because Pardo stayed there his second night out from Fort San Felipe, and because the Savannah was called *Yawwhoyawran* (emphasis added). The last mention of the Hoya seems to be as the "Oya" in 1604.

<sup>5</sup>The Edisto, Audusta, or Orista were the principal tribe of the Port Royal Region in 1562. After moving north about 1579, they were the principal tribe between the Escamacu and the Kiawah. Their village in c. 1565 was south of the Broad River in the vicinity of Chechessee Bluff. Following their defeat in the Escamacu War, they moved north, briefly having St. Helena Sound called "Orista" for them (1586).

By 1663 they were on Edisto Island, and in 1666 their settlement was near the present junction of Edisto. They ceded the Island in 1684, when their lands were described as between the Stono and Kussoe to the west or northwest and the St. Helena, Ashepoo, and uninhabited land to the south or southwest. When the Spanish raided Edisto Island in 1686, most of the Edisto were probably killed. Some, though, are mentioned as late as 1743.

<sup>6</sup>The Touppa were one of the small Port Royal tribes allied with the Edisto in 1562. Their village in c. 1565 is shown south of the Broad River in the vicinity of Boyd's Neck.

<sup>7</sup>The Mayon were another of the less important tribes allied with the Edisto in 1562. Their village in c. 1565 is shown on the southwest side of the Broad River about twenty-three miles inland, possibly on or near Huguenin's Neck.

<sup>8</sup>The Stalame were the only tribe north of the Broad River who are known to have been allied with the Edisto in 1562. Their village in c. 1565 is shown at the northeast corner of Port Royal Island.

<sup>9</sup>From the similarity of sound, their importance, and the general location, the Kussah were probably referred to as Coçao in 1566. In 1682 the Kussah were on the Ashepoo River, probably on the south side opposite Deer Creek (cf. 1711). They ceded lands in 1684 south or southwest of the St. Helena, Combahee, and uninhabited lands. Other 1684 cessions establish that the Kussah and Kussoe were entirely separate (see Part Two for a detailed discussion). Each is also listed separately in 1696 and are shown separately in 1706. The 1684 cession of the Kussah probably included Coosaw and Polawana Island. They may have moved to the Ashepoo shortly before and later moved back about 1706. By then, Coosaw Island had already been granted (in 1703), but they were allowed to have Polawana Island. This land was also sold out from under them, but was restored in 1712 as a reservation "forever" (which turned out to be until 1738, when the land was offered to another tribe). Nothing specifically is known about them after 1712. Because of their proximity and probable loyalty to the English, they may have been destroyed by the Yemassee in 1715-1716.

<sup>10</sup>The village of Coçapoy, which was destroyed in 1579, was probably the major settlement of the Kussoe. This village was twenty leagues or about eighty miles north of Fort San Marcos, which was on Parris Island; and Charleston Harbor is about sixty miles north. In 1671 they are mentioned to the west of Charles Town. In 1675 they became the first Coastal tribe to cede their lands, giving up the "great and the Lesser Cassoe," which was between the Ashley and the Edisto Rivers about twenty miles inland. The Kussoe moved a few miles farther inland, where they were mentioned in 1684 and 1711. There are frequent references to them as late as 1743, when they were in St. Paul's Parish (inland between the Stono and Edisto Rivers).

<sup>11</sup>The Sewee were living on or near the Santee River in 1564, 1605, and 1609. When the first English colonists visited them in 1670, they had a village on or near Sewee (now Bulls) Bay. They occupied most of the land between the head of Wando River and the mouth of the Santee; it was, therefore, largely uninhabited, probably even more so than the rest of the Coast. They had a "fort" south of the Wando River near the west side of Toomer Creek in c. 1685; and since this area was part of a reserve set aside for Indians who had been forced to move, they may originally have had land on Charleston Harbor near its mouth. Avendaugh-bough, a village which was almost certainly theirs, was near Bulls Bay in 1701. They also had inland plantations at Mockand (Wadmacon, 1696) and Waha (1701), both on the Santee Delta. During the Yemassee War, they were living near the French settlements on the Santee. In 1716 they turned on the French and were enslaved.

Footnotes for Pages 3-4

<sup>12</sup>The destruction during this war must have been as complete as in Guale, the province adjacent to the south, where every village was destroyed (Menéndez Márques 1578: 81-83 and Oré 1617-1620: 41). For the accounts of the war, cf. Escamacu, 1576-1578.

<sup>13</sup>The Spanish dismantled Fort San Marcos in 1587 and abandoned Santa Elena, not because of further conflict with the Indians, but because they could not defend both Santa Elena and St. Augustine from English incursions (cf. the statement by Alonso Garcia de la Vera dated 4 Sept. 1587; AGI ST 54-5-16, bnd. 628, p. 35-36). Much less information is consequently available until the English began to explore the Lower Coast in the 1660's. The tribes that are mentioned seem to be in about the same locations as at the end of the Escamacu War. The Westo invasion shortly before 1670 "ruinated" the coast from St. Helena to Kiawah, but the major tribes were still at or near the locations mentioned by Hilton in 1664 and Sandford in 1666 when the English colonists arrived in 1670.

