

The Archaeology of North Carolina: Three Archaeological Symposia

Charles R. Ewen – Co-Editor
Thomas R. Whyte – Co-Editor
R. P. Stephen Davis, Jr. – Co-Editor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	iv
List of Tables	xiv
Acknowledgements.....	xv
Twenty-five Years and Counting: Current Archaeological Research in the North Carolina Coastal Plain	xvi
<i>Charles R. Ewen</i>	
Archaeology in the North Carolina Mountains.....	xviii
<i>Thomas R. Whyte</i>	
Introduction to the Conference on the Archaeology of Piedmont North Carolina: Old Things Seen in a New Light.....	xix
<i>R. P. Stephen Davis, Jr.</i>	

Coastal Plain Symposium Chapters

1: Geoarchaeological Investigations of Stratified Sand Ridges Along the Tar River, North Carolina.....	1-1
<i>Christopher R. Moore, I. Randolph Daniel, Jr.</i>	
2: Lithic Resources of the North Carolina Coastal Plain: Prehistoric Acquisition and Utilization Patterns	2-1
<i>Lawrence E. Abbott, Jr., Kathleen M. Farrell, John G. Nickerson, Norman K. Gay</i>	
3: Current Research into the Paleoindian and the Archaic Periods in the North Carolina Coastal Plain	3-1
<i>I. Randolph Daniel, Jr., Christopher R. Moore</i>	
4: Recent Woodland Archaeology of Coastal North Carolina.....	4-1
<i>Joseph M. Herbert</i>	
5: Woodland Period Site Distribution and Landscape Use in the Coastal Plain of Southeastern North Carolina	5-1
<i>Tracy L. Mills</i>	

6:	Broad Reach Revisited: Preliminary Results of the 2006 Data Recovery Excavations	6-1
	<i>Heather Millis</i>	
7:	Historical Archaeology on the Coastal Plain in the Post-South Era.....	7-1
	<i>Charles R. Ewen</i>	
8:	“...They in respect of troubling our inhabiting and planting are not to be feared.” Archaeology and Ethnohistory of Native Coastal Populations Before and After European Contact.....	8-1
	<i>John J. Mintz, Thomas E. Beaman, Jr., Paul J. Mohler</i>	
9:	Archaeological Research at Fort Raleigh – Past and Present	9-1
	<i>Nicholas M. Lucchetti, Eric C. Klingelhofer, Phillip W. Evans</i>	
10:	Coastal Plain Iroquoians Before and After European Contact: An Interpretive Study of Cashie Phase Archaeological Research in Northeastern North Carolina.....	10-1
	<i>Charles L. Heath, E. Clay Swindell</i>	
11:	Giving Voice to a Silent Past: African American Archaeology in Coastal North Carolina	11-1
	<i>Patricia Samford</i>	
12:	Forty Years Beneath the Waves: Underwater Archaeology in North Carolina.....	12-1
	<i>Richard W. Lawrence</i>	
13:	Now You See It; Now You Don’t. Coastal Erosion and Coastal Cottages: Twenty Years of Cultural Resource Management Studies.....	13-1
	<i>Loretta Lautzenheiser, Susan E. Bamann, Dennis C. Gosser</i>	

Mountains Symposium Chapters

14:	Rock Features of Western North Carolina.....	14-1
	<i>Cheryl Claassen and Mary Elizabeth Compton</i>	
15:	Collision at the Crossroads: Confusion in the Late Woodland Period (AD 800-1400) of Northwestern North Carolina.....	15-1
	<i>Thomas R. Whyte</i>	
16:	Cherokee Ethnogenesis in Southeastern North Carolina.....	16-1
	<i>Christopher B. Rodning</i>	

Piedmont Symposium Chapters

- 17: A New Look at an Old Sequence: Time, Typology, and Intrusive Traditions in the Carolina Piedmont..... 17-1
I. Randolph Daniel, Jr.
- 18: The Current State of Town Creek Research: What Have We Learned After the First 75 Years? 18-1
Edmond A. Boudreaux III
- 19: The Burke Phase: Native Americans and Spanish Conquistadors in the Western North Carolina Piedmont 19-1
Christopher B. Rodning, David G. Moore, Robin A. Beck, Jr.
- 20: Eastern Piedmont Farmsteads and Plantations: A Site File Expedition 20-1
Linda France Stine

