

Introduction

DENNIS B. BLANTON AND JULIA A. KING

Between A.D. 1500 and 1750, as indigenous Indians, colonizing Europeans, and, later, Africans came into sustained contact, their cultures underwent a transformation, sometimes rapidly, sometimes slowly, generating and regenerating new cultural orders. Renewed interest in these transformations is building as the nation prepares to recognize the four hundredth anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, Virginia, the event that brought permanent English settlement into the picture. The essays in this book offer an alternative to traditional approaches that sometimes privilege either archaeological or ethnohistorical perspectives and either Indian or European perspectives, in an often exclusionary fashion. The post-Contact world was unusually complex, and credible interpretation of that world means that we must dispense with traditional distinctions drawn along cultural and intellectual lines. Rather than disentangling the component parts of these interactions and transformations, the authors consider their interconnection as crucial for understanding this unique, multicultural event, one that was a defining part of the rise of the modern world.

This collection complements and expands rather than replaces previous studies of contact. Indeed, many of the papers that follow are inspired in part by the pleas issued by our predecessors for particular kinds of investigations and thinking. Both Dan Mouer (1993) and Pat Rubertone (2000) have urged archaeologists to reevaluate how they study and interpret New World colonial-

ism and creolization. Randy Turner (1986) had previously taken a hard look at the archaeological record of Powhatan sites, and how that record does and does not meet our expectations of chiefdom-level developments. Subregional studies have also been appearing, including Stephen Potter's (1993) northern Virginia monograph and Helen Rountree and Tom Davidson's (1997) study of Eastern Shore Indians. The essays in this book build on these earlier studies and others to offer new discussions about what we know, and what we still do not know, about culture contact in the Mid-Atlantic.

The chapters in the volume provide, through case studies, a historical perspective on the complex relationships between European colonists and native Indians across the Mid-Atlantic region. At its most basic, the book is archaeological in scope, but the more important goal is a better understanding of Mid-Atlantic colonial societies following sustained European contact. By design, authors emphasize the native record, recognizing that thorough treatment still lags in colonial Chesapeake scholarship. The native emphasis is made, however, with full consideration of interactions across cultural lines. Achieving this goal necessarily requires investigation of all available information—documentary, ethnohistorical, and archaeological—and each paper in this volume makes use of these complementary sources.

Each essay also provides a sample of the range of problems archaeologists are investigating in the Mid-Atlantic. From the reconstruction of colonial climate to querying the role archaeologists play in constituting their subject of research, these essays affirm not only the complicated cultures we study but also the complicated methods and philosophies archaeologists bring to their craft. We have striven to include current, compelling research, but our effort is by no means exhaustive, nor could it have been. What we have attempted to present is a collection of papers that restores Indians and their cultures to their rightful place as important participants in the colonial Mid-Atlantic, and to show how archaeological research plays a major role in that endeavor. There is a great deal that remains to be done, and these essays suggest the fresh and exciting directions that lie before us.

Because each essay brings multiple issues to a discussion of the Contact era, we could have organized them along any number of themes, from chronological to topical. The presentation we have chosen reflects, we believe, issues that emerged as particularly timely or relevant for our authors and colleagues who reviewed the manuscript as it was prepared. The connections suggested by the final arrangement, however, are not the only ones linking the essays, and readers

are urged to find the many other ties—whether cultural, spatial, temporal, theoretical, or methodological—that bind the essays together.

The first three chapters, written, respectively, by Dennis B. Blanton, Martin D. Gallivan, and Michael J. Klein and Douglas W. Sanford, provide important context for understanding climatic change, village organization, and regional organization. The authors share an insistence that the complexion of post-Contact events was significantly shaped by what came before. The ways in which late prehistoric Indians adjusted to environmental conditions, adapted their systems of social and economic organization, and interacted with neighbors near and far had essential bearing on the pace and direction of relations with the colonizers. Blanton shows how climatic factors affected the fine-tuning of native settlement and subsistence strategies, and how the age-old but fragile balance could be especially strained under circumstances of contact. Gallivan argues that inequalities in the domestic and political spheres of the native system were well entrenched before English arrival, but that certain factors, including a degree of built-in fluidity, were intrinsic to the functioning of the paramount Powhatan chiefdom in the post-Contact era. The notion of fluidity in the large-scale and long-term operation of the region's Indian societies cuts through the Klein and Sanford paper, too. These authors attribute observable patterns of regional change and diversity to a history of cycling, in the value and nature of prestige goods, for example, or in the ways populations were organized and distributed.