<sup>14</sup>In 1586 Charleston Harbor was called Kiawah so the tribe was undoubtedly nearby. The tribe is specifically mentioned in 1596, 1605, and 1609. Sandford also refers to them at "Kiwaha," which he renamed Ashley River. In 1682, they were on both sides of the Ashley River (between the Colonists and the Kussoe), but that same year some or all of them probably moved south to Kiawah Island. In c. 1685 that island is called Kiawah, and they are also mentioned there in 1687. They had probably moved again by 1699 because the entire island was granted then. About 1716 they seem to have been living on the Cooper River just north of Wappaoola Creek at Harry Hill Plantation, which is named for their chief. They are last mentioned in 1743, first asking for lands south of the Combahee River and later as a tribe exempt from some trade regulations.

<sup>15</sup>The Etiwan or Ittiwan are called Ypaguano in 1609, when one of them was taken prisoner in Charleston Harbor. In 1670 they were north of Albemarle Point, probably on Oyster Point. In 1671 they are listed north of the Wando and south of the St. Pa. (Sampa). They lived on the Etiwan (Cooper) River to the north of Daniel Island and on the island itself, which was also originally named for them. They must have moved from the island fairly early because grants there were being issued in 1676. In 1675 they may have been among the "neighbor Indians" requesting a reservation; one was provided in 1680, and in c. 1685 they appear to be shown on part of it (south of the Wando River on the northwest side of Horlbeck Creek about a mile and a half from its mouth). In 1682, however, they were said to be on the Cooper River. They are definitely placed there in 1710

and 1712, and they were on or near Goose Creek.

After the Yemassee War, they lived in small, scattered groups. A few are mentioned in St. Thomas Parish between 1719 and 1726. Most seem to have been in St. James Goose Creek Parish in 1724, but they are not specifically named. Some of them were in St. John's Berkeley that same year. In 1750 a remnant was in St. Andrews Parish. The last specific mention of them is in 1751.

<sup>16</sup>The Stono chief was at Charleston Harbor in 1609. In 1663 the Stono were near the mouth of the North Edisto River. They are listed north of the Edisto and south of the Kiawah in 1671 and again in 1682, when they also are first specifically said to be on the Stono River. In 1684 they ceded land between the "English Settlement" to the north or northeast and Edisto and uninhabited land to the south or southwest. As more and more of their former lands were taken up, they removed south to Stono (now Seabrook) Island (c. 1695). They are last mentioned in 1707, the same year two large grants were made for land on their island. They may have united with the Kussoe, who were their allies in 1674.

<sup>17</sup>In 1671 the Wimbee were living south of the Edisto. They ceded Wimbee (Port Royal) Island in 1684, and their lands were described as lying between the Combahee, St. Helena, and uninhabited lands on the west or northwest and Parris Island and uninhabited lands on the south or southwest. They probably moved north to Wimbee Creek after the Spanish raided Port Royal in 1686. They are not specifically mentioned after 1696, and warrants were soon afterwards issued for all of Port Royal Island.

<sup>18</sup>The Combahee are first mentioned in 1670 and in the following year were about fifty-three miles south of Charleston Harbor or in the Port Royal vicinity. In 1684 when they ceded their lands, they were between the Kussoe and uninhabited land to the north or northeast and the Wimbee and uninhabited lands on the south or southwest; they were occupying Ladies Island and the lands in between to the Combahee River. A warrant for Combahee Island was issued in 1698 so they must have moved inland by then. The latest specific mention of them is 1696.

<sup>19</sup>The Ashepoo are mentioned first in 1670 and are listed north of the St. Helena in 1671. Later in 1671 they are said to be somewhat more than a day's travel away from Charleston Harbor and thus were probably on the Ashepoo River. They ceded land in 1684 between the Kussoe to the north or northeast and the Combahee and uninhabited lands to the south or southwest; they must

Footnotes for Page 4

have originally claimed much of the Ashepoo River, although they shared at least part (the ten or so miles adjacent to the ocean) with the Kussah in 1682. They were near the mouth of the Ashepoo in 1687, when they are last mentioned, and the Yemassee were then about thirty miles up the river. Possibly the Yemassee destroyed them in 1715-1716, but since some Ashepoo were spies for the Spanish in the 1670's, they may have allied with the Yemassee and moved south with them after their defeat.