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1:	A geomorphic map of the lower Tar River Basin in the vicinity of Greenville, NC (Pitt County) based on analysis of LiDAR elevation data	1-3
1-2:	A generalized topographic and geologic schematic representing the evolution of the Tar River Basin in the upper Coastal Plain	1-4
1-3:	A spectacular example of relict source-bordering dunes on river terrace escarpments along the Cape Fear River, Bladen County, North Carolina.....	1-6
1-4:	Known relict source-bordering dune regions along coastal rivers in Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina.....	1-8
1-5:	Locations of all archaeological sites identified during shovel test survey of selected sand ridges between Tranter's Creek (northeastern Pitt County) and Tarboro, North Carolina.....	1-15
1-6:	Archaeostratigraphy, interpreted lithostratigraphic zones, and luminescence (OSL) geochronology for the (A) Barber Creek Site (31Pt259) and (B) Squires Ridge (31Ed365).....	1-16
1-7:	Archaeostratigraphy, interpreted lithostratigraphic zones, and luminescence (OSL) geochronology for the Owens Ridge Site (31Ed369).....	1-17
1-8:	Archaeostratigraphy, interpreted lithostratigraphic zones, and luminescence (OSL) geochronology for (A) Taft Ridge (31Pt605) and (B) Hart Ridge (31Pt606).....	1-18
1-9:	A generalized geomorphic map of the Tar River Basin between Tarboro, NC (northern Edgecombe County, NC) and Tranter's Creek (northeastern Pitt County, NC) based on analysis of LiDAR elevation data for the Tar River Basin produced by the NCDOT Floodplain Mapping Program	1-20
1-10:	Single-aliquot luminescence and 14C geochronology for buried archaeological sites along the Tar River plotted over the GISP2 Oxygen Isotope curve for the last 17.....	1-21
1-11:	A Generalized topographic and geologic schematic of the Tar River Basin in the upper Coastal Plain of North Carolina showing single-aliquot luminescence (OSL) and calibrated 14C geochronology obtained for buried archaeological sites with relict sand ridges.....	1-22
1-12:	Single-grain luminescence (OSL) age estimates for the Barber Creek Site	

	(N445, E430) showing a lithostratigraphic boundary between underlying fluvial or flood-deposited sediments (note fining-upward sediment lenses defined by granulometry and overprinted by pedogenic lamellae) and predominantly aeolian sediments (upper meter of sand)	1-28
2-1:	The Coastal Plain of North Carolina in the context of A) geologic provinces, and B) river basins, the Fall Zone, and archeological sites chosen for this study	2-2
2-2:	Stairstep topography (dip-parallel cross-sectional view) as depicted by a series of marine terraces that step down to the coast across interfluves in a ramp setting, between incised valleys.....	2-3
2-3:	Sketch (orthogonal cross sectional view) through a river basin that shows stairstep topography from the top of an interfluve to the stream at the base of a terraced drainage.....	2-3
2-4:	Geomorphology of the Coastal Plain of North Carolina, derived from a LiDAR-based elevation model	2-5
2-5:	Map of surficial units showing approximate distribution of Pleistocene, Pliocene and older Coastal Plain deposits, derived from a LiDAR elevation Model	2-5
2-6:	Geologic Map of North Carolina (NCGS, 1985) shows subcrop formations that underlie unmapped surficial geologic units	2-6
2-7:	Example of a facies model that shows a hypothetical cross section parallel to a coast such as North Carolina’s Outer Banks.....	2-8
2-8:	Landforms associated with the Holocene embayed coastline, and other relict marine highstand positions (map view).....	2-8
2-9:	Conceptual model that shows stratigraphic architecture of a series of depositional systems, preserved in the geologic record as unconformity bounded units	2-9
2-10:	Variations in toe elevation at a marine highstand (cross sectional view) in relative sea level.....	2-9
2-11:	Chart showing relative ages and map units for Virginia’s Coastal Plain Map	2-12
2-12:	The Upper Cape Fear River Basin shows the distribution of archaeological sites in the context of: A) geomorphology, B) surficial geologic units,	