The next two chapters, by Robert D. Wall and by John E. Byrd and Charles L. Heath, are devoted mainly to questions of settlement. Wall details events in the northern reaches of the Mid-Atlantic region related to aggressive Susquehannock expansion. He marshals evidence to suggest that the southward intrusions of this group were initiated during the prehistoric Late Woodland period but that they accelerated considerably as the Susquehannock sought to assert more and more control over the colonial-era fur trade. Archaeological evidence reveals the extent of the expansion and how it influenced the distribution of indigenous populations in the Potomac River valley. Byrd and Heath seek to account for the distribution of Tuscarora communities occupying southern sections of the region. They, too, argue for the prehistoric origins of the historical settlement pattern. By the eighteenth century, however, upper and lower Tuscarora groups had organized themselves differently in response to conditions of contact, and survey findings presented in the paper carefully document the dispersed pattern of the southern area.

The essays by Seth W. Mallios, Clifford Boyd, and Heather Lapham explore exchange relations in the Contact era from three very different but not necessarily mutually exclusive perspectives. Mallios's original examination of Contact-period Indian behavior applies archaeological reasoning to ethnohistorical data. Drawing on Marcel Mauss's (1990) classic work on gift exchange, Mallios develops a new theory to explain how initial native responses to the contact experience, which could be harsh, were routinely provoked by gift-exchange violations on the part of Englishmen. Viewed from this perspective, the seemingly erratic reactions of Indians to a host of the earliest encounters were in reality quite consistent. Boyd uses evolutionary theory to interpret Indian-European trade in the far western reaches of the region. Working with assemblages from early to late Contact sites in North Carolina and Virginia, he charts how the frequency and diversity of traded items increase with time on native sites. From this evidence, he argues for the selective advantages accrued to individuals who could effectively negotiate the new relations of exchange. The process was hardly one-sided, Boyd argues, since there are good indications of changes within both the Indian and European systems. Lapham examines the deerskin trade in the same region considered by Boyd, finding an independent record of change and adaptability. With tests of her "hunting for hides" model, she describes ways by which Indians altered aspects of their economy around the skin trade. Increasingly selective predation is one characteristic of an economic intensification process associated with colonial market factors.

The four remaining essays draw more directly on ethnohistorical sources to critically examine a range of questions relevant to contemporary archaeology. Julia A. King and Edward E. Chaney consider how historical archaeologists often approach the Contact period. They first describe how the discipline tends to be fractured along ethnic lines to the point where Indians are often excluded from serious consideration. The balance of their paper illustrates a profitable alternative approach based on equal treatment of European and Indian material culture. The result is documentation of how the use of native goods by Europeans shifted from the routine to the symbolic. Thomas E. Davidson uses probate inventories to document the local trade in "Indian bowls" in Somerset County, Maryland, and applies the findings to the discussion of the Colonoware debate. His evidence indicates that the trade in bowls made by Eastern Shore Indians tended to be localized and that geographic factors mattered as much or more than social or economic ones in determining who made use of the bowls. Redirection of a traditional ceramic craft activity allowed the local

Indians to fill a limited economic niche in a system that increasingly marginalized them. Martha W. McCartney lays out the history of the contest for land between the region's indigenous groups and the colonizing English. Colonial authorities were ultimately helpless in stemming the appetite for land, even after recognizing the relevance of suitable protected tracts for tributary Indian groups. McCartney's paper provides important material for consideration for archaeological studies of regional settlement. Finally, Philip Levy relates the fascinating story of an early colonial landscape feature—a lengthy palisade designed to partition Indian and English realms. Levy argues that this feature's influence persists today, both directly as a key referent in what he describes as an “Anglophied” landscape and as a symbol of a legacy of separation.

We are very grateful to our colleagues who have, through their essays, contributed new ideas about life in the Contact and early colonial periods in the Mid-Atlantic. We would also like to thank the people and institutions that helped in producing this volume. David Lewes of the Center for Archaeological Research at the College of William and Mary formatted all the essays in this book. Eric Agin, also of the Center for Archaeological Research, helped prepare the figures for publication. Edward E. Chaney of the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory at the Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum proofread the final manuscript. Sharon Raftery, also at the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory, provided administrative assistance in the preparation and revision of the manuscript. Charles R. Ewen, L. Thompson Shields, and an anonymous colleague graciously reviewed all the essays and provided a number of important suggestions for strengthening the volume. Finally, we are also very grateful for the efforts of Meredith Morris-Babb and John Byram of the University Press of Florida and Ronald L. Michael of the Society for Historical Archaeology, who conceived, encouraged, and enabled this book's publication. We also wish to thank Rita Bernhard, Mary Ann F. Williamson, Suzanne E. Coffman, and Michele Fiyak-Burkley for their hard work copyediting, proofreading, indexing, and overseeing the volume in its last stages.