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SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Most prehistoric sites within the New River Gorge National River (NERI) and Gauley River National Recreation Area (GARI), West Virginia represent short term use for hunting and gathering. Due to the rugged nature of the parks’ landscapes there are only a few areas where there is potential for locating village sites and base camps. While the New River served as a major corridor connecting the southeast and Atlantic coast with the Ohio Valley, the major Indian trails avoided the river and New River Gorge.

West Virginia and the upper and mid-Ohio Valley were depopulated prior to the arrival of Europeans during the Beaver Wars of the 1640s and 1650s, raids conducted by the Five Nations Iroquois to obtain furs for trade and captives to replenish Iroquoian population losses. For these reasons, modern Indian tribes cannot be associated with archeological assemblages with a high degree of accuracy.

During the Paleoindian period (10,500 to 9000 BC) NERI and GARI were sparsely utilized. Paleoindian bands were generally associated with high quality chert sources and no such sources are present in NERI or GARI. Based on the discontinuous distribution of Indian language groups and tribes at early contact, it is probable that during the early prehistoric periods NERI, GARI and much of the eastern United States were occupied and utilized by Proto Algonquian, Iroquoian and Siouan speakers. Given the nature of the study area and the lack of cultural continuity through time, in the event that burials are recovered from a Paleoindian context, consultation should proceed with all of the tribes listed in chapter five of this report.

During the Archaic period NERI and GARI were utilized for hunting and gathering by culturally diverse bands. Numerous projectile point types and differences in chert preferences indicate bands from areas to the west, south, and east used NERI and GARI. At the present time there is no demonstrated association between these bands and historic tribes. In the event that burials are recovered from an archaic context, consultation should proceed with all of the tribes listed in chapter five of this report.
During the Early Woodland and Middle Woodland periods NERI and GARI were utilized for hunting and gathering by culturally diverse bands. One earthen mound and five stone mounds have been recorded in NERI, but the other sites include sparsely occupied camps and rockshelters. There is no evidence of Classic Adena and Hopewell. Using NAGPRA’s ten lines of evidence there are few indications of cultural associations that can be connected to historical tribes in NERI and GARI. Future research may demonstrate associations of pottery with S-twist cordage and Algonquian tribes. Pottery with Z-twist cordage is associated with Late Prehistoric Siouan-speaking tribes and this may extend back into the Early Woodland period. In the event that burials are recovered from an Early or Middle Woodland context, consultation should proceed with all of the tribes listed in chapter five of this report.

The Late Woodland period (AD 400 to 1200) is characterized by the end of mound building and the termination of the Adena and Hopewell trade networks. In NERI and GARI sites consist of open camps and rockshelters. The major innovation during the Late Woodland is the introduction of the bow and arrow circa AD 700, which is associated with Jack’s Reef and Levanna points and Parkline pottery. Historical linguistic evidence indicates that the bow and arrow was introduced to Siouan bands by Algonquian speakers. Consultation with federally recognized tribes representing the Siouan-speaking Tutelo, Saponi, and possibly the Occaneechi based on the current tribal membership of these groups should include the Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma and the Cayuga Nation. Consultation with federally recognized tribes representing the Ohio Valley Siouan and Mississippi Valley Siouan Dhegiha Tribes should include the Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe of Louisiana, Quapaw Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma, Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, and Osage Nation, Oklahoma. Consultation with the Algonquian Tribes should include Absentee-Shawnee Tribe, Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, Shawnee Tribe, Delaware Nation, and the Delaware Tribe.

The Late Prehistoric period (AD 1200 to 1550) in this region is characterized by the appearance of shell tempered ceramics, several types of triangular arrow points, intensive corn agriculture, and village sites. Only one village site has been identified in NERI and none in GARI but both areas are within the range of annual hunting and gathering activities of Bluestone, Woodside, and Huffman phase villages. Based on burial orientation, cordage twist patterns, decorated pottery, and historical linguistics all three of these phases represent eastern Siouan tribes. Consultation with federally recognized
tribes representing the Tutelo, Saponi, and possibly the Occaneechi based on the current tribal membership of these groups should include the Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma and the Cayuga Nation. Consultation with the Ohio Valley Siouan Language tribes and Dhegihan Siouan Language tribes should include the Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe, Quapaw Tribe, Omaha Tribe, and Osage Nation.

The Early Contact period represents an extension of the Late Prehistoric period during which European trade goods, but not European documents, were present in this region. During the Early Contact period (AD 1550 to 1671), based on the presence of European trade goods in the Kanawha Valley including a top-view lizard/beaver effigy and an Iroquoian pipe, tribes potentially associated with NERI and GARI include the Iroquoian tribes listed in chapter five.

Based on burial orientation, cordage twist patterns, decorated pottery, oral tradition, and historical linguistics, the tribes potentially associated with NERI and GARI include the Ohio Valley Siouan Language tribes and Dhegihan Siouan Language tribes (Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe, Quapaw Tribe, Omaha Tribe, and Osage Nation). Consultation with federally recognized tribes representing the Virginia Siouan tribes, Tutelo, Saponi, and possibly the Occaneechi, based on the current tribal membership of these groups should include the Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma and the Cayuga Nation.

During the Contact period (AD 1671 onwards), based on historical records and treaties, the federally recognized tribes potentially associated with NERI and GARI are the Iroquoian Tribes (Tuscarora Nation, Tonawanda Band of Seneca, Seneca Nation of Indians, St. Regis Mohawk Tribe, Onondaga Indian Nation, Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma, Cayuga Nation, Oneida Nation of New York, and Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin), the Cherokee Tribes (Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, Cherokee Nation, and United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians), and certain Algonquian Tribes (Absenee-Shawnee Tribe, Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, Shawnee Tribe, Delaware Nation, and Delaware Tribe).
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CHAPTER ONE
STUDY OVERVIEW

As part of its ongoing consultation responsibilities under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (25 USC 3001 et seq., Nov. 16, 1990), the National Park Service (NPS) contracted with the Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology (BARA) at the University of Arizona under Cooperative Agreement Number H1200050003 to conduct a cultural affiliation investigation for the New River Gorge National River (NERI) and Gauley River National Recreation Area (GARI) (see Figure 1). The authorizing legislation for NERI (P.L. 95-625, Nov. 10, 1978, 92 Stat. 3544; 16 USC § 460m-15) states its purpose as being to conserve and interpret “outstanding natural, scenic, and historic values and objects in and around the New River Gorge and preserve as a free-flowing stream an important segment of the New River in West Virginia for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.” The authorizing legislation for GARI (P.L. 100-534, Oct. 26, 1988, 102 Stat. 2702; 16 USC § 460www) states its purpose as “to protect and preserve the scenic, recreational, geological, and fish and wildlife resources of the Gauley River and its tributary, the Meadow River.”

Both park units emphasize ecological protection and recreational opportunities while recognizing important cultural aspects of local history. In the 2009 Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for New River Gorge National River, the purposes of New River Gorge National River were clarified to:

- preserve an important free-flowing segment of New River
- preserve, protect, and conserve outstanding resources and values in and around New River Gorge, including geologic and hydrologic features, terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, historic and archeological resources, cultural heritage, and scenic character, and
provide opportunities for public understanding, appreciation, and enjoyment of the park’s natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources and values.

The inclusion of cultural heritage and archeological resources reflects a recognition of the cultural foundations of the area. While resources related to 19th and 20th century history and culture are fundamentally significant, the indigenous cultures, history, and archeology are recognized as important resources and values. At NERI, recent ethnohistoric (Hufford 2007) and archeological research (Pollack and Crothers 2005a, 2005b) reflects efforts to attend to this need. While these reports touch on the Native American history of the area, this document provides a more detailed view of the indigenous cultural groups which may be culturally affiliated with Native American cultural items excavated or discovered unintentionally in the park units in the future.

**Project Scope and Methodology**

The primary objective of this report is to provide information about all federally recognized tribes who were identified during the research as having ancestors who may have used and/or occupied the NERI and GARI park units so that park personnel can carry out their responsibilities under NAGPRA for consultations and, if appropriate, disposition of Native American cultural items (human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony) to Indian tribes, should any such items be discovered and removed in the future. While the park hopes that Native American burial sites will never be disturbed, and all Native American remains uncovered accidentally can be left in situ, the park also recognizes a need to be prepared in the event that such incidents may occur inadvertently or as the result of a planned activity. If Native American cultural items are discovered inadvertently, or there is the potential for such disturbance through a planned activity, NAGPRA requires rapid notification of and consultations with culturally affiliated Indian tribes. If cultural items are removed from the ground, they belong to the culturally affiliated tribes and disposition will be arranged through consultation with those tribes. For these reasons, the NPS is seeking information about the potential cultural affiliation of Indian tribes with human remains and cultural items that may, in the future, be discovered within NERI and GARI. While the study does not specifically include the Bluestone National Scenic River, the findings can be applied to this area also.
This report is based on a major literature review conducted by BARA, supplemented with additional sources identified by the author, which have been critically evaluated and distilled for appropriate information. Documentary information and data were pulled from as many relevant sources as possible to identify potentially culturally affiliated tribes based on at least one of ten types of evidence identified in
NAGPRA regulations: anthropological, archeological, biological, folklore, geographical, historical, kinship, linguistic, oral tradition evidence, or expert opinion. This report is organized by time periods identified through archeological evidence, the lines of evidence for Native American occupation and use of park lands in the past. It summarizes the available types of evidence for each period, giving particular attention to the information that pertains to potential relationships of shared group identity between identifiable earlier groups and modern day American Indian tribes, and identifies the contemporary federally recognized Indian tribes with potential cultural affiliation with park resources. All lines of evidence are presented. In some cases the lines of evidence are complementary, but in other cases they may be contradictory. This is to be expected at this level of analysis.

At the end of each time period a section on Implications for Cultural Affiliation is included, which lists federally recognized tribes that should be consulted. For the early time periods all tribes listed in chapter five should be consulted since the archeological evidence cannot be associated with contemporary tribes with any degree of accuracy. Given the discontinuous distribution of Indian language groups and tribes at early contact, it is probable that during the early prehistoric periods NERI, GARI and much of the eastern United States was occupied and utilized by Proto Algonquian, Iroquoian, and Siouan speakers. The tribes listed in chapter five represent those tribes that have historical connections with the region, appear to have some connections to the archeology of NERI and GARI, or have previously expressed and interest in West Virginia based on consultations with the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and Federal Highways Administration.

State recognized tribes and descendant groups who attach cultural and religious significance to the park units due to their association with former inhabitants of the region found during the course of the research are mentioned but not included for official consultation under NAGPRA. While the focus of the research was on the park units, the units do not exist in a vacuum. Information relevant to the surrounding landscape and region, where a great deal of tribal interactions and movements occurred and influenced use of the park areas, is included as well.

Most prehistoric sites within the two parks represent short term use for hunting and gathering. Due to the rugged nature of the parks’ landscapes there are only a few areas where there is potential for locating village sites and base camps. While the New
River served as a major corridor connecting the southeast and Atlantic coast with the Ohio Valley, the major Indian trails (Figure 2) avoided the river and New River Gorge. As Hufford (2007:27) noted, mountain trails often ran along higher ground and ridges “where the undergrowth was not so dense, and where there were fewer streams to cross.” The west branch of the Great Indian War Path (Figure 2, trail 31) may pass through parts of NERI.

West Virginia and the upper and mid-Ohio Valley were depopulated prior to the arrival of Europeans during the Beaver Wars of the 1640s and 1650s, raids conducted by the Five Nations Iroquois to obtain furs for trade and captives to replenish Iroquois population losses (Richter 2003:20). These raids resulted in the elimination of many tribes and the migration of tribes, groups, and individuals (including captives) over long distances that are only beginning to be understood and documented. For these reasons, contemporary Indian tribes cannot be associated with archeological assemblages in NERI and GARI with any degree of accuracy.
Given the history of the area and the nature of the landscape, a multi-scalar approach (Nassaney and Sassaman 1995, Miroff and Knapp 2009) will be used, starting with specific sites and artifacts found in the park and their relationship to sites and cultural complexes in the immediate area and surrounding regions. Using the ten lines of evidence referenced in the NAGPRA regulations, it may eventually be possible to associate some archeological complexes with historical tribes or linguistic groups. Using multiple lines of evidence is not a new approach. Crumley (1995) cites Walter Taylor (1948) who “stresses the importance of multiple lines of evidence, an integrative perspective, and an emphasis on popular rather than elite traditions.” This was Taylor’s Conjunctive Approach that has been largely panned by postmodern archeologists, but is useful for the purposes of NAGPRA.

There are many problems with the archeological terminology used in West Virginia, Virginia, and the Ohio Valley. Many of these problems result from early attempts to organize data and develop formal descriptive units that led to the adoption of the Midwestern Taxonomic Method that was formalized by McKern (1939). Archeologists are the first to admit that these archeological units, such as Fort Ancient, Woodland, Hopewell, and Adena, were created to organize archeological data, are arbitrary, and do not necessarily represent prehistoric cultural or ethnic groups.

The chronological sequence used in this report (Table 1) was adapted from the West Virginia Encyclopedia (Maslowski 2006b:583). All radiocarbon dates are calibrated in terms of calendar years Anno Domini (AD) and Before Christ (BC) (Maslowski et al. 1995:5).

Table 1. Chronology used in this report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paleoindian</td>
<td>(10,500-9000 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
<td>(9000-6000 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Archaic</td>
<td>(6000-3000 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>(3000-1000 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Woodland</td>
<td>(1000-200 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Woodland</td>
<td>(200 BC-AD 400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>(AD 400-1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Prehistoric</td>
<td>(AD 1200-1550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Contact</td>
<td>(AD 1550-1671)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>(AD 1671 onwards)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While attempts to project ethnicity into prehistory remain as Engelbrecht (2003:128) notes “problematic”, there are correlations between material culture,
language, biology, and behavior that may reflect a shared group identity at some level. Behavioral traits that often reflect a shared group identity are simple traits that may be overlooked or go unrecorded in the archeological analysis. Some of the traits used in this study are burial orientation, cordage twist, specific ceramic decorations, and chert utilization patterns.

For example Pearson (2000:6) suggests that orientation of a burial is an important feature that may reflect religious beliefs. Many attributes of burials traditionally recorded, such as the presence of diagnostic pottery and pipes do give indications of cultural affiliation. The presence and abundance of grave goods has traditionally been used to determine social status. The presence of marine shell and European trade good often are used to reconstruct trade networks. Burial orientation, however, is one of the few attributes that carries over to historical tribes.

Several Late Prehistoric and Early Contact village sites in southern West Virginia have the majority of the burials with the heads toward the east (Table 2). Based on settlement placement and diagnostic artifacts, Buffalo, Rolfe Lee, Mount Carbon, and Burning Springs Branch are closely related and culturally distinct from Orchard, a Madisonville site. This is reflected in the burial orientation at the sites.

Table 2. Late Prehistoric and Early Contact sites showing percentage of burials with heads to the east

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>46PU31</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>Hanson 1975:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolfe Lee</td>
<td>46MS51</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>Youse 1965:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Carbon</td>
<td>46FA7</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>Broyles 1973:5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning Spring Branch</td>
<td>46KA143</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Pullins et al. 2008:745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>46MS61</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>Broyles 1973:61-67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the ethnographic record (Voegelin 1944:348, table x), tribes that bury their dead with heads to the east include Kickapoo, Winnebago, Delaware, Alabama, Omaha, and Kansa. Tribes that bury with the heads to the west include Sauk, Fox, Potawatomi, Seneca, Shawnee, Yuchi, Creek, and Chickasaw.

In some cases burial orientations have changed through time. Among the Seneca there is a shift in burial orientation with the head toward the west (Engelbrecht 2003:66).
This shift in burial orientation appears to be widespread in the Northeast in the 16th century (Engelbrecht 2003:66-67; Axtell 1981:116).

Shawnee burials have traditionally been placed in the grave with the heads to the west (Howard 1981:147; Voegelin 1944:143-147) and there is no evidence of change in burial orientation over time. Howard (1981:149-150) indicates that the western burial orientation is one of the traits that is shared by all five Shawnee divisions whereas other traits are common to one, two or three of the divisions. Voegelin (1944:378-379) attributes this stability in mortuary rites to a general cultural conservatism and multiple but brief contacts with neighbors during their migrations.

In terms of anthropological evidence, the orientation of a burial or predominate orientation of a group of burials (east or west) might favor one group of tribes over the other groups.

Cordage twist analysis is another attribute that is potentially useful in determining ethnicity or shared group identity at various levels. Cordage twist analysis of Ohio Valley pottery began in the 1970s as an attempt to make attribute analysis of undecorated pottery more meaningful. Studies have shown that cordage twist when combined with pottery attributes and other artifact analyses can be a useful tool for demonstrating ethnicity, migration, and social interaction patterns (Carr and Maslowski 1995; Maslowski 1996; Peterson and Wolford 2000).

A commonly reported technique of cordage making in North America involves the manual rolling of fibers down the right thigh with the palm of the hand, which produces an initial S-spin, and then plying two or more yarns by rolling them up the thigh, which produces a final Z-twist. This technique is described for the Zuni (Stevenson 1915:78), Pueblo groups (Underhill 1944:30), Paiutes (Wheat 1967:52), coastal Virginia Indians (Strachey 1953:75; Smith 1910:69), and Chippewa and other tribes of the eastern woodlands (Jones 1936).

Minar (2001, 2000) has demonstrated that final twist direction in cordage is a conservative and persistent attribute. Once a twist direction is established within a group, it is maintained by the teaching and learning process, and reinforced by the development of motor skills that are necessary for efficient production. In some cases it is also reinforced by cultural beliefs about the directionality to assure that the “right” way to spin is conserved (Minar 2000:99). In reviewing Newton’s (1974) research on the Timbira Hammock as a cultural indicator of social boundaries, Minar (2000:95) found
that of the seven attributes studied, only two distinguished one group from another, cordage twist direction and twining slant direction. As Minar notes, these are the only two attributes that are motor-skill dependent. In non-industrial societies, motor skills are learned at an early age and are generally practiced throughout one’s life.

In New England Petersen and Wolford (2000:105) have demonstrated that the Late Prehistoric St. Lawrence Iroquois had a preference for Z-twist cordage while the Late Archaic Moorehead Phase, early eastern and western Abnaki, and non-coastal dwelling historical Malecite had a preference for S-twist cordage. In New England this would suggest a correlation between Iroquoian speakers and Z-twist cordage and Algonquian speakers and S-twist cordage, but the historical Passamaquoddy (Algonquian speakers) had a preference for Z-twist cordage.

Minar (2001:108) stresses that final twist directions reflect communities of practice. These are not necessarily ethnic groups but could be a family group, a clan, or even men only or women only groups. She gives the example of Kogi males and females who spin in the opposite directions (Reichel-Dolmatoff 1949-1950).

In Petersen and Wolford’s (2000) New England examples the differences in Algonquian cordage twist patterns may reflect different histories. If bands or tribes marry with neighbors that have the same cordage preferences there will be no noticeable change in twist patterns. If they marry with neighbors that have the opposite pattern a person will teach that pattern to their children and a new community of practice will be developed within that band, tribe, or village. There will be a gradual shift in the percentages of S- and Z-twist cordage within that community. If women are responsible for making most of the cordage, one would expect more continuity in cordage twist patterns if the band or tribe had a matrilocal residence pattern and more mixture of cordage twist preferences if the residence pattern was patrilocal.

These examples reinforce the point that cordage twist direction cannot be used by itself to delineate ethnic groups or social boundaries, but can be a powerful method of analysis when combined with other traits. Combined with genetic, anthropological, linguistic, and other archeological evidence, cordage twist direction can be used to demonstrate and interpret shared group identities on various levels such as bands or tribes.
CHAPTER TWO
PRE-CONTACT PERIOD

Paleoindian (10,500–9000 BC)

An archeological overview of NERI was done by Pollack and Crothers (2005a, 2005b). An archeological reconnaissance was done for GARI by Burdin (2004).

Based upon current genetic, archeological, and environmental evidence the first humans began to colonize the Americas about 15,000 years ago (Malakoff 2008:27). A commonly held view is that people migrated from Siberia into the Americas over the Bering Land Bridge during the last glacial period. MtDNA studies have defined haplogroups A, B, C, D, and X, which are genetic markers characteristic of Native American populations. The distribution of these genetic markers suggests that Native American people came from Central Siberia, Southeastern Siberia, and northern China (Adovasio and Pedler 2005:40-41).

Dennis Stanford’s Solutrean Hypothesis proposes that some early Americans, the ancestors of the Clovis, came from Western Europe. He and his allies argue, “stone artifacts found at pre-Clovis sites like Cactus Hill in central Virginia appear to have been worked in a style that combines Clovis and Solutrean technologies” (Malakoff 2008:27). Part of his argument is based on the distribution of fluted points, which is centered in the eastern United States rather than in the west. In terms of genetics, Haplogroup X, which is found among Algonquian speakers, is trans-Eurasiatic in occurrence (Adovasio and Pedler 2005:41). Stanford's transatlantic route could have provided another point of entry for Haplogroup X into the Americas (Adovasio and Pedler 2005:44).

The earliest cultural material identified in NERI and GARI is Clovis that dates to approximately 10,500 BC. No pre-Clovis sites or artifacts have been identified in West Virginia and, as Figure 3 shows, relatively few Clovis points have been recorded there.
Figure 3. Fluted point distribution (Malakoff 2008:28).

Figure 4. Clovis point and unifacial scraper from New Richmond Bottoms site (Fuerst 2002:54).
There are two Paleoindian components recorded in NERI (Pollack and Crothers 2005a:21-22) and none in GARI. A Clovis Point and unifacial scraper (Figure 4) were found in 1980 during the construction of the I-64 bridge at the New Richmond Bottoms site (46SU104). The chert used for the two artifacts was identified as possible Hillsdale or Huntersville chert (Holland 2001:20-21). The two nearest outcrops of these cherts are located about 50 miles east and about 50 miles south of the site (Fuerst 2002:54-55).
Meadow Creek Bottoms (46Su107) is about three kilometers downstream of the New Richmond Bottoms site and similar in landform location and temporal affiliation. The two sites are located toward the south end of the park (Figure 5), and are approximately five miles apart (McBride 2005a:68).

McMichael (1965:76) found only a few possible Paleoindian artifacts in Nicholas County, West Virginia, which he attributed to a lack of territory used by large herd animals.

Current interpretations suggest that eastern Clovis was more sedentary than first thought (Malakoff 2008:29). It has been established that the large Clovis sites in the east were connected to quarry sites that produced high grade flint and chert (Malakoff 2008:30; Carskadden 2004).

[Figure 6. Major chert sources (Pullins et al. 2008:21).]

Studying sites in the Shenandoah Valley, Gardner (1977:257-258, 1987, 1989:12-13) found Paleoindian settlements to be situated near specific resources, such as jasper outcrops that provided material for tool manufacture. Carr (1983:155) specified quarries as central to Paleoindian settlement. Gardner has gone so far as to suggest that for early Paleoindians, chert was the most critical of all resources (Custer 1984:51). The correlation between concentrations of early Paleoindian sites and chert outcrops has
been previously documented for Coshocton County, Ohio (Prufer 1971; Seeman and Prufer 1982; Lepper 1986, 1988), where over 300 fluted points have been collected. This is in the area of the high quality Flint Ridge and Upper Mercer flint quarries (Figure 6).

Gardner (1987:17-19, 1989) suggested that the use of local chert is an indication that West Virginia Paleoindians did not have to travel great distances for hunting or procuring raw materials; however, many of these early studies did not identify specific cherts or quarry sites. West Virginia does not have much in the way of high quality chert resources and more recent studies suggest that fluted points in West Virginia are generally made of non-local cherts (see Figure 6).

Figure 7. Mid-Paleoindian culture areas (Anderson 1995:10)
According to Anderson (1996:36), Paleoindian groups established staging areas from which the surrounding region was settled. He identified two cultural areas near NERI and GARI whose populations are likely candidates for activities along the Kanawha-New and Gauley Rivers. One of these areas was northwest along the Ohio River, and the other one was east in the Shenandoah Valley (Figure 7). The area along the Ohio River was associated with the high quality flint and chert deposits of central Ohio while the other was most likely associated with Virginia quarry sites.

Gardner (1974, 1977, 1989) found evidence of Paleoindian settlement systems at Flint Run in the middle Shenandoah Valley, which could be part of Anderson’s staging area. Anderson (1995:5, 1996:36) also identified rivers as central to expanding Paleoindian populations (McBride 2005a:63-65) and the highest concentration of fluted points in West Virginia occurs in counties along the Ohio and Kanawha rivers.

**Implications for Cultural Affiliation**

Based on the available evidence for the Paleoindian period there are no indications of cultural associations that can be connected to historical tribes in NERI and GARI. All tribes listed in chapter five should be consulted since the archeological evidence cannot be associated with contemporary tribes. Given the discontinuous distribution of Indian language groups and tribes at early contact, it is probable that during the early prehistoric periods NERI, GARI and much of the eastern United States was occupied and utilized by Proto Algonquian, Iroquoian and Siouan speakers.

**Early Archaic (9000–6000 BC)**

Around 9000 BC there is a transition in West Virginia from Paleoindian to the Early Archaic (Figure 8) that is characterized by the utilization of more local cherts and the development of several regional projectile point styles. While fluted points are found over all of North America, distinct regional styles of projectile points such as the fluted and unfluted Dalton (Figure 8) and Hardaway and Palmer (Figure 9) begin to develop during the Early Archaic period. Styles become more pronounced and localized during the Middle and Late Archaic.

There are 85 sites with Archaic components in NERI. These include 24 Early Archaic components, 21 Middle Archaic components, and 51 Late Archaic components. No Early Archaic Sites have been found in GARI to date but this is largely due to a lack of
archeological surveys. Burdin (2004) indicates that there were no previously recorded sites in GARI and only 799 acres (7.0%) of the 11,145 acres in GARI were surveyed (Burdin 2004:1).

Figure 8. Chronology of southeastern Paleo points (Anderson 1990:165).
Early Archaic components in NERI were identified on the basis of dated projectile point types. Palmer, Charleston Corner Notched, Kirk Corner Notched, Kirk Stemmed, Big Sandy, St Albans, LeCroy, Kanawha, and Amos projectile points (Figure 9) were documented in NERI (Fuerst 1981). The 24 Early Archaic components include the Taylor site (46FA191) and the Headquarters site (46FA190), which are located at Glen Jean (Alterman 1997), nine rockshelters, seven sites located on terraces, three sites on benches, and three sites on ridgetops (McBride 2005b:77; Fuerst 1981).

Figure 9. Projectile points from St. Albans and North Carolina sites (Broyles 1966:39).
Models of Early Archaic lifeways and settlement patterns portray the people as highly mobile hunters and gatherers (Anderson 1996; Barber 2003; Jefferies 1996; Kimball 1996). They lived in small camps and rockshelters for short periods and subsisted on deer and other animals and on plant foods and nuts. In NERI the Early Archaic sites are located on several landforms, but all sites are small camps. The Early Archaic people and many of the later groups in NERI appear to have relied on Kanawha Black chert for tool manufacture (Pollack and Crothers 2005a:13, Whyte et al. 1991:8). The Kanawha Black chert deposits (Figure 6) are located in Boone, Clay, Fayette, Kanawha, Nicholas and Webster counties, north of NERI (Holland 2001:21). GARI, in Nicholas County, however, is located within the area of Kanawha Black chert deposits.

GAI consultants did extensive studies in Nicholas County for the Corridor L and Robinson North highway projects located just north of GARI (MacDonald et al. 2006). While Kanawha Black chert remained the most used chert, Hillsdale, Upper Mercer and other non-local cherts were also used throughout most of the temporal sequence. They propose a Three-Tier Mobility Model that includes micromovement, mesomovement, and macromovement. Micromovement occurs during a daily subsistence round. Mesomovement is roughly equivalent to the yearly extended range of hunting and gathering activities. Macromovement involves exploratory travel to distant locations that could consist of males looking for mates (MacDonald et al. 2006:130), and in later periods trade, raiding and warfare.

![Graph showing cumulative projectile points by period for Phase II Corridor L sites.](image-url)

Figure 10. Cumulative projectile points by period, Phase II Corridor L sites (MacDonald et al. 2006:127).
The cumulative projectile point counts for Phase II Corridor L sites (Figure 10) are similar though not identical to the distribution of archaic components in NERI. Both show a decrease during the Middle Archaic and a steep increase during the Late Archaic.

The Nicholas County data suggest two different patterns of chert utilizations over the course of the Holocene (Figure 11). The Corridor L data suggests mesomovement use of the area by bands connected to the Hillsdale deposits 50 km (30 mi) east along the Greenbrier River (MacDonald et al. 2006:131). The Robinson North data suggests more macromovement connected to the Ohio River Valley where high quality Upper Mercer cobble cherts were collected from river deposits (MacDonald et al. 2006:132). The sites recorded in GARI had 97.6% Kanawha Black Flint, 1.7% Hillsdale, .18% Paoli, and .52% unidentified (Schlarb 2004:123), which indicates a pattern of micromovement for local bands associated with the upper Kanawha Valley.
involved in daily hunting and gathering activities. It also indicates minor mesomovement involving bands from the Greenbrier area to the east and bands from Kentucky to the southwest. The early archeological reports for NERI did not contain detailed lithic source information. In the future, these old collections should be reanalyzed to determine the lithic utilization patterns and how they change through time.

**Implications for Cultural Affiliation**

Based on the available evidence for the Early Archaic period there are no indications of cultural associations that can be connected to historical tribes in NERI and GARI. All tribes listed in chapter five should be consulted since the archeological evidence cannot be associated with contemporary tribes.

**Middle Archaic (6000–3000 BC)**

In addition to changes in projectile point styles, Middle Archaic artifact assemblages are distinguished from earlier assemblages by the introduction of a variety of new tools (Jefferies 1996:48). Groundstone implements such as full grooved and ¾ grooved axes, nutting stones, and grinding stones, used for processing plant foods, become more common during this time period. Stone pestles which were common in Kentucky and central Ohio are rare in West Virginia and appear to be absent in NERI and GARI.

Within NERI, 21 Middle Archaic sites have been documented (McBride 2005b:82; Fuerst 1981). No Middle Archaic sites were recorded in GARI. Projectile points recovered from these sites span the entire period and include Stanly, Morrow Mountain, Guilford, Brewerton, and Big Sandy II point styles (Fuerst 1981). Thirteen of the 21 sites are rockshelters. The other landforms are upland stream juncture, terrace, upland bench, ridgetop, and lowland rockshelter. These landforms each had one or two sites (Fuerst 1981). Within NERI, Middle Archaic sites show a strong preference for rockshelters, compared to Early and Late Archaic sites.

While Middle Archaic people continued a hunting and gathering way of life, exploitation of plant food and aquatic resources increased during this period in Tennessee, Kentucky, and southern Illinois, reflecting larger populations and possibly increased sedentism in those locations (Crothers and Bernbeck 2004; Jefferies 1996; Lewis and Lewis 1961; Marquardt and Watson 1983). There have been no such sites...
found in NERI. Instead, the people utilizing NERI during the Middle Archaic were still highly mobile and lived in small groups, as evidenced by a preference for establishing camps in rockshelters.

**Implications for Cultural Affiliation**

Based on the available evidence for the Middle Archaic period there are no indications of cultural associations that can be connected to historical tribes in NERI and GARI. All tribes listed in chapter five should be consulted since the archeological evidence cannot be associated with specific contemporary tribes.

**Late Archaic (3000–1000 BC)**

A survey of GARI located three Late Archaic sites (Burdin 2004:115, table 6). All of the sites are open habitation sites and are located on a terrace, a ridgetop, and a hillside, respectively. A single diagnostic point was found at each site: two Buffalo Stemmed and a Lamoka-like point (Burdin 2004). The limited number of artifacts, lack of midden and features suggests that these sites were short-term limited activity camps (McBride 2005b:88).

NERI contains 51 Late Archaic sites (McBride 2005b:88; Fuerst 1981). Of these, 21 are associated with rockshelters and 18 sites are located on terraces and upland stream junctures. Some of the sites are multi-component, while others only contain a Late Archaic component. The point types recovered include Brewerton, Lamoka, Savannah River, Perkiomen, Susquehanna, Piedmont Stemmed, Buffalo Stemmed, Orient Fishtail, and Merom point types (McBride 2005b:88; Fuerst 1981). The Susquehanna, Perkiomen, Lamoka, and Orient fishtail suggest Northeastern influences, while the Savannah River points are associated with the Southeast (Coe 1964; Justice 1987; Ritchie 1961). The single Merom point suggests influences from around the Charleston area or the Ohio River (Jeffries 1996; Justice 1987; Pullins et al. 2008:552).

When Middle Archaic Guilford points and Late Archaic Morrow Mountain and Savannah River points appear in the New River area, they most likely represent movement of bands from Virginia, Tennessee, and the Carolinas to the south into the New River Area. The majority of these points are made of quartzite (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1979:16) or siliceous shale and many of the sites are characterized by the presence of siliceous shale debitage. Johnson (1984:123-127) identifies one Morrow
Mountain I-like point, two Guilfords, and four Savannah River-like points from 46SU9 in the Bluestone Reservation. One was made of sandstone while the others were made of quartzite or siliceous shale. This non-chert utilization pattern associated with these point types is most commonly found to the east and south of NERI.

While most of what is known about the Late Archaic period in NERI comes from survey data, two sites (Taylor and Headquarters) excavated at Glen Jean in Fayette County had Late Archaic components (Alterman 1997). The Taylor site (46FA191) Late Archaic artifact assemblage consisted of a Savannah River stemmed point and two unnamed stemmed points, debitage, and fire-cracked rock (Alterman 1997:74).

The Headquarters site (46FA190) also produced Savannah River, Late Archaic Stemmed, and Lamoka-like points (Alterman 1997:84-85). The limited number of features and the quantities and range of debitage at both of the Glen Jean sites indicate that lithic reduction and tool maintenance were conducted at these sites (Alterman 1997:98).

During the Terminal Late Archaic steatite bowls and sandstone bowls appear in Late Archaic sites along the upper Kanawha River about 1200 to 1000 BC (Pullins et al. 2008:929; Youse 1976:68, 1992). The steatite comes from east of the Allegheny Mountains and to some degree correlates with the introduction of Susquehanna, Perkiomen, and Orient Fishtail points. Whether the appearance of steatite bowls represents migration of eastern bands, trade, or macromovement of Kanawha Valley bands cannot be determined at this time, but the few steatite bowls were rapidly replaced by bowls made of local sandstone.

Two steatite sherds were recovered from Phase II testing at the Headquarters site (46FA190B) in NERI (Henderson 2005a:111; Alterman 1997). Henderson (2005a:111-112, table 6.2), however, uses a different chronology and places steatite bowls along with Ashtabula, Orient Fishtail, Perkiomen, and Susquehanna points as diagnostic of the Early Woodland period.

The association of steatite sherds with these point types suggests the presence of a cultural group with shared group identity that originates in the eastern Pennsylvania area, but at the present time this cultural group cannot be associated with a particular tribe or linguistic group.

The Late Archaic is interesting from a linguistic perspective. For purposes of culture-historic inference Foster (1996:67) places the limit at about 6000 years due to the
ceiling set by glottochronology, which has a range of applicability of 5000 years or the beginning of the Late Archaic, 3000 BC. Sapir (1929) and Voegelin and Voegelin (1965) produced maps depicting higher-order linguistic groupings and both show NERI and GARI and much of Appalachia as blank (Foster 1996:67-69). In Sapir’s (1929) map (Foster 1996:68) Appalachia, NERI, and GARI are basically bordered by Algonkin-Wakashan and Hokan-Siouan, which included Iroquoian. In Voegelin and Voegelin’s (1965) map (Foster 1996:69) the same area is bordered by Macro-Algonquian and Macro-Siouan, which again includes Iroquoian.

The split between Northern Iroquoian and Southern Iroquoian (Cherokee) is estimated at 1800 to 1500 BC (Foster 1996:105). Proto-Macro-Siouan existed by 2000 BC and possibly as early as 4000 BC (Foster 1996:103). Proto-Algonquian terms for plants and animals suggest a homeland in the Great Lakes area at about 1200 BC (Foster 1996:99).

Implications for Cultural Affiliation

Based on the available evidence for the Late Archaic period there are no indications of cultural associations that can be connected to historical tribes in NERI and GARI. All tribes listed in chapter five should be consulted since the archeological evidence cannot be associated with contemporary tribes. Given the discontinuous distribution of Indian language groups and tribes at early contact, it is probable that during the early prehistoric periods NERI, GARI and much of the eastern United States was occupied and utilized by Proto Algonquian, Iroquoian and Siouan speakers.

Early Woodland (1000–200 BC)

Our knowledge of Early Woodland peoples in regions surrounding NERI/GARI is based largely on the excavations of burial mounds. While diagnostic Early Woodland artifacts are often found in rockshelters and multi-component open habitation sites, few habitation sites have been thoroughly studied in West Virginia.

Mink and Crothers (2005:13-14) report 32 Early Woodland sites for NERI and a 1-km buffer surrounding the park boundary while Henderson (2005a:111), using another chronological sequence, reports 21 sites with Early Woodland components based on the presence of diagnostic projectile points. These include 12 open camp sites, 8 rockshelters, and one site that was unidentified according to type. Henderson
places 5 stone mounds and one earthen mound in the Middle Woodland period but indicates that no temporally diagnostic artifacts have been recovered from these mounds so their temporal placement is questionable.

One Early Woodland site (46NI584) was recorded in GARI (Schlarb 2004:115, table 6). This was an open habitation site Burdin 2004:60) that had one Adena Stemmed Point and a Late Archaic Buffalo Stemmed point (Schlarb 2004:115)

In West Virginia and much of the eastern United States, the Early Woodland period is characterized by the introduction of pottery and burial mounds. Pottery preceded burial mounds by several hundred years in West Virginia. Early pottery types recorded in northern West Virginia include Adena Plain and Half-Moon Cordmarked. Both are characterized by thick walls and heavy grit tempering. At the Winfield Lock site on the Kanawha River, Half-Moon Cordmarked var. Winfield was radiocarbon dated to 911 BC (Pullins et al. 2008:61; Hughes and Niquette 1992:199). Other dates for Half-Moon Cordmarked include 500 BC for the Crawford-Gist site near Pittsburgh (Pullins et al. 2008:60; Grantz 1986) and 800 to 1500 BC for Meadowcroft Rockshelter (Pullins et al. 2008:60). The most reliable dates fall between 1000 and 500 BC.

While no Early Woodland pottery has been reported from NERI and GARI, McMichael (1965:96) reported 21 heavy grit-tempered sherds in his Nicholas County survey, most with interior cordmarking that was similar to Half-Moon Cordmarked from northern West Virginia and Vinette I, the earliest pottery type from New York State.

Besides conical earthen burial mounds, classic Adena also produced the first smoking pipes in West Virginia and the use of tobacco (Rafferty 2001:296-298), evidence of textiles (Figure 12), artistic artifacts like stone tablets believed to be fabric stamps, and evidence of an extensive trade network involving marine shell, copper, and mica.

Adena (Clay 2002, 2005) and for that matter, Hopewell, Fort Ancient, and Monongahela, are no longer considered cultures. Adena may be better viewed as a burial tradition, with many local variations used by different ethnic groups. Clay (2005:107) suggests that archeologists “return to the field and develop local sequences of archeological sites that express space/time variation in human behavior.”
As an example, Rafferty (2005:167) did a comparison of six burial mounds, two in northern West Virginia, two in the Scioto Valley of Ohio and two in the Licking River area of Kentucky, and found evidence of three distinct regional differences in the ritual practices associated with death and mound burial.

One anthropological characteristic overlooked in the study of Adena burials is the interpretation of burial orientation. As Pearson (2000:6) suggests, “orientation of the burial is an important feature that may reflect religious beliefs.” For the Late Prehistoric period Means (2007) used rose plots to demonstrate that Late Prehistoric Monongahela villages in the Allegheny Mountains of Pennsylvania have a preference for placing burials with the heads pointed toward the east.

Gruber (1971) demonstrates a similar preference at the Late Prehistoric Mohr site, a Shenks Ferry Village in eastern Pennsylvania. He demonstrated that 90% of the burials fell within the solar arc, the rising position of the sun on the horizon (Gruber 1971:67). Plotting the position on the solar arc would give an indication of the season when the individual died and the burial occurred. Gruber (1971:72) interpreted the rose plot to indicate that there were two periods of high mortality, late July and August and late March and April, which were generally periods of food shortage for simple horticultural villages.

Webb and Elliot (1942:421) constructed a rose diagram for the Robbins Mound in Boone County, Kentucky, (Figure 13) and noted “a conspicuous maxim for
orientation E 30 degrees North.” While there is a definite preference for a burial orientation with heads to the east, there are also burials with heads to the north, south, and west. The Wright mounds also had a preference for burials with heads to the east. Of the 16 burials, 11 had the heads to the east, two north, two south, and one west (Webb 1940:111). This supports Clay’s theory that mounds did not serve as the ritual centers for Adena group territories, but were the final resting places for the dead of composite groups and represented compromise localities in space, splitting the social distance between allied groups (Clay 1992:80, 1998:16). In considerations of cultural affiliation an Adena mound may be associated with (or related to) two or more unrelated groups rather than a single group.

Figure 13. Rose diagram of Robbins Mound showing burial orientations (Webb and Elliot 1942:421, fig. 21).

**Implications for Cultural Affiliation**

Based on the available evidence for the Early Woodland period there are few indications of cultural associations that can be connected to historical tribes in NERI and GARI.
For West Virginia this is the first chronological period where oral tradition comes into play. The Cherokee have a tradition that they came from the upper parts of the Ohio, where they erected mounds on Grave Creek, which if so would date to Early Woodland, and they “removed thither” from the country where Monticello (near Charlottesville, Virginia) is located (Mooney 1975:8; Haywood 1823:225-226).

In terms of perishable industries, Early Woodland Adena/Middlesex and the northeastern United States are characterized by a preponderance of S-twist cordage and S-weft slant basketry (Heckenberger et al. 1996:68; Peterson and Hamilton 1984:430). Relatively little research has been done on cordage twist and early ceramics in the Ohio Valley but preliminary results suggest a preference for S-twist cordage. William Johnson’s analysis of Half-Moon Cordmarked ceramics from 46MR139 in Marshall County West Virginia (personal communication) shows all eleven sherds having S-twist cordage.

The spread of early ceramics and S-twist cordage south roughly coincides with the first Algonquian expansion or migration that Foster (1996:99) estimates at 900 BC and Fiedel (1990) estimates at circa 600 to 200 BC. The relationship of early ceramics, the Algonquian language, and S-twist cordage should be a topic for future research.

Based on the available evidence for the Early Woodland period there are no indications of cultural associations that can be connected to historical tribes in NERI and GARI. All tribes listed in chapter five should be consulted since the archeological evidence cannot be associated with contemporary tribes.

**Middle Woodland (200 BC–AD 400)**

Mink and Crothers (2005:13-14) report 31 Middle Woodland sites for NERI and a 1-km buffer surrounding the park while Henderson (2005a:115) chose to use the revised Woodland chronology developed by Clay and Niquette (1992), which places Adena at 400 BC to AD 250, based on the fact that all of the Adena mounds in the Kanawha Valley area date to after 400 BC. The pottery generally associated with these mounds is thinner than the typical Early Woodland types and corresponds more closely to what would be found in Middle Woodland. Mink and Crothers (2005) apparently prefer the more traditional chronology used in this report. The two sites identified as Late Middle Woodland to Early late Woodland on the basis of a Chesser Notched point
and a Lowe Flared Base point (Schlarb 2004:115, table 6) have been included in the Late Woodland Period.

In the Scioto Valley in Ohio, classic Middle Woodland Hopewell develops out of Adena, but as Applegate (2005:17) points out there is a problem with equating chronological units with formal units. Over time Adena became equated by archeologists with Early Woodland and Hopewell became equated with Middle Woodland. While this may apply to the Scioto Valley (Greber 2005:39), the data for other areas, especially West Virginia, does not fit the model.

In terms of Middle Woodland, there is little evidence of Classic Scioto Hopewell in West Virginia. There was undoubtedly interaction with Scioto Hopewell people and occasionally Hopewell artifacts are found on West Virginia sites but there are no examples of classic Hopewell earthworks in West Virginia. In the Kanawha Valley, classic Adena mound building may simply extend into the AD 200 to 400 Middle Woodland period. The presence of stone mounds is always problematic. Unless they are tested (to see if they are actually prehistoric) and dated, nothing definitive can be said about their chronological placement or cultural affiliation.

In West Virginia, Middle Woodland and Late Woodland settlement patterns are basically a continuation of the Early Woodland patterns consisting of scattered farmsteads and hunting and gathering camps.

Diagnostic Middle Woodland artifacts include Armstrong ceramics (McMichael 1965:94-95; Henderson 1986). Classic Hopewell artifacts include the Snyders point and prismatic blades made of Flint Ridge Chert. A variety of other corner and side notched points also occur during this period (McMichael 1968:26). Prismatic flint blades are generally associated with mica and were used to carve mica figures. Mica comes from the southeast and sites in the Big Sandy River drainage with mica and prismatic Flint Ridge blades such as the Blanton site (15JO32) in eastern Kentucky, may have served as trade centers connecting Ohio Hopewell with the southeast (Adovasio et al. 1982:364-365, 979, 984; Sanders 1976). This suggests that during the Middle Woodland the Big Sandy was the main connecting trail for trade between Ohio and the Southeast, rather than the New River.
Implications for Cultural Affiliation

Little can be said about cultural affiliations during the Middle Woodland period in NERI and GARI. As mentioned earlier, Adena and Hopewell likely represent traditions involving multiple cultural groups. NERI and GARI were utilized by several different cultural groups during the Middle Woodland period. NERI and GARI continued to be within the annual cycle of hunting and gathering bands associated with the Kanawha Valley based on the presence of artifacts made of Kanawha Black Chert. Detailed analysis of the non-Kanawha lithic artifacts may demonstrate associations with other bands especially those located in the mountains east of GARI and NERI.

Based on the available evidence for the Middle Woodland period there are no indications of cultural associations that can be connected to historical tribes in NERI and GARI. All tribes listed in chapter five should be consulted since the archeological evidence cannot be associated with contemporary tribes.

Late Woodland (AD 400–1200)

Henderson (2005a:149) indicates that there are 35 Late Woodland sites in NERI. This includes 16 rockshelters, 14 open camp sites, and the five stone mounds previously listed for the Middle Woodland period. Mink and Crothers (2005:16, table 2.1) list 17 rockshelters. Three Late Woodland sites were identified in GARI (Schlarb 2004:115, table 6). The site with the Hamilton-like point identified as Late Woodland/Late Prehistoric is included in the Late Woodland on the basis of its proposed date of AD 500 to 1000 (Schlarb 2004:117).

The Late Woodland is characterized by the end of mound building and termination of the Adena and Hopewell trade networks. Copper, mica, and marine shell are not part of Late Woodland assemblages. The Late Woodland period reflects the problems with using some of the early pottery type descriptions and trying to fit those descriptions into a chronological sequence. There are several different cultural traditions represented in the archeology of NERI and GARI during the Late Woodland period. These traditions overlap chronologically because bands from the Kanawha Valley and Virginia continue to utilize the resources of NERI and GARI during their seasonal rounds. This is demonstrated in the distribution of cordage twist patterns for the Middle and Late Woodland sites in the Ohio and Kanawha valleys (Maslowski 1996:95).
Figure 14 the Kanawha Valley sites seem to be evenly divided between sites having a strong preference for Z-twist cordage and others with a strong preference for S-twist cordage. These sites generally have a wide range of pottery with several different tempers, including limestone, grit, sandstone, chert, and siltstone, indicating several different cultural traditions.

Railey and Henderson (1986) define a Schoolyard Phase for the New River area that is characterized by siltstone tempered Lick Creek ceramics with Z-twist cordage and Chesser Notched/Lowe Flared Base projectile points. Henderson (2005a:145) places the Schoolyard Phase at AD 500 to 800.

Buck Garden is another ceramic series originally defined by McMichael (1965:92-94). The temper material was described as crushed sandstone, flint, and limestone, in that order of frequency (McMichael 1965:92). The type description was based on 556 sherds from rockshelters in Nicholas County (just north of GARI) and the Mount Carbon site in Fayette County (just south of GARI). While most archeologists admit that Buck Garden is a general term for Late Woodland in West Virginia and has
little interpretive value, its use still persists and its meaning continues to be expanded. Henderson (2005a:103) understands the problem when she states “the enigmatic Buck Garden Phase (AD 500-1200), defined by McMichael (1962, 1965, 1968), spans the late Middle Woodland, the Late Woodland, and extends into the earliest centuries of the Late Prehistoric period.” Looking at more recently defined pottery types, it is possible to deconstruct Buck Garden into three, and possibly four, ceramic types that have temporal and cultural significance.

One of the hallmarks of Buck Garden was the added rim strip with paddle edge decoration. This type has been defined as the Parkline Series (Niquette and Kerr 1993:54-55), dates from AD 750 to 900 (Niquette and Kerr 1993:52), and is associated with Jack’s Reef and Levanna points (Figure 15). The Levanna points are the first arrow points to appear in the Kanawha and New River drainages. This marks the introduction of the bow and arrow into the Ohio Valley and is associated with Algonquian expansion into the Ohio-West Virginia area from the north (see Niquette and Kerr 1993:52-53, 56-57). The Parkline Series was dominated by Z-twist cordage (92%). In terms of chert utilization, Jack’s Reef and Raccoon Notched points were made of exotic Upper Mercer and Flint Ridge cherts while triangular points were made of local Kanawha Black Flint (Niquette and Kerr 1993:53).

![Figure 15. Jack’s Reef Pentagonal and Levanna triangular points (Lantz 1989:30).](image-url)
Another characteristic of Buck Garden is chert tempered pottery. Chert tempered pottery is found in small quantities over much of West Virginia and probably represents a diagnostic artifact of a particular band or ethnic group. The chert tempered pottery at Seneca Rocks has been named as the provisional South Branch Series dating to the Middle Woodland period (Robertson et al. 1998:268-272). Six small chert tempered sherds with eroded exterior surfaces were recovered from the Headquarters site (Mink and Crothers 2005:49; Alterman 1997:77).

Looking at McMichael’s Buck Garden Rim sherds (McMichael 1965:93, fig. 38), David Fuerst (personal communication) noticed that the first sherd in the second row was a Page Cordmarked rim sherd. This leaves the possibility that some, or even all, of the limestone tempered pottery in the original Buck Garden series was really Page Cordmarked, which dates from AD 1200 to 1400.

Basically that leaves only sandstone tempered sherds in the Buck Garden Series. Henderson (2005c:374) describes two Unknown Rock and Sandstone Tempered sherds from Meadow Creek Bottoms (46SU107). Henderson (2005c:378-379, 1985:210-216) described three different sandstone tempered ware groups for the Green Sulphur Springs Complex but acknowledged that no type names or ware designations could be assigned to the specimens. She further stated the Buck Garden Ceramics were so poorly defined that a consideration of that series would not be useful.

For the Late Woodland in NERI and GARI, the Parkline Phase might provide the best example for an association with known linguistic groups. The diagnostic lithic and ceramic attributes of the Parkline Phase include the Jack’s Reef and Levanna projectile points (Figure 15) and pottery with an added on rim strip with paddle edge impressions (Figures 16, 17). While Parkline pottery has not been identified in NERI, Jacks Reef and Levanna points are listed as diagnostic Late Woodland materials recovered specifically from NERI sites (Mink and Crothers 2005:112, table 6.2).

While Parkline was intentionally defined as a local phase in order to document regional variation in what Seeman (1992) refers to as a Jack’s Reef Horizon, Niquette and Kerr emphasize the similarities with the Intrusive Mound Culture of Ohio and the Everman Phase in Kentucky (Niquette and Kerr 1993:52). All three of these complexes include Jack’s Reef and Levanna points and diagnostic pottery attributes consisting of an added on rim strip with paddle edge impressions.
Figure 16. M, Levanna Corded Collar; S, Jack’s Reef Corded Collar (Griffin 1952).

Figure 17. Parkline pottery with added rim strip and paddle edge impressions (Niquette and Kerr 1993:47).

In terms of the radiocarbon chronology (Niquette and Kerr 1993:51, table 4) the earlier dates tend to be in the northern areas, New England, Ontario, New York, and Ohio, suggesting a movement from north to south that may correspond to the southward movement of Algonquian linguistic groups. Fiedel (1990) suggested that there were two Algonquian population expansions or migrations. The first is estimated at 600 to 200 BC while the second is estimated at AD 200 to 700, which would correspond loosely with the spread of the Jack’s Reef, Levanna, and Raccoon Notched projectile points and Levanna and Jack’s Reef ceramic attributes.

While Parkline and other Jack’s Reef Horizon sites and components may be associated with Algonquian-speaking bands, there is the possibility that the southern expressions of the Jack’s Reef Horizon are also associated with Siouan speakers. Robert Rankin (2006:571) determined that all of the Siouan words associated with the bow and arrow are derived from Algonquian and based on the Midwestern archeological
chronologies these words would have been introduced about AD 400 to 600 or later. The Jack’s Reef Horizon extends as far west as Illinois and as far south as Tennessee and northern Alabama (Justice 1987:219).

Siouan tribes that may have used NERI and GARI include the Ohio Valley Siouan groups (Tutelo, Saponi, Occaneechi, Ofo, and Biloxi) and the Mississippi Valley Siouan Dhegiha (Omaha, Ponca, Kansa, Osage, and Quapaw). The Tutelo, Occaneechi, and Saponi were located in Virginia and can trace their origins back to the Late Woodland Period. Rankin (2006:574, table 41-3) places the Tutelo, Saponi, Occaneechi, Ofo, and Biloxi in the Ohio Valley or Southeastern Siouan group. Later Rankin (2009) identified the Tutelo, Saponi, and Occaneechi as Virginia Siouan. In both cases Rankin places the separation at approximately AD 400, the beginning of the Late Woodland period. During this Late Woodland period the Virginia Siouan tribes and Fort Ancient tribes develop distinct histories reflecting in their material culture distinct shared group identities. The Ofo and Biloxi are connected to the Ohio Valley based on linguistic reconstructions.

The Dhegiha speakers separated from Ohio Valley Siouan approximately 200 BC at the beginning of the Middle Woodland period (Rankin 2006:574, table 41-3). Based on oral tradition, the Dhegiha speakers migrated from the Ohio Valley. They share a related term for bow and arrow with the Tutelo (mikte); however, by the time the Tutelo term was collected it referred to gun (Rankin 2006:571).

**Implications for Cultural Affiliation**

The cultural affiliation for Jack’s Reef and Levanna points in NERI and GARI would most likely be with Algonquian-speaking tribes based on the constellation of the archeological attributes that include Jack’s Reef and Levanna Points (associated with introduction of the bow and arrow) and pottery with an added on rim strip with paddle edge impressions. This is supported by historical linguistics (Siouan borrowing of Algonquian terms for bow and arrow) and geography (southern movement of Algonquian languages).

Based on historical linguistics, some of the southern sites with Levanna and Jack’s Reef points could have been populated by Siouan speakers as well as Algonquian speakers. The potentially culturally affiliated Siouan-speaking tribes include:

Tutelo
Saponi
Occaneechi
Ofo
Biloxi
Omaha
Ponca
Kansa
Osage
Quapaw

The Tutelo, Saponi, and Occaneechi are tribes that are, or were, geographically closest to NERI and GARI. In 1753 the Tutelo and Saponi in Virginia were adopted by the Cayuga (Engelbrecht 2003:166), so in terms of cultural affiliation descendants of these tribes are represented by the Cayuga Indian tribes.

Consultation with federally recognized Algonquian tribes should include:
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
Shawnee Tribe
Delaware Nation
Delaware Tribe

Consultation with federally recognized tribes representing the Tutelo, Saponi, and possibly the Occaneechi should include:
Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma
Cayuga Nation

Consultation with federally recognized tribes representing the Ohio Valley Siouan and Mississippi Valley Siouan Dhegiha Tribes should include:
Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe of Louisiana
Quapaw Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma
Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Osage Nation, Oklahoma

Late Prehistoric (AD 1200–1550)

In southern West Virginia the Late Prehistoric period is characterized by the appearance of shell tempered ceramics, several types of triangular arrow points (all
generally smaller than Levanna), intensive corn agriculture, and village sites. Only one village site has been identified in NERI and none in GARI, largely due to the rugged environment and lack of large floodplains. The McGraw site (46RG7) was identified as a dispersed Bluestone Phase Fort Ancient Village based on the University of Kentucky test excavations conducted in 2009 (Fuerst et al. 2010).

Figure 18. Map of selected eastern Fort Ancient sites highlighting Bluestone Phase sites and Woodside Phase sites (Maslowski and Drooker 2007).
Thirty-eight sites within NERI have Late Prehistoric components. These sites tend to be located near permanent streams: 12 sites occur close to the New River and 14 sites are situated near permanent non-New River watercourses (Mink and Crothers 2005:25).

NERI and GARI are within the range of annual hunting and gathering activities of several Late Prehistoric village sites. The sites closest to NERI are the Bluestone Phase Fort Ancient villages in the Bluestone Reservation (Applegarth et al. 1978; Johnson 1984) directly south of NERI (Figure 18). Residents of the McGraw site and the Bluestone Phase sites south of NERI used the land and resources within NERI on a daily basis.

The Woodside Phase sites, Man (46LG5) and Burning Springs Branch (46KA143), are also within the annual range of NERI and GARI.

Both the Bluestone and the Woodside phases are characterized by the use of shell tempered pottery and a range of triangular arrow points. Shell tempered pottery cannot be associated with a specific phase unless diagnostic decorated sherds are present. In
terms of cordage twist patterns all of the Fort Ancient sites in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky have a high preference for Z-twist cordage (Figure 19) while those Fort Ancient sites in western Ohio have a preference for S-twist cordage and those sites in border areas tend to be mixed. During the Woodland period several sites in the Kanawha valley showed a preference for S-twist cordage so there was some population replacement that led to bands producing S-twist cordage leaving the area.

Between AD 1200 and 1450 western Ohio Fort Ancient sites have a high percentage of pottery with guilloche designs (Figure 20), the hallmark of Fort Ancient. A guilloche sherd has been identified at 46SU3, a Bluestone Phase site located in Bluestone Reservoir south of NERI (Figure 21), but the guilloche design is rare in West Virginia and the sherd probably was traded into the area or represents one or two foreign individuals who were incorporated into local village sites. The Bluestone Phase also has affinities with the Fort Ancient Philo Phase located in the Muskingum Valley of Ohio, and at least one Philo Punctate rim sherd (Figure 22) was recovered from 46SU3 (Johnson 1978:50).

Figure 20. Fort Ancient pot with Guilloche design (Robert A. Genheimer).
Another characteristic of Fort Ancient sites is square or rectangular houses (Maslowski and Drooker 2007). The test excavations on Bluestone sites were not extensive enough to uncover house patterns. In Virginia, east and south of the Bluestone Reservation, the Radford and Huffman villages and hamlets are characterized by the presence of limestone tempered pottery and circular houses. The percentage of limestone pottery on Bluestone Phase sites gradually increases in the southern villages as one approaches the Virginia border. The Snidow village site on the Bluestone River
(Jones 1987:11) is an anomaly in that it has circular houses and a predominance (72.6%) of shell tempered pottery.

The Bluestone Phase sites also have an abundance of marine shell beads and pendants made from Marginella, Olivella, and Whelk (Maslowski 1985) indicating the development of major trade networks with the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

Fort Ancient villages, including Bluestone Phase villages, were generally occupied for 15 to 20 years, then abandoned because of depletion of soil and wood resources. Village sites were often reoccupied once the soil and wood resources were replenished. During the Early-Middle Fort Ancient period (ca AD 1000 to 1400 or 1450) tributaries off the Ohio River often had a series of Fort Ancient Villages sequentially occupied by one cultural group that developed their own unique pottery variations. As many as seven diverse subregional traditions, each with distinctive pottery, are recognized (see, e.g., Carskadden and Morton 2000:fig. 5:3; Church 1987:127-135; Cowan 1986, 1987; Drooker 2000:228-245; Drooker and Cowan 2001:85-87; Essenpreis 1982:201-205; Graybill 1981:25-37; Henderson et al. 1992; Maslowski 1984).

After AD 1400 to 1450, many of the tributaries were abandoned, including the New River in West Virginia, and many villages moved to the main stem Ohio and Kanawha rivers, and far fewer components were located on the upper reaches of Ohio River tributaries (Maslowski and Drooker 2007). The Levissa Fork in eastern Kentucky was also abandoned at this time and it appears the Woodside villages moved across drainages to the upper reaches of the Guyandotte River to the Man site and to the Burning Springs Branch site on the Kanawha River.

The Woodside Phase that includes the Man site on the Guyandotte River and the Burning Springs Branch site on the Kanawha River provides the best example of Late Prehistoric migration, settlement systems and cultural affiliation associated with Siouan speakers.

One of the unique characteristics of the Fort Ancient Woodside houses at Slone in eastern Kentucky was the addition of what Dunnell et al. (1971:11-13) called porticos, small covered additions to houses used for work areas. Similar additions were found on six of the 24 late Fort Ancient Burning Spring Branch houses on the Kanawha River (Pullins et al. 2008:722). The Burning Spring Branch additions were smaller than the Slone porticos and they were identified as protected storage areas (Pullins et al. 2008:722). Slone and Burning Spring Branch appear to be the only Fort Ancient sites
where these additions have been identified. This suggests a continuing architectural form with a changing function.

Analysis of the Burning Springs Branch shell tempered pottery indicated that 21.5% of the shell tempered rims (37.9% by weight) exhibited corncob-impressions, an attribute associated with Late Prehistoric sites in Virginia connected with Siouan-speaking groups (Spencer 2009:150; Pullins et al. 2008:586-587, table 8-48). Corncob-impressed pottery was also present in high frequencies at Man, Buffalo, Marmet Village, and Rolfe Lee (Spencer 2009:150).

The predominant Late Woodland/Late Prehistoric ceramic tradition in southwestern Virginia is the Eastern Woodland Pottery Tradition that includes net-impressed, cordmarked, and corncob-impressed pottery with limestone (Radford), sand (Wythe), shell (New River), or soapstone temper (Smyth). In general, the Eastern Woodland Pottery Tradition is associated predominantly with Siouan-speaking Tutelo and Saponi (Egloff 1992:198, 203), and Clarksville, Dan River, and Wythe wares are associated particularly with the Siouan-speaking Occaneechi (near Clarksville), the Saponi (Charlotte County), and the Tutelo (Roanoke and Radford areas) (Spencer 2009:147-148). This suggests that corncob-impressed pottery is a Virginia Siouan trait. Figure 23 shows village sites in West Virginia with significant percentages of corncob-impressed pottery (Spencer 2010:5). It should be noted that corncob-impressed pottery is often difficult to identify, especially when it is applied over cordmarking and it was only recently identified in West Virginia in substantial quantities (Spencer 2009; Pullins et al. 2008).

Pottery samples from the New River area and eastern Kentucky have not been reanalyzed to determine if corncob-impressing is present. In terms of chronology Late Woodland in Virginia is essentially equivalent to Late Prehistoric in West Virginia, so Radford ware found in West Virginia would be placed in the Late Prehistoric period.

In terms of cordage twist patterns, Figure 19 shows a very strong preference for Z-twist cordage in southern West Virginia and eastern Kentucky during the Late Prehistoric period. At Burning Springs Branch there appears to be a 100% correlation between Z-twist cordage and Corncob-Impressed-and-Cordmarked pottery and Corncob-Impressed-Over-Cordmarked pottery (Pullins et al. 2008:581, table 8-43). This would indicate that a strong preference for Z-twist cordage might also be a Siouan trait.
This trend is also supported to a degree by the linguistic maps of Bushnell (1934). Figure 24 shows the Iroquoian Migration covering eastern Kentucky and a shift by AD 1500 of Siouan speakers from western West Virginia and eastern Ohio into southern and eastern West Virginia. The archeological record indicates that Siouan speakers (the Late Prehistoric Woodside Phase characterized by Z-twist cordage impressed pottery, among other traits) moved into eastern Kentucky around AD 1200 and replaced a Woodland group (using Levisa Cordmarked pottery) that was characterized by a preference for S-twist cordage (Carr and Maslowski 1995:327).

In terms of lithics at Burning Springs Branch (Figure 25), the dominant non-Kanawha chert for the Late Prehistoric period is Newman from eastern Kentucky (Pullins et al. 2008:948-949). This could suggest that even though eastern Kentucky was abandoned by the Woodside people after AD 1400 to 1450, it remained within the annual hunting and gathering range (mesomovement) of the Burning Spring Branch village. This Kanawha Valley chert connection with eastern Kentucky extends back to the Late Archaic/Early Woodland periods but becomes more pronounced during the Late Prehistoric period.
Figure 24. Tribal migrations of linguistic families (adapted from Bushnell 1934).

Figure 25. Non-Kanawha Cherts for the Late Prehistoric and Late Archaic-Early Woodland components at Burning Spring Branch (46KA142; Pullins et al. 2008:949, fig. 9-96).
A Siouan presence in eastern Kentucky is also supported by the geographic evidence. The former name for the Big Sandy River in eastern Kentucky is Totteroy, a corruption of the Iroquois name for the Tutelo and other Siouan tribes. While Hale (1883) interpreted the name Totteroy as indicating the path by which the Tutelo came to the headwaters of the Roanoke River just east of New River, where Batts and Fallam found them in 1671, Totteroy most likely refers to the homeland and later the hunting grounds of a group of eastern Siouan speakers, the Woodside Phase people.

Figure 26. Neighbor-Joining tree representing 16 ancient and modern populations. The Fort Ancient sample (lower left) is from the Man site (46LG5) in Logan County, West Virginia (from Mills 2001:11, fig. 1).
The Man site (Merriwether et al. 1994, 1995; Mills 2001, 2003) is the closest site to NERI and GARI that has been subjected to DNA analysis. Figure 26 is a DNA diagram showing the relationship of several prehistoric and historical populations to Ohio Hopewell. The Fort Ancient sample is the most distant from Hopewell, the Mohawk, and the Cherokee. This sample was taken from the Fort Ancient Village in Man, Logan County, West Virginia, which is a Fort Ancient Woodside Phase site, tentatively identified as Siouan. If the Siouan connection is upheld by future research, the Man site would provide a DNA footprint for Ohio Valley Siouan populations.

Figure 27. Burning Spring Branch, schematic plan view showing location and distribution of burial types (red for Simple, blue for Compound, green for Compound Stone Covered; Pullins et al. 2008:748, fig. 9-14).
At the Burning Spring Branch site burials were positioned throughout the village. Fourteen were found in the plaza, seven were found in structures, six were found in isolated areas around the periphery of the village, and three were found between structures (Figure 27).

In terms of burial orientation, all of the burials at Burning Spring Branch where head orientation could be identified had the heads oriented to the east, with the majority to the southeast (Figure 28). This may be another example of a Siouan trait. The Omaha and Kansa, Mississippi Valley Siouan tribes, also bury their dead with heads generally to the east (Voegelin 1944:348, table x).

Figure 28. Burial orientations at 46KA142 (Pullins et al. 2008:749, fig. 9-15).
Another Late Prehistoric Phase (Virginia Late Woodland) that has definite ties to NERI, and possibly GARI, is the Huffman Phase (Geier and Boyer 1982; Geier 1983, 1985) located on the Jackson and Cow Pasture Rivers in Alleghany and Bath counties, Virginia, east of NERI and GARI. The Huffman Phase is characterized by small villages or hamlets that lack stockades. Houses are large circular structures (30 feet in diameter) that were probably multi-family dwellings. The phase dates from AD 1200 to 1400 (Geier 1985:67). The hallmark of the Huffman Phase is Page Cordmarked pottery. Page Cordmarked pottery was recovered from the McGraw site (46RG7) in NERI (Figure 29).

Page Cordmarked was defined as a minor pottery type at the Keyser Farm site in Page County, Virginia (Manson et al. 1943:405). This pottery is limestone tempered and Evans (1955:67-68) indicated that it was similar to Radford (some of the McGraw site rim sherds are shell tempered). The surface is cordmarked or smoothed over cordmarked. The most diagnostic characteristic of this pottery type is an added rim strip or collar that is decorated. The collars are generally 2 to 3 cm wide. Decorations include parallel rows of cord impressions on the rim strip (Figure 29).

Figure 29. Page Cordmarked rim sherd from the McGraw site, NERI (David Fuerst).
Geier and Warren (1982) separate Page Cordmarked into two types. Page Cordmarked I (Geier and Warren 1982:117-118) include vessels with rim diameters of 16 cm or less. Page Cordmarked II (Geier and Warren 1982:117-118) includes vessels with rim diameters greater than 16 cm.

In terms of multi-scalar analysis, if the definition of Page Cordmarked is limited to its original type description, the center of distribution is located in Alleghany and Bath counties, Virginia, where the majority of the pots in the four villages analyzed by (Geier 1985) have the added rim strips decorated with horizontal cord impressions.

Page Cordmarked is relatively rare in the New River Valley, but the distinctive decorated collar enables it to be easily identified. Solecki (1949:plate 6, fig. 9) illustrates a Page Cordmarked rim from 44GS10 and notes that only three rim sherds of this type were found in the Bluestone Survey (Solecki 1949:405). Sherds have also been reported by Dave Dobbins of the West Virginia Archeological Society from 46SU3, 46SU9, 46RG7, and Grotto #1, a rockshelter in Summers County (Maslowski and King 1983:82). A Page Cordmarked rim from Nicholas County (McMichael 1965:93, fig. 38) is in the Buck Garden Ceramic Series type sample. The rim is identified as a Cord Impressed folded rim strip.

Two Page Cordmarked rims are also illustrated in Baker (1976, 1981:17, fig. 8) from the Henderson Rocks site (46TA1) in Taylor County, West Virginia. These are misidentified as Watson Cordmarked. Another site with Page Cordmarked rims, excavated in West Virginia is the Seneca Rocks site (46PD1; Robertson et al. 1998).

The early radiocarbon dates cited for 46SU3 and 46SU9 (Jones 1987:13) and Henderson Rocks (Baker 1976, 1981) tend to support the AD 1200 to 1400 dates for the Huffman Phase and Page Cordmarked pottery.

The distribution of Page Cordmarked pottery (based on diagnostic rim sherds) suggests that the center of distribution was the Huffman Phase villages in Alleghany and Bath counties, Virginia. The limited distribution of Page Cordmarked at sites like Rapps Cave (Maslowski 2006a), Grotto #1 rockshelter, and Buck Garden Rockshelter suggest that these represent mesomovement, the extent of the Huffman Phase hunting and gathering range. The limited distribution of Page Cordmarked pottery at village sites like the Radford Phase 44GS10 site, the Bluestone villages 46SU3 and 46SU9, Henderson Rocks (46TA1), Seneca Rocks (46PD1), the Page Cordmarked type site, Keyser Farm, and the Sours site (44WR2; Wall 2005:29, fig. 4), suggests that these are trade items or
represent Huffman Phase individuals who have been incorporated into these non-Huffman Phase villages.

The co-occurrence of distinct pottery traditions at a single site may reflect interaction in the form of intermarriage between Late Prehistoric communities (Knapp 2009:105) rather than the “Captured Bride Syndrome” (Knapp 2009:107). This is especially true of the Bluestone Phase sites like the McGraw site that have mixtures of shell tempered (Bluestone Phase or New River pottery) and Limestone tempered Page Cordmarked pottery. In the case of the McGraw site, some of the Page Cordmarked pottery is shell tempered, suggesting that there were Huffman Phase potters living at the site.

The association of the Huffman Phase with historically known Indian tribes and groups has not been determined in the available research documents. The sites are located just west of what Hantman (2001:108-109) defined as the Siouan-speaking Monacan territory. Houck and Maxham (1993:18) extend the Monacan area further west to include the Jackson and Cowpasture rivers where the Huffman Phase sites are located. Both Hantman (2001) and Houck and Maxham (1993) include the Tutelo, Saponi, and Occaneechi under the term Monacan. Hantman (2001:110) proposes the name Monacan as “an explicitly archeological complex based on prehistoric material culture patterns and as a name that allows recognition of continuity between prehistory and history.” Monacan is also used as the name of an Indian group that received state recognition in 1989 (Hantman 2001:116; Houck and Maxham 1993).

In terms of burial orientation Boyd and Boyd (1992:256) indicate that 56% of the burials in southwest Virginia have the heads to the east. For the Huffman site they list five burials with heads to the east, one south, one west, and 12 indeterminate. Johnson (nd:41) indicates that the burials at Huffman were similar to most burials in western Virginia except for the lack of consistently eastward orientation of the bodies.

In terms of cordage twist, limited analysis of Page Cordmarked pottery indicates a high preference for Z-twist. The Huffman Phase does share many Virginia Siouan traits such as the circular houses, preference for Z-twist cordage, and limestone tempered pottery, and based on its geographic location it can tentatively be include as a Virginia Siouan group.

In terms of linguistic evidence the Kanawha and New River area are recognized as being populated by Ohio Valley Siouan speakers during the Late Prehistoric and Early
Contact periods (AD 1200 to 1670; Spencer 2009; DeMallie 2004; Bushnell 1934). Spencer (2009:143-145) summarizes linguistic evidence and oral traditions that place Siouan populations in the Ohio and Kanawha valleys. Between July 1673 and July 1674 Gabriel Arthur stayed with the Tomahitan Indians and traveled over a lot of the southeast United States (Briceland 1987:149). One of his trips was to a Moneton Village, ten days north of the Tomahitan village, believed to be on the Kanawha River (Alvord and Bidgood 1912:210-226; Olafson 1960:33-34). DeMallie (2004:290) indicates that the Tomahitans were a group incorporated into the Creek Confederacy as the Tamahita, who were identified by Swanton (1922:184-191) as a division of the Yuchi. The Moneton were Ohio Valley Siouan speakers. In the Ohio Valley Siouan language “Mony” signified water and “ton” translates as great (DeMallie 2004:290-291; Oliverio and Rankin 2003:165). Rankin (2009) refines his classification and identifies Moneton as Virginia Siouan. Rankin states that there are exactly two words of Moneton attested, mony signifying water and ton signifying great. Mani is water in Tutelo and ani is water in Ofo and Biloxi. Ita is big or great in Tutelo and Ofo/Biloxi. DeMallie (2004:291) states that there is no evidence that the Moneton were connected with the Tutelo or later joined them (Speck 1935:212; Swanton 1946:152). This consistent with the archeological evidence that indicates Virginia Siouan and Fort Ancient have different histories and developed distinct material cultures during the Late Woodland period. This still provides a linguistic example for the Kanawha/New River area being populated by Siouan speakers, just not the Virginia Tutelo and Saponi.

The Bluestone Phase and Woodside Phase can be included in the Siouan linguistic group but may represent Siouan Language groups associated at one time with the Ofo and Biloxi or even the Quapaw, Omaha, Ponca, and Kansa, who have oral traditions of coming from the Ohio Valley (Spencer 2009:146; Buffalohead 2004:331-332). Looking at the family tree of Siouan languages (Figure 30), Ofo and Biloxi are more closely related to Virginia Siouan and may be distantly related to those Fort Ancient phases located closer to Virginia. Keeping in mind that there are as many as seven pre-AD 1450 subregional traditions recognized as “Fort Ancient” (Maslowski and Drooker 2007), there are several possibilities for cultural affiliation with Siouan tribes.
One of the characteristics differentiating Fort Ancient Siouan from Virginia Siouan is house structures, with Fort Ancient being rectangular and Virginia Siouan being circular. Other characteristics include pottery tempering. Virginia Siouan Radford ware is limestone tempered even on Early Contact sites, while Bluestone, Woodside, and other Fort Ancient sites have shell tempered pottery. The Woodside Phase is geographically closer to the Virginia Siouan area than to the Fort Ancient heartland in terms of its location in the Big Sandy drainage of Kentucky as well as village locations on the headwaters of the Guyandotte and upper Kanawha (Figure 31). This could explain the diffusion of Virginia Siouan pottery traits like corncob and net impressing.

The Bluestone Phase appears to be more connected with the Ohio Valley in terms of pottery attributes. The phase appears to end around 1450 like other Fort Ancient phases located on tributary streams. Drooker (2002a:120) suggests that after 1450 almost all settlements were located on the Ohio River or along the lower reaches of its tributaries. It is possible that the Bluestone people moved to large village sites on the
Kanawha or Ohio rivers that eventually became Early Contact Fort Ancient villages. Jeter (2002:214-215) proposes that some of these were proto-Quapaw who moved west of the Mississippi in the 1650s and 1660s (Figure 32). While no Quapaw sites of this time period west of the Mississippi have been excavated, this scenario is supported by the oral traditions of the Dhegiha and ethnohistoric accounts of Quapaw bark covered longhouses (Jeter 2002:213; Hoffman 1991:57, 59; Hoffman 1986:30, 32).

Figure 31. Location of Siouan-speaking tribes at earliest contact (Rankin 2009).

Figure 32. The late Quapaw migration scenario (Jeter 2002:214).
Oral traditions of all Dhegihan