C) subcrop geologic units, and D) interfluves (ramps) and incised Paleovalleys	2-16
2-13: The lower Cape Fear River Basin shows the distribution of archaeological sites in the context of: A) geomorphology, B) surficial geologic units, and C) subcrop geologic units	2-17
2-14: The middle to upper Neuse River Basin shows the distribution of archaeological sites in the context of: A) geomorphology, B) surficial geologic units, and C) subcrop geologic units	2-19
2-15: The lower Neuse River Basin shows the distribution of archaeological sites in the context of: A) geomorphology, B) surficial geologic units, and C) subcrop geologic units	2-20
2-16: The upper Roanoke River Basin shows the distribution of archaeological sites in the context of: A) geomorphology, B) surficial geologic units, and C) subcrop geologic units	2-22
2-17: The lower Roanoke River Basin shows the distribution of archaeological sites in the context of: A) geomorphology, B) surficial geologic units, and C) subcrop geologic units	2-23
2-18: Distribution of raw materials within Cape Fear River Basin: A) < 20 km from trunk stream; B) > 20 km from trunk stream	2-29
2-19: Diagrammatic view of Cape Fear River basin archaeological site locations.....	2-30
2-20: Distribution of raw materials in the Neuse River Basin: A) <20 km from trunk stream, and B) >20 km from trunk stream	2-31
2-21: Diagrammatic view of Neuse River Basin archaeological site locations	2-32
2-22: Distribution of raw materials within 20 km of trunk stream, Roanoke River Basin	2-33
2-23: Diagrammatic view of Roanoke River Basin archaeological site locations	2-34
2-24: Map of gravel patches on selected 7.5 Minute Quadrangles	2-35
2-25: Example of a high-density gravel patch in a recently tilled field	2-36
2-26: Distribution of gravel locations on the Stancils Chapel 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle	2-37

3-1:	Frequency distribution of fluted points by county	3-2
3-2:	Site locations along the Tar River.....	3-6
3-3:	Artifact backplot for 445 East Trench at the Barber Creek site illustrating piece-plotted, OSL ages, artifact frequency by level and grain-size data.....	3-8
3-4:	Revised Paleoindian and Archaic culture-history of the North Carolina Coastal Plain	3-18
3-5:	Schematic profiles of Tar River sites.....	3-19
4-1:	Geographic distribution of the Hamp’s Landing series	4-4
4-2:	Dates associated with the Hamp’s Landing series	4-5
4-3:	Geographic distribution of the New River series.....	4-7
4-4:	Dates associated with the New River series	4-8
4-5:	Geographic distribution of the Mount Pleasant series	4-11
4-6:	Dates associated with the Mount Pleasant series.....	4-12
4-7:	Geographic distribution of the Hanover series	4-14
4-8:	Dates associated with the Hanover series	4-15
4-9:	Geographic distribution of the Cape Fear series.....	4-16
4-10:	Dates associated with the Cape Fear series.....	4-17
4-11:	Geographic distribution of the Townsend series	4-19
4-12:	Dates associated with the Townsend series	4-20
4-13:	Geographic distribution of the Colington series.....	4-21
4-14:	Dates associated with the Cashie series	4-23
5-1:	Location of study area within Onslow County	5-2
5-2:	Major drainages of Camp Lejeune.....	5-3
5-3:	TRC survey areas 1998–2008.....	5-6

5-4:	Camp Lejeune site distribution	5-7
5-5:	Prehistoric sites located on Mainside.....	5-7
5-6:	Distribution of Woodland components in the New River drainage.....	5-8
5-7:	Distribution of Stallings series.....	5-10
5-8:	Distribution of Thom’s Creek series.....	5-10
5-9:	Distribution of Hamp’s Landing series.....	5-11
5-10:	New River sites.....	5-12
5-11:	Distribution of Deptford series	5-14
5-12:	Distribution of Cape Fear series	5-15
5-13:	Distribution of Hanover series	5-16
5-14:	Distribution of Onslow series	5-17
5-15:	Frequency of sherds and components by ceramic series	5-19
5-16:	Distribution of White Oak series	5-20
5-17:	Distribution of Mockley series.....	5-21
5-18:	Distribution of Swansboro series	5-23
5-19:	Distribution of Brunswick series	5-24
6-1:	Plan map of Broad Reach Site showing features and stripped area outline.....	6-2
6-2:	Close up of post mold patterns in a portion of the site east of the marina.....	6-4
6-3:	Close up of post mold patterns in the southwestern corner of the site	6-4
6-4:	View of typical structure outline in the southwestern corner of the site	6-5
6-5:	View of post mold profile along structure wall	6-6
6-6:	Distribution of features containing White Oak and Hanover sherds	6-8

6-7:	View of canine burial Feature 3573	6-10
6-8:	View of canine burial Feature 24570	6-10
7-1:	Sixteenth-century Snaphaunce gunlock and signet ring from 31DR1	7-3
7-2:	Eighteenth-century cellar excavation at Bath, NC	7-4
7-3:	Excavation of the front porch of the Robert Hay House, New Bern, NC	7-5
7-4:	Excavations at Foscue Plantation, Jones County, NC	7-8
7-5:	Bottom panel from what is believed to be Governor Richard Caswell's Coffin	7-10
9-1:	Plan of Fort Raleigh National Historic Site showing the locations of Harrington's test trenches	9-4
9-2:	VCF excavation of 1585 scientific workshop area with undisturbed "A" horizon in the center of the excavation, facing northeast	9-6
9-3:	1994 test square excavated in the Hariot Woods Nature Trail showing buried "A" horizon, facing south	9-7
9-4:	Detail of Feature 13 showing copper plates in situ	9-11
9-5:	Map of the north end of Roanoke Island showing areas of archaeological Interest	9-13
10-1:	Map of eastern North Carolina and southeastern Virginia region showing approximate locations of key sites mentioned in the text	10-2
10-2:	Radiocarbon probability curves for recalibrated Cashie phase dates included in Table 2	10-19
10-3:	Digital rendering of presently known Cashie I series vessel forms represented in Cashie I subphase ceramic assemblages recovered from regional sites	10-41
10-4:	Digital rendering of presently known Cashie II series vessel forms represented in Cashie II subphase ceramic assemblages recovered from regional sites	10-41
10-5:	Cashie I series rim sherds and reconstructed vessel sections from the Jordan's Landing site	10-42

10-6:	The Neoheroke Fort site (31GR4)	10-55
10-7:	Pre-conservation treatment artifact sample from a cache of personal items recovered from a wall niche inside Feature 16 (semi-subterranean house-bunker) at the Neoheroke Fort site	10-56
11-1:	Reconstructed slave quarter buildings at Somerset Plantation	11-2
11-2:	On the left is a royal rim creamware plate and to the right are two colonoware sherds showing the same royal rim shape	11-6
11-3:	African American women removing the heads from herring at a North Carolina fishery.....	11-10
11-4:	Artist David Hunter Strother drew this camp in Virginia’s Dismal Swamp in 1856	11-11
12-1:	Leslie Bright in the Fort Fisher Preservation Laboratory with conserved artifacts from the blockade-runner Modern Greece, ca. 1966	12-3
12-2:	UAB and ECU staff with visitors from Virginia aboard R/V Murphy Base during the 1981 Edenton field school	12-7
12-3:	1988 investigation of a sunken colonial sailing vessel at the Rose Hill Plantation landing, Northeast Cape Fear River.....	12-11
12-4:	Aboard the North Carolina Marine Fisheries’ barge R/V Shell Point during the 2007 QAR project	12-14
13-1:	Map of Northeastern North Carolina showing the locations of sites discussed	13-3
13-2:	Plan view of the Baum Site, 31CK9, showing changes to the shoreline based on overlay of ECU site mapping, topographic maps, and aerial images and archaeological investigations by ECU (1974-1983) and CCR (2005 and 2007	13-4
13-3:	View of the shoreline at 31HY6, the Davis Bay Site, showing ongoing Erosion	13-5
13-4:	Domestic artifacts from 31BF397 at the Barrow Tract	13-9
15-1:	Diminishing evidence of limestone tempering at rockshelter sites along the Watauga River.....	15-4

15-2:	Excavation plan view of the Ward site (31WT22), Watauga County, North Carolina	15-5
15-3:	Pottery rim sherds from the Ward site (31WT22), Watauga County, North Carolina	15-6
15-4:	Excavation plan view of the Katie Griffith site (31WT330), Watauga County, North Carolina	15-7
15-5:	Pottery rim sherds from the Katie Griffith site (31WT330), Watauga County, North Carolina	15-8
15-6:	Pottery vessel body sherds from the Katie Griffith site (31WT330), Watauga County, North Carolina, showing rectilinear stamping and rectilinear stamping over net impressing	15-8
16-1:	Selected archaeological sites and groups of historic Cherokee towns in the southern Appalachians	16-2
16-2:	Sequence of townhouses at the Coweeta Creek site in southwestern North Carolina	16-5
16-3:	Schematic template of seventeenth-century Cherokee townhouses.....	16-6
16-4:	Schematic template of eighteenth-century Cherokee townhouses.....	16-7
17-1:	Pre-Woodland period projectile point traditions of the North Carolina Piedmont.....	17-2
17-2:	Hardaway Blades: proposed Hardaway-Dalton preforms and possible pre-Clovis bifaces	17-4
17-3:	North Carolina Clovis Points.....	17-5
17-4:	North Carolina Redstone Points and Cumberland Point.....	17-5
17-5:	Variation in Guilford Lanceolate point bases found in stratified context from Trench 1 at Lowder's Ferry	17-11
17-6:	Guilford Lanceolate I.....	17-13
17-7:	Guilford Lanceolate II.....	17-13
17-8:	Proposed revision to the projectile point typology and chronology of the North Carolina Piedmont	17-15

18-1:	Town Creek area map showing sites mentioned in text	18-2
18-2:	Town Creek map showing all features documented at the base of plowzone	18-3
18-3:	Section of the digital photomosaic showing Structure 7 (Mortuary D).....	18-10
18-4:	The original, unrevised map of archaeological features at Town Creek	18-11
18-5:	Identified architectural elements at Town Creek	18-12
18-6:	Structures and burial clusters at Town Creek	18-13
18-7:	Select architectural elements from the early Town Creek phase occupation	18-14
18-8:	Select architectural elements from the late Town Creek-early Leak phase occupation.....	18-15
19-1:	Spanish forts and Native American towns and villages in the northern borderlands of La Florida.....	19-2
19-2:	Route of the Soto expedition through the North Carolina Piedmont and surrounding areas	19-3
19-3:	Route of the first Pardo expedition through the North Carolina Piedmont and surrounding areas	19-3
19-4:	Burke-phase sites in the Western North Carolina Piedmont.....	19-4
19-5:	Burke pottery from the Berry site	19-5
19-6:	Burke-phase settlement pattern along Upper Creek and Warrior Fork.....	19-6
19-7:	Structures and pit features at the Berry site	19-8
19-8:	Structure 3 at the Berry site	19-9
19-9:	Structure 2, and pit features at its corner, at the Berry site (31BK22).....	19-10
19-10:	Structure 5 at the Berry site	19-10
19-11:	Structure 1 at the Berry site	19-11
19-12:	Spanish goods from the Berry site	19-12

19-13: Structure 1 at the Ensley site (31BK468) on the Johns River.....	19-13
19-14: Structure 1 at the Catawba Meadows site (31BK18) on the Catawba River	19-13
20-1: Abandoned farmhouse in Guilford County, 2011.....	20-5
20-2: Dismantling Hines Log Cabin in Guilford County, 2011.....	20-5
20-3: Relative frequencies of prehistoric and historic properties in nine Piedmont counties.....	20-7
20-4: Relative frequency of National Register of Historic Places and study list properties in 10 eastern counties.....	20-8

LIST OF TABLES

1-1:	Dosimetry data and OSL ages for Tar River Survey, NC.....	1-23
1-2:	Dosimetry data and single grain OSL ages for Barber Creek (31PT259)	1-27
2-1:	USGS Quadrangles utilized in this analysis, organized by river basin.....	2-27
2-2:	Raw material data, Cape Fear, Neuse, and Roanoke River Basins.....	2-28
4-1:	Chronometric Data and Associated Woodland Pottery from Coastal North Carolina	4-27
10-1:	Ceramic types.....	10-17
10-2:	Radiocarbon dates associated with Cashie I and Cashie II subphase features or burials.....	10-18
10-3:	Paste temper grain size ranges and modal ranges by river basin segment (north-to-south) for Cashie I-II series ceramics sample	10-45
10-4:	Vessel interior surface treatment percentages by river basin segment (north-to-south) for Cashie I-II series ceramics sample	10-48
18-1:	Dates for Phases in the Town Creek Area	18-7
18-2:	Mississippian Period Radiocarbon Dates from Town Creek	18-8
20-1:	Number of Historic and Prehistoric Properties in Nine Piedmont Counties	20-7
20-2:	Number of Sites in Nine Piedmont Counties Determined Eligible for Nomination to the National Register	20-12
20-3:	Archaeological Farmstead Sites Listed for Guilford County	20-15
20-4:	Frequency of Guilford Farms by Acreage, 2009 Architectural Survey.....	20-19

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This volume of very excellent papers has been a while in the making and the result of many people's hard work. I first would like to thank John Mintz and Lea Abbott for conceiving of the symposia and helping make them a reality. The fiscal help of the North Carolina Archaeological Council, Archaeological Consultants of the Carolinas, Environmental Services Incorporated, TRC-Solutions, New South Associates, Tar River Archaeological Consultants and the North Carolina Archaeological Society in producing the Coastal Plain symposium was much appreciated.

I am also obliged to the contributors whose patience was sorely tested as the compilation process inched along. I hope you agree that it was worth the wait. The comments of the anonymous reviewers helped make this an even stronger volume and forced us all to clarify and defend our positions. I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge Tom Beaman's efforts to shepherd this project along and make sure that was posted on-line. Finally I want to thank my graduate assistants, Jennifer Gabriel and especially Amanda Keeny, for assembling, formatting, and copy editing the final contributions.

Charles R. Ewen

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AND COUNTING: CURRENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN THE NORTH CAROLINA COASTAL PLAIN

Charles R. Ewen

In 1983, the publication of *Prehistory of North Carolina: An Archaeological Symposium* summarized what archaeologists had discovered through their decades of excavations throughout the state. The volume, edited by Mark Mathis and Jeffrey Crow, combined the contributions of three archaeologists who were acknowledged leaders in their region. David Phelps prepared the chapter covering the coastal plain, Trawick Ward took the piedmont, and Burt Purrington the mountains. The result was the “blue bible” which became one of NC Historical Publications most enduring and best-selling volumes.

Two decades later the volume had been superseded by Ward and Davis’s *Time Before History* (1999), but the pace of archaeology in the state continued to accelerate as universities expanded their archaeology programs and CRM-oriented archaeology struggled to keep pace with development. To expand and further synthesize the archaeological work that had been done, John Mintz and Lea Abbott of the North Carolina Office of State Archaeology, initiated a series of symposia. A separate symposium would take place at a university in each of the three physiographic regions of the state. The first of these was hosted by the Department of Anthropology, East Carolina University, and the Southern Coastal Heritage Program and addressed many topics including: settlement patterns, coastal resource utilization, and ceramic and lithic studies that spanned both the prehistoric and historic periods.

In the previous compendium, Phelps (1983:1) stated that “the North Carolina Coastal Plain has been the least known archaeological region of the state, has received less professional attention, and supported fewer projects than other regions until very recently.” Has that assessment changed much in twenty-five years? There has certainly been a lot more archaeology done on the coastal plain. The coastal development boom at the end of the 20th century resulted in many small and large scale, legally-mandated archaeological investigations (see Heather & Tracy Millis, Herbert, Lawrence, and Lautzenheiser et al. this volume). At the same time, David Phelps retired from East Carolina University but was replaced by a prehistoric and historical archaeologist that, with the aid of a legion of graduate students, have expanded the academic investigations of the coastal plain (see Daniel & Moore, and Ewen this volume).

As North Carolina entered the 21st century, there were still many questions relating to the settlement of its coastal plain that remain unanswered. A steady rise in the region’s commercial and residential development as well as the rising sea level and resulting coastal erosion lends a sense of urgency to discovering, studying, and protecting coastal North Carolina’s rich cultural heritage. The contributors to this volume have examined the state of research and, as the reader will see, have presented a better, though still woefully incomplete, understanding of life on the coastal plain.

However, this volume is more than merely an update to the coastal section of the 1983 Mathis & Crow volume. It adds studies of the historic period (see Ewen, Mintz et al., Lucchetti et al., Heath & Swindell, and Samford this volume) underwater archaeology (see Lawrence this volume), as well as the impact of cultural resource management (see Abbott et al., Herbert, Heather & Tracy Millis, Mintz et al., and Lautzenheiser et al. this volume), which have

transformed North Carolina archaeology in the past quarter century. The authors, themselves, are comprised of State archaeologists, private contractors as well as academicians. The result is a more comprehensive assessment of the state of archaeology on the coastal plain as we move into the new millennium.

This volume is also different in the way that it is being published. By publishing online in PDF format, the information becomes accessible to all in a way that is both timely and affordable (it's free!). The reader can download the entire volume or individual chapters. They can be printed and bound or simply read them online. The information can be accessed anywhere there is an internet connection on all manner of devices. This will enable archaeologists to readily extract data from the documents and incorporate them (with proper citation) into their own research.

Whether you are reading this book on a Kindle at Starbucks, a computer at work, or a smartphone in the field, one thing has not changed. All these data were still collected by hand, mostly with shovel and trowel. Archaeology today is not that much different than it was twenty-five years ago. We have a few more tools at our disposal, but the most powerful interpretive tool continues to be our brain. Enjoy picking the brains of the contributors to this volume.

ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE NORTH CAROLINA MOUNTAINS

Thomas R. Whyte

The papers that follow under the Mountains Symposium Chapters heading are a sample of the seventeen originally presented at a symposium on North Carolina mountain archaeology held at Appalachian State University in October 2009. Those seventeen covered the gamut of space, method and theory, and time (11th millennium BC through 19th century AD), and they included presentations from academia, cultural resource management, state and federal agencies, and the Cherokee Nation. In these presentations it was revealed that we have learned a great deal more from the archaeological record since the onset of the Cherokee Project conceived by Joffre L. Coe in the 1960s. As Burton L. Purrington noted in his keynote address at the symposium, indeed, much has changed since 1983, when he wrote “Ancient Mountaineers: An Overview of the Prehistoric Archaeology of North Carolina’s Western Mountain Region” (in *North Carolina Archaeology* edited by Mark Mathis and Jeffrey Crow). Burt’s approach in that synthesis was to present existing evidence and current interpretations, but also to summarize with interesting questions remaining to be answered. The new archaeologists have risen to the challenge. The resulting changes in the practice of archaeology and a tremendous accumulation of new evidence were the impetus for the three symposia that provided the foundation for this volume, intended to serve as an update of the 1983 Mathis and Crow “Blue Book.” Growing research programs in archaeology at Western Carolina University, Warren Wilson College, and Appalachian State University, renewed vitality of the Cherokee Project of the Research Laboratories of Archaeology at UNC-Chapel Hill, the booming business of cultural resource management, and an ever changing ontological climate have all contributed new evidence and new ways of looking at old discoveries in the Mountains.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CONFERENCE ON THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PIEDMONT NORTH CAROLINA: OLD THINGS SEEN IN A NEW LIGHT

R. P. Stephen Davis, Jr.

On September 24–25, 2010, the third and final symposium on the archaeology of North Carolina was held at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill. The purpose of this symposium was to present the results of current and recent research, and to take stock of archaeology in piedmont North Carolina since the publication in 1983 of *The Prehistory of North Carolina: An Archaeological Symposium*, edited by Mark Mathis and Jeffrey Crow.

In lieu of a keynote address, an informal gathering was held Friday evening to remember our friend and colleague Trawick Ward, who passed away in June 2010. Trawick, who wrote the chapter on Piedmont archaeology for the Mathis and Crow volume, was to have been the keynote speaker, and no one could have been a better choice to reflect, with memorable humor, on what we have, and haven't, learned about the Piedmont's archaeological past over the last 27 years.

While 27 years isn't a long time, especially to an archaeologist, it is worth noting that of the six contributors to *The Prehistory of North Carolina* — David Phelps, Trawick Ward, Burt Purrington, Joffre Coe, Mark Mathis, and Jeff Crow — only Burt and Jeff Crow, co-editor and a non-archaeologist, are still with us. You could say that we are now fully within a new era of archaeological study in North Carolina.

In preparing my brief opening remarks to the conference, I re-read Trawick's chapter in the Mathis and Crow volume, as it had been more than a decade since I had last looked at it. The purpose of his chapter, titled "A Review of Archaeology in the North Carolina Piedmont: A Study of Change," was threefold: (1) to evaluate what we knew (in 1980) of the archaeology of piedmont North Carolina; (2) to assess the current state of research in the region; and (3) to identify issues important to future study. As I read, I was immediately struck by two things.

First, the issues Trawick considered and the criticism he offered clearly reflect an earlier era in Piedmont archaeology. Almost 30 years ago, an uneasy tension existed between CRM-based and what might be termed "academic" archaeology (with "academic" archaeology largely being a euphemism for Joffre Coe's archaeology program at the University of North Carolina). Prior to the early 1970s, almost all archaeology in North Carolina was undertaken either by universities or by state government. The numbers of yearly field projects were very low and budgets were extremely limited. In situations where more expansive projects were undertaken, such as the survey and salvage projects for Roanoke Rapids Reservoir, Lake Gaston, Lake Norman, Jordan Lake, and Falls of the Neuse Reservoir, the fieldwork was always woefully under-funded and financial support for subsequent analysis and reporting was non-existent. Despite these limitations, a workable culture-chronology had been worked out for much of the Piedmont. As for historical archaeology, most projects before 1970 were on state properties and most were conducted by historic sites archaeologist Stanley South.

All this changed with the passage of historic preservation and environmental legislation in the late 1960s and early 1970s. As cultural resource management came into its own during the 1970s, environmental engineering consulting companies, colleges, universities, and government agencies all hired archaeologists to take advantage of the financial resources that were increasingly available for undertaking and reviewing mandated compliance projects. This was

also a time when new investments were being made in public infrastructure — from wastewater treatment plants and sewer lines to the electrical power grid, municipal water reservoirs, and the nation’s highway system. In short, archaeologists increasingly were in demand and the money was flowing.

Coincidentally, Americanist archaeology in general was undergoing its own transformation during this period, as proponents of the “new” archaeology, with its focus on ecological issues, systems theory, statistical analysis, and the scientific method, challenged more traditional research emphases on archaeological culture definition and chronology building. In the North Carolina Piedmont, Joffre Coe and his students at UNC represented the traditional, or the status quo. It is no exaggeration that, in 1970, virtually everything known archaeologically about the North Carolina Piedmont was a direct result of archaeology conducted out of Chapel Hill. It is perhaps no surprise, then, that Coe would view with considerable suspicion the newly-arrived archaeologists at Wake Forest, Catawba College, UNC-G, and in both state government and private industry. North Carolina archaeology since the late 1930s had been a one-man show, and during the decade leading up to 1980, the archaeological community in North Carolina (and elsewhere) became much larger and intellectually more diverse. In many ways, Trawick’s chapter reflects this uneasy changing of the guard.

As I think most would agree, the old distinctions and dichotomies within archaeology, whether it be contract versus academic, or historic versus prehistoric or precontact archaeology, have become progressively blurred and today have little to do with the true nature of archaeology. We are all interested in what went on in the past, and why; and how we go about conducting our research, or how it is funded, is less important than what we actually learn.

The second thing that struck me about Trawick’s chapter was that many of the research problems he identified still remain. Perhaps the most important and relevant point he made is this: Regardless the question we are interesting in investigating, it is first necessary to acquire the appropriate archaeological data. While our theoretical frames of reference and the ways we structure our research questions may change, we will always need good data, because that is our tangible connection to the past. Without it to support our interpretations, we are just telling stories. In his concluding remarks, Trawick noted:

These comments are made not so much as substantive criticisms, but rather to point out that problems in understanding the cultural-systemic processes operative in the Piedmont do not revolve around whether questions are asked before or after the data are gathered or whether assumptions are called inductive statements or test implications. The problems are with the data base: the extent of what is preserved in a site and the integrity of its spatial context. Southeastern archaeological sites in general and Piedmont sites in particular, under the best conditions, contain only traces of a small fraction of material technology. If the chances for answering the more complex questions are to be maximized, efforts must be concentrated at sites that have maximum data for such questions. Simply rephrasing the questions will only continue to befuddle the issues. [Ward 1983:79–80]

My own take on the situation is that, over the past 30 years, archaeologists working in the Piedmont have heeded this advice, striving to identify and excavate those sites with the greatest potential to address the important questions at hand. And, as we heard in some of the presented papers, important archaeological information also remains to be “excavated” from existing archives and collections.

One final point I would like to make is this: We should never become complacent with what we think we know about the past. When we do, we deny ourselves the opportunity to learn

the unexpected. Each project we undertake should challenge us to question the status quo, not to be contrary or dismissive of the interpretations of previous researchers, but to see if our new data bring new insights. My own experiences, from the discovery of the Jenrette site where surface survey indicated there should be very little or nothing, to finding historic Catawba villages in places contrary to prevailing settlement models and conventional wisdom, have been sober reminders that there is always much more to learn about even some of our most basic assumptions.

Trawick's summary of Piedmont archaeology suggested that in 1980 we had a good basic understanding of the contact period, based on lengthy excavations at Upper Sauratown. During the subsequent two decades, Trawick and I, along with a group of remarkable graduate students, would demonstrate through the Siouan Project just how wrong that notion was. And in hindsight, we would be naïve if we thought that 20 years of excavations at a dozen sites was even barely sufficient to firmly grasp the many facets of this dynamic period of Indian history in the Piedmont.

Of the 11 papers presented in Chapel Hill, four are included in this volume under the heading Piedmont Symposium Chapters, and they cover the Piedmont Archaic, the Mississippian period, early Spanish explorations into the western Piedmont, and the archaeology of farmsteads and plantations in the historic era.

The following is a list of all the papers that were presented at the Piedmont Symposium:

A New Look at an Old Sequence: Time, Typology, and Intrusive Traditions in the Carolina Piedmont
I. Randolph Daniel, Jr.

Deep Testing for Archaeological Sites of the North Carolina Piedmont
Keith C. Seramur, Dawn M. Bradley, Loretta Lautzenheiser, and Susan E. Bamann

Schiele Museum Archaeology: Catawba Valley Red Hills and Brown Flood Plains
J. Alan May

Current Town Creek Research: What Do We Know after the First Fifty Years?
Edmond A. Boudreaux

The Burke Phase: Native Americans and Spanish Conquistadores in the Western North Carolina Piedmont
Christopher B. Rodning, David G. Moore, and Robin A. Beck, Jr.
An Update on the Dan River Phase
Jane M. Eastman

What Happens after Lawson? Archaeology of the Catawba Nation in the 18th and early 19th Centuries
Brett H. Riggs

Rediscovering Redwares from Piedmont North Carolina
Linda F. Carnes-McNaughton

Archaeology of Historic Farmsteads and Residential Sites in the North Carolina Piedmont:
1750–1825, Part I
Kenneth W. Robinson and Linda France Stine

Archaeology of Historic Farmsteads and Residential Sites in the North Carolina Piedmont:
1750–1825, Part II
Linda France Stine and Kenneth W. Robinson

Transportation Archaeology in the North Carolina Piedmont: A 21st-Century Perspective
Shane C. Petersen