<sup>20</sup>In 1670 the Wando are listed to the north of Albemarle Point. In 1671 they are listed north of the Sampa and south of the Etiwan. They seem originally to have lived along the northern edge of Charleston Harbor, just to the south of where the Wando River enters the Cooper (the section of the Cooper River between Oyster Point and Daniel Island was also called the Wando). In 1675 the Wando were among the tribes requesting a reservation, and they received one that included lands on both sides of the present Wando River three miles beyond its mouth (cf. 1680). They are shown there in c. 1685 on the south side opposite Cainhoy. Several later maps refer to them, but all of these may have been inadequately revised. The few later references to free Indians in Christ Church Parish do not specifically refer to the Wando, although some may be intended. They are possibly the tribe almost completely decimated by smallpox in 1699. A few survivors may later have moved north of the Santee.

<sup>21</sup>The Sampa are listed north of Albemarle Point in 1671, and they may have been living on or near Charleston Harbor. By c. 1685 they had moved inland and are shown north of the Wando River, apparently on Point Hope Island, within the reserve set aside in c. 1675 for Indians which had been forced to move from their original locations. They may have moved from "Sampitt" (now Sawpit) Creek, which flows into the north side of the Ashley River opposite Runnymede Plantation. Still later, they probably moved north of the Santee River to "Sampit" Creek (c. 1722) and possibly also to Cape Fear (cf. 1715).

<sup>22</sup>Cf. Wando, 1680.

<sup>23</sup>Mathews c. 1685.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. Swanton 1922: 422; also the section herein on Intertribal Relations Outside the Area.

<sup>25</sup>The separate cessions are quoted in part in the sections on each respective tribe in Part Two. The general cession is quoted in the section on the Kussah, 1684. The procedure and witnesses are given most fully in the section on the Stono, 1684.

Footnotes for Pages 4-7

<sup>26</sup>The earliest reference to the Witcheaugh, in 1684, has them ceding all of the land between the Savannah River and the Broad River. This same land had been occupied by the Hoya, Escamacu, Edisto, Touppa, and Mayon in 1562. The Escamacu and Edisto later moved north, possibly leaving the Hoya, Touppa, and Mayon within the area, but since these last three were allies of the Edisto, they probably moved with them. The Witcheaugh may be identical with one or more of the three smaller tribes, but their history prior to 1684 is unknown.

After ceding their lands, they seem to have moved to the mouth of the Ashepoo, where a "Witcheaw" Island is mentioned in 1726. They may have moved to put distance between themselves and the Yemassee, who began arriving in 1685. Nothing further is known about their location, but the present "Watchcaw" Creek on the Savannah possibly indicates that, still later, they moved there.

<sup>27</sup>Milling 1940: 284; 267.

<sup>28</sup>1682: 13.

<sup>29</sup>Although no name is given, the earliest reference to the Bohicket is probably in 1666. They are shown along Bohicket Creek and are named in c. 1685. They were a small tribe between the Edisto and Stono. The last specific reference to them is in 1707.

<sup>30</sup>McDowell 1955: 269.

<sup>31</sup>Salley 1945B: 103-105.

<sup>32</sup>Salley 1946.

<sup>33</sup>Cooper 1838: 141, 371-373, and 317.

<sup>34</sup>p. 156.

<sup>35</sup>p. 289.

<sup>36</sup>Infants with serious deformities were probably left exposed, as in most other areas of North America (Driver 1969: 366).

<sup>37</sup>p. 8.

<sup>38</sup>1701: 33-34.

<sup>39</sup>Mooney 1894.

Footnotes for Pages 7-10

<sup>40</sup>Cf. the section herein on Language.

<sup>41</sup>1709: 34.

<sup>42</sup>1591A: v

<sup>43</sup>For a discussion of other early illustrations of South Carolina Indians, see Edisto, 1565.

<sup>44</sup>1682: 13-14.

<sup>45</sup>Driver 1969: 365.

<sup>46</sup>1682: 14-15.

<sup>47</sup>1763: 517-518.

<sup>48</sup>1784: 187-190.

<sup>49</sup>317-318.

<sup>50</sup>1577: 197.

<sup>51</sup>Velasco 1577: 5. Of the many different lengths assigned for a Spanish league, the one which seems to have been used in the Southeastern United States in 1565 and afterwards was the geographic league, of which there are 17 1/2 in a degree. The equivalent length of one league in English miles is 3.9461 and in kilometers is 6.3505; for the purposes of this study, an even four miles will be used to calculate the relatively short distances. The geographic league was definitely used by Menéndez de Avilés because in a treatise that he wrote on navigation, he specifies equivalent lengths for leagues and degrees (Lawson n.d.: 449 & n.). He was an exceptionally knowledgeable navigator, and Philip II granted him a patent for a navigational instrument in 1573. He probably required all of the St. Augustine pilots to use this measure, which, however, was not made obligatory until 1718. Earlier pilots probably used the marine league or twenty leagues to a degree or 3.4590 miles per league (Doursther 1840: 210).

<sup>52</sup>Martinez Carvajal 1579: 249.

<sup>53</sup>1617-1620: 41. This was probably the Escamacu village, since they opened the war.

<sup>54</sup>Cf. Escamacu.

<sup>55</sup>Cf. Sewee. Milling 1940: 82.

Footnotes for Pages 10-14

<sup>56</sup>Myer 1928: 736.

<sup>57</sup>p. 173.

<sup>58</sup>p. 6-7.

<sup>59</sup>Cf. Edisto, 1686.

<sup>60</sup>1701: 9.

<sup>61</sup>Cf. Childs, 1940; White 1975: 233-243; Dalcho 1820: 32, n; Smyth 1784: 185-187; Hudson 1976: 105 & 20; and Crosby 1976.

<sup>62</sup>p. 42.

<sup>63</sup>p. 105.

<sup>64</sup>Klingberg 1956: 134.

<sup>65</sup>Johnson 1715: 236-239.

<sup>66</sup>Cf. Cusabo, 1707.

<sup>67</sup>De Richebourg 1716: 153. I am indebted to Wes White for this reference.

<sup>68</sup>McDowell 1955: 270.

<sup>69</sup>p. 439.

<sup>70</sup>p. 496.

<sup>71</sup>V, 703.

<sup>72</sup>1775: 343. Cf. also, Kiawah 1727.

<sup>73</sup>McDowell 1958.

<sup>74</sup>White 1973: n. 32. White also pointed out to me that 1748 to 1756 are probably the eight years that Adair refers to.

<sup>75</sup>Cf. Etiwan, 1751 & 1753.

<sup>76</sup>p. 44-45.

<sup>77</sup>p. 68.

<sup>78</sup>p. 343.

<sup>79</sup>1973: Table 34, pp. 89-90.

<sup>80</sup>How many Indians moved into the Low Country after 1775 is unknown. How many were slaves and were freed in 1865 is unknown. How many descendants of the original population still survive can perhaps only be determined by extensive genealogical research based primarily on church, census, cemetery, and family records. The necessary research is beyond the scope of this study, which limits itself to reconstructing their way of life before it was destroyed.

<sup>81</sup>1963: 138-141, tables 7 & 15, and map 21.

<sup>82</sup>"Cusabo" is more of a historiographical problem than an actual one because as an Indian confederation, it exists only in the writings of historians. For a discussion, cf. the placename "Cusabo" in Part Two; the actual meaning of the word is Kussah River.

As is mentioned in Part Two, Adair was probably not aware of any convenient designation for the Coastal Tribes; if he had been, he would almost certainly have used it instead of referring to them variously as "our Settlement Indians," "Parched-corn-Indians," "our valuable civilized Indians," and "our domestic Indians." Hewatt (1779) does not use the term. Drayton does (1802: 100), but in the limited sense of a tribe, and he was probably incorrect; he lists the "Coosah" as living "in Beaufort district," and also the "Cusaboe" as "Towards Savannah River." He lists the Stonoe and Sewee separately, but no other Coastal Tribes, and his table is for "about the year 1700" or half a century before others of the Coastal Tribes ceased to be mentioned individually in statutes and the Gazette so he was evidently unaware of the existence of any others. Mills (1826: 106-107) refers separately to the Wimbee, Stono, Combahee, St. Helena, Kissah or Cosah, and Sewee; he then mentions the Cusoboe as a separate tribe living in "the middle country on Savannah river" along with the Savannahs, Seranna, and Euchee; since he says this was in "about the year 1700,"-he is incorrect, and his surmise is probably derived from Drayton. Rivers (1856: 38) is the first historian to use Cusabo to apply to most of the Coastal Tribes (and some others), and significantly, he does not imply that the tribes he lists were in any way unified: "The tribes of St. Helena, Wimbee, Edisto, Coosaw, Stono, and Kiawaw, who with the Santees, Seewas, and Etiwans were commonly called Cusabees, lived between Charleston and Savannah" (emphasis added; as I have shown in Part Two under Cusabo, the designation was never commonly applied and was very rarely used in any inclusive sense).

Ethnohistorians have accepted the term as if it had actual significance for the Indians themselves. Mooney (1894: 86) applied it to "the coast tribes between the Ashley river and the Savannah." He recognized that "the name was elastic in its application," and he made it more so by including the Westo, who were not indigenous, and the Wapoo, which was not a tribe, and also by rejecting the Santee and Sewee, who are both called Cusabo in an 18th Century document. Swanton (1922: 16-17) accepted Mooney's linguistic argument for excluding the Santee and Sewee, and he also excluded the Westo. Although he was aware that the term Cusabo was "sometimes used" and was used in an inclusive sense only "by the English," he also assigned it ethnological significance. Wallace (1934: I, 16) basically adopted the conclusions of the Bureau of American Ethnology, but he warned that "no word suggesting anything of real unity can be used." He complicates the situation somewhat, though, by including the Cotachicach, Isaws, Salchichees, and Wappoos; the first two never lived in the area, the third was not indigenous, and the fourth--as noted (and despite Bartram)--was not a tribe (p. 25). Swanton later (1946: 128-130) used the term Cusabo to mean "a tribe, or rather group of small tribes, in the southern part of South Carolina..." and he extended the usage by creating a "Cusabo province," which is unprecedented. When he generalized even further (1952: 94-96), he treated "these people" as an established entity and even distinguished the "Cusabo proper" from the Coosa (curiously separating the tribe which he had said was the source of the name; 1946: 128). He cautioned the reader about early writers who "erroneously include the Siouan Santee as Cusabo." The one 18th Century writer who did (probably Thomas Nairne) cannot be considered in error because his statement implies nothing about the unity of these tribes (cf. Cusabo, 1707, in Part Two).

<sup>83</sup>p. 314. Cf. Hudson (1976: 229-232) for a discussion of liability.

<sup>84</sup>Cf. Edisto, 1566: pp. 175-176. Possibly, these smaller tribes consisted primarily of former members of the "mother" town and were in a sense colonies.

<sup>85</sup>However, these two tribes (Edisto and Escamacu) probably had close ties through intermarriage, and the Hoya and the other small tribes were probably also closely connected. Rogel notes that the chiefs of Edisto, Escamacu, and Hoya attended a feast together in 1570 (pp. 328-329).

<sup>86</sup>Cf. Kussah, 1684, and n. 25 herein.

<sup>87</sup>1600: 314.

Footnotes for Pages 18-21

<sup>88</sup>1663: 21.

<sup>89</sup>1666: 64.

<sup>90</sup>1682A: 182.

<sup>91</sup>1682: 173. "Government" is an inappropriate word in its usual sense of separate branches and a bureaucracy. No Coastal tribe is known to have had any full-time officials; instead, a council probably met when it needed to discuss a specific course of action (see the section on "Politics" herein).

<sup>92</sup>1684.

<sup>93</sup>Cooper 1837: 108.

<sup>94</sup>1699.

<sup>95</sup>1715: 236-239.

<sup>96</sup>Cooper 1838: 141.

<sup>97</sup>1789: 22.

<sup>98</sup>Lowery 1905: 275-276.

<sup>99</sup>1570: 328.

<sup>100</sup>p. 77.

<sup>101</sup>p. 334, cf. OED.

<sup>102</sup>Le Moyne c. 1565.

<sup>103</sup>Oré 1617-1620: 34.

<sup>104</sup>Gomes 1577: 197.

<sup>105</sup>Menéndez Márques 1578: 80.

<sup>106</sup>B: 283.

<sup>107</sup>Catesby 1777: I, XV.

<sup>108</sup>Ecija 1609.

<sup>109</sup>1666: 79.

<sup>110</sup>p. 66.

Footnotes for Pages 21-27

<sup>111</sup>Cf. footnote 319 herein and Kiawah, 1670 (11 Sept.) for more on Cofitachiqui.

<sup>112</sup>Johnson 1715.

<sup>113</sup>1775: 343-344.

<sup>114</sup>p. 331.

<sup>115</sup>Cf. Childs 1936; Escamacu 1671; Combahee 1671; Swanton 1946: 46.

<sup>116</sup>p. 72; cf. also Ugarte 1935: 107.

<sup>117</sup>1702-1707: 42.

<sup>118</sup>Le Jau's 1711 statement about the linguistic affiliation of the Yemassee follows; cf. also 1712: 121.

<sup>119</sup>p. 13; for Ferguson's sources, cf. the entry for him and for Woodward in the Bibliography.

<sup>120</sup>1714: 25.

<sup>121</sup>Foster 1931: II, 102.

<sup>122</sup>1771: I, xii.

<sup>123</sup>1960: 251.

<sup>124</sup>1922: 16-25. Swanton probably knew of these interrogations because he refers to Barcho Amini and Bluacacay, but at the time he interpreted "Chiluques" as a reference to the Cherokee tribe; cf. 1922: 20 & 1946: 46.

<sup>125</sup>1922: 24. Swanton's classification of Southeastern languages has been questioned by Kroeber (1963) and Haas (1973). He probably oversimplified when he grouped languages unless he was aware of definite evidence that they should be kept separate.

<sup>126</sup>1922: 17. Cf. Kiawah, 1609.

<sup>127</sup>Cf. the following section on "Surviving Words."

<sup>128</sup>Rogel 1570: 307. Swanton 1922: 18, 85, & 180. The 1671 interrogation of Escamacu and Combahee Indians is fairly conclusive, and another indication of a difference is that the Spanish consistently referred to the Port Royal area as a province entirely separate from Guale (sometimes calling it the

Footnotes for Pages 27-32

Province of Oristan, occasionally of Escamacu, but generally of Santa Elena). Swanton's argument can be turned around, and it is probably more correct that not "so much as a hint that any such" similarity existed. The absence of any direct statement makes speculation useless.

<sup>129</sup>Carteret 1670: 167.

<sup>130</sup>Le Jau 1711.

<sup>131</sup>As a reference, Swanton gives "Lowery and Brooks, MSS," presumably indicating that a copy was available in both collections. I could not find the phrase in any of the 1580 letters of Menéndez Márques in the Lowery Collection.

<sup>132</sup>1922: 25.

<sup>133</sup>Cf. Cusabo and Polawana in Part Two. Swanton assumed that Polawana Island was a reservation for the Cusabo when it was, instead, evidently intended for one tribe, the Kussah. In any case, none of the Indians of the Lower Coast occupied the island in 1738, when it was offered to the Natchez.

<sup>134</sup>1946: 30; 28.

<sup>135</sup>Lawson 1960: 249. Cf. "ahha" for goose in Catawba; Chamberlain 1882: 2.

<sup>136</sup>1670.

<sup>137</sup>Smith 1913: 61-62.

<sup>138</sup>Stoney 1955: 76.

<sup>139</sup>OED.

<sup>140</sup>Stoney 1955: 76.

<sup>141</sup>Swanton 1922: 24.

<sup>142</sup>Gatchet 1877: 629.

<sup>143</sup>pp. 15, 82.

<sup>144</sup>Leadenwah is probably a corruption of Iahteonwash. Cf. Sebeok 1973: 776-777.

<sup>145</sup>Swanton gives Aluete and Talapo, but these words occur south of the Savannah (1922: 82). He also gives Callowaggie

(Island), which seems to be a Yemassee word (like the adjacent Chechessee (Creek; cf. the Chasee king of the Yemassee, 1922: 97).

<sup>146</sup>Ibid., 15.

<sup>147</sup>Ibid., 15.

<sup>148</sup>Ibid., 15.

<sup>149</sup>Ibid., 19.

<sup>150</sup>Cf. Bartram 1789: 14 and Swanton 1946: 46.

<sup>151</sup>1922: 24 & 15.

<sup>152</sup>Byington 1915.

<sup>153</sup>Ibid., 143. Without placing undue emphasis on negative evidence, it may be significant that common Muskhogean words such as "hatchie" and "mico" are not known to have been used in South Carolina until after the Yemassee arrived.

<sup>154</sup>Chew and Rockwood 1845; McMurray 1845.

<sup>155</sup>Gallatin 1836.

<sup>156</sup>Less is known about Southeastern Indian languages than many secondary sources suggest. In 1973, Haas considered the amount of linguistic research that had been done inadequate for an accurate classification to be possible, "especially for the Carolina-Virginia coast and the lower Mississippi River area" (p. 1229). Kroeber attempted to delimit the linguistic areas of North America earlier in this century, and he assigned stocks for almost every inhabited section of the continent. A conspicuous exception is the area between Charleston Harbor and Awendaw Creek and inland to the Appalachian Mountains; he simply has question marks (1963: Map 1a).

<sup>157</sup>Cooke 1936: fig. 1; p. 5; fig. 4-6.

<sup>158</sup>p. 171.

<sup>159</sup>Sandford 1666: 65.

<sup>160</sup>Sewee, 1701.

<sup>161</sup>Cf. Kelley 1963.

Footnotes for Pages 35-38

- <sup>162</sup> Archdale 1707: 290.
- <sup>163</sup> Cooke 1936: 160 & pl. 18.
- <sup>164</sup> 1671: 336; 1680: 157. Cf. Wilson 1682: 168 and Ashe 1682: 114.
- <sup>165</sup> Landers 1970. Most of the information in the following four paragraphs of the text is also from this source.
- <sup>166</sup> p. 177 & 210.
- <sup>167</sup> Cf. fn. 163 herein. The colonial records contain frequent references to hurricanes, and the 1686 one was vividly described by Moore (p. 85).
- <sup>168</sup> Sandford 1666.
- <sup>169</sup> p. 24. Ashe (1682: 143) also refers to "Indian Corn, which produces a vast Increase, yearly, yielding Two plentiful Harvests..." Cf. Hudson (1976: 293, 297-298) for information about the varieties of corn and the options for planting them.
- <sup>170</sup> 1775: 343.
- <sup>171</sup> 1771: I, ix.
- <sup>172</sup> 1680: 156.
- <sup>173</sup> 1683: 6-7.
- <sup>174</sup> 1771: I, ix.
- <sup>175</sup> 1663: 24 & cf. 21. Swanton notes that watermelons were introduced by Europeans.
- <sup>176</sup> 1711: 8.
- <sup>177</sup> 1771: I, ix.
- <sup>178</sup> 1570: 329. The soil of many areas was obviously well suited to agriculture, but just as obviously, it did wear out. The Southeastern Indians are not known to have used fertilizer, to have intentionally let their fields lie fallow, or to have practiced crop rotation; but they did practice intercropping of corn and beans, and they planted relatively few seeds in any given area (Hudson 1976: 290-297; contrast "intensive" on 291 with 297).

Footnotes for Pages 38-39

<sup>179</sup>Laudonnière 1562: 315.

<sup>180</sup>1570: 327; 1710B: 80.

<sup>181</sup>Bartram 1789: 31.

<sup>182</sup>Ashe 1682: 145.

<sup>183</sup>1670: 166.

<sup>184</sup>1682: 156-157.

<sup>185</sup>Sandford 1666: 76. Cf. Swanton 1946: 631 and 637.

<sup>186</sup>Merás 1567: 173.

<sup>187</sup>p. 21.

<sup>188</sup>Seale 1670: 211, Mathews 1680: 158, Newe 1682A: 182,  
Ferguson 1682: 16, Crafford 1683: 6, & Hasell 1724: 450-451.

<sup>189</sup>1680: 157.

<sup>190</sup>1771: I, ix.

<sup>191</sup>Merás 1567: 175.

<sup>192</sup>pp.173-177.Cf. Laudonnière 1562: 338-339.

<sup>193</sup>p. 77. The heaps were likely midden.

<sup>194</sup>1682.

<sup>195</sup>p. 24.

<sup>196</sup>p. 166.

<sup>197</sup>p. 328.

<sup>198</sup>p. 315.

<sup>199</sup>p. 175. Bartram (1789: 32) says that Southeastern Indian women "gather an incredible amount of nuts and acorns, which they manufacture into oil for annual consumption."

Hutson (1976: 259) says that women were almost as invariably responsible for all gathering as men were for all hunting. In agriculture, men generally cleared the land and women did the planting elsewhere in the Southeast, but this division of labor

Footnotes for Pages 39-41

by sex does not seem to have been observed on the Coast, where women had achieved a higher status. The division for hunting and gathering was probably a holdover from Archaic or earlier traditions.

<sup>200</sup>p. 166.

<sup>201</sup>1682: 11. Cf. Freud 1951: 58-66.

<sup>202</sup>1682: 142.

<sup>203</sup>1771: I, ix. A chinkapin is a chestnut (OED). The reference to live oak indicates that he was thinking at least partly of Coastal Indians.

<sup>204</sup>p. 230.

<sup>205</sup>Bartram 1789: 31.

<sup>206</sup>pp. 338-339.

<sup>207</sup>1666: 78; Carteret 1670: 68; 1683: 6-7.

<sup>208</sup>Searle 1670: 211.

<sup>209</sup>1680: 157.

<sup>210</sup>1682A: 182.

<sup>211</sup>1682: 170-171. On p. 167, Wilson notes that land "near the Town...is sold for twenty shillings per Acre, though pillaged of all its valuable Timber, and not cleared of the rest...."

<sup>212</sup>1707: 289.

<sup>213</sup>1670: 168.

<sup>214</sup>1707: 289.

<sup>215</sup>1701: 23.

<sup>216</sup>1682: 151.

<sup>217</sup>Mathews 1680: 157 & Crafford 1683: 6-7. Still others mention "fowle" and are probably referring primarily to turkey (Searle 1670: 211 and Newe 1682A: 182).

<sup>218</sup>Mentioned also by Mathews 1680: 158; Ferguson 1682: 16; and Crafford 1683: 6.

Footnotes for Pages 41-43

<sup>219</sup>Gregorie 1926.

<sup>220</sup>Cf. Gatesby 1771: I, xi.

<sup>221</sup>Lawson 1701: 9-10.

<sup>222</sup>"Lucerne"; Laudonniere 1562: 310.

<sup>223</sup>OED.

<sup>224</sup>1682: 155.

<sup>225</sup>1663, 1666, & 1682 respectively. Taboos against certain foods may have existed, but none are known for the Coast.

<sup>226</sup>1682: 156.

<sup>227</sup>1565, pl. V.

<sup>228</sup>Lawson 1960: 5. The widely used practice of stalking deer with a stuffed deer head is not known to have been used on the Coast, possibly because hunting was largely done inland and the practice was less likely to have been observed.

<sup>229</sup>Le Moyne 1565: pl. V, and Laudonniere 1562: 310.

<sup>230</sup>1771: I, ix. Curing and drying in the sun enabled Southeastern Indians to preserve any surpluses that they had and to maintain an adequate food supply throughout most, if not all, of each year.

<sup>231</sup>Mathews c. 1685.

<sup>232</sup>1701: 8-9.

<sup>233</sup>Driver 1969: Map 3. Hudson (1976: 258) states that "the Southeastern Indians were unusual in that they possessed a way of making a living which contained in fairly even proportions the hunting and gathering of wild foods with the cultivation of domesticated foods. They were both hunters and farmers...." The Coastal Tribes evidently farmed less and fished more and thus had an even more distinctive subsistence.

<sup>234</sup>Le Moyne 1591: pl. V and the other plates in the same series. Cf. Milling 1940: 267 and Swanton 1946: 462 & 475-477.

In Part Two, under Orista, c. 1565, is a discussion of the likelihood that Le Moyne did visit the South Carolina Coast.

Footnotes for Pages 43-44

It seems reasonable to assume that he did, but even if he did not, his representation of nude Indians was probably based on eyewitness accounts. Certainly, numerous details of the De Bry engravings were considered inconsequential and were added or altered at the will of the engraver. However, since nudity was so unusual to most Europeans, it was probably depicted only when it actually existed.

The ethnological value of the Le Moyne-De Bry engravings are discussed in detail by Sturtevant (Milanich and Sturtevant 1972; Sturtevant 1977). He follows Swanton in preferring to accept only what is otherwise confirmed by another source. However, after a careful examination of every trait, he concludes that except for insignificant details (q.v. Swanton 1946: 510), almost everything depicted is confirmed by another source.

<sup>235</sup>Cf. Lawson 1960: 2.

<sup>236</sup>Quoted in White 1975: 244.

<sup>237</sup>1707: 289; 1682: 150.

<sup>238</sup>1682: 156.

<sup>239</sup>1670: 166. Timucuan women used moss for shirts, but most Southeastern women wore shirts of deerskin (Fundaburk 1958: 39 & 81; Hudson 1976: 264). In 1704 Hannah Williams of Charleston sent Sir Hans Sloan "a queen's petticoat made of moss" (Andrews and Davenport 1908: 13). The black, hair-like filament of the moss may have been woven into a textile (White 1975: 225-231), but the Le Moyne illustrations appear to indicate that the entire plant was tucked into a belt and left to dangle. Cf. Swanton 1946: 442 & 471-472.

<sup>240</sup>1562: 314.

<sup>241</sup>Carteret 1670: 166.

<sup>242</sup>Catesby 1771: I, xi. The use of oyster shell makes this a likely reference to Coastal Indians.

<sup>243</sup>1682B: 184.

<sup>244</sup>1591: pl. V.

<sup>245</sup>Cf. Fundaburk 1958: pl. 15 for a scalp being smoked, indicating that this was a hair style and not headgear.

<sup>246</sup>1779: 68.

Footnotes for Pages 44-45

<sup>247</sup>1666: 79. Sandford also points out, as will be discussed later, that their houses of state were identical.

<sup>248</sup>1682: 156. Cf. Swanton 1946: 530; most Southeastern women did not use paint "except those of a particular class, when disposed to grant certain favors to the other sex" (quoting Bartram on the Creeks).

<sup>249</sup>Laudonnière 1562: 315.

<sup>250</sup>Le Jau 1712: 105-106.

<sup>251</sup>1779: 68.

<sup>252</sup>Ribaut 1562: 93; Carteret 1670.

<sup>253</sup>Laudonnière 1562: 310.

<sup>254</sup>1666: 66.

<sup>255</sup>Le Moyne 1591A: pl. V. A single door was usual for Southeastern dwellings (Swanton 1946: 428).

<sup>256</sup>Ashe 1682: 149-150.

<sup>257</sup>Laudonnière 1562: 318; Rojas 1564: 120. Cf. Swanton (1946: 413) for an important difference between typical Algonquian houses (with no distinction between the roof and walls) and typical Southeastern houses (with a structurally separate roof made of different materials from the walls).

<sup>258</sup>Merás 1577: 176.

<sup>259</sup>1670: 166.

<sup>260</sup>1663: 20-21. A wall plate is the top of the wall on which the rafters rest (OED).

Swanton (1922: 48), Calmes (1964: 35-36), and South (1973: 2-4) quote Oviedo's detailed description of a house in Gualdape. Swanton considers Gualdape to have been just north or south of the Savannah River's mouth or thus either in the province of Santa Elena or Guale, and Calmes agrees that it was probably a "Cusabo" dwelling. South considers Quattlebaum's location in the Winyah Bay area to be more likely. Regardless of the location, the house is altogether unlike any other that is known for the Lower Coast and there are other good reasons for believing that either the locations proposed are incorrect or the original information is inaccurate. Dwellings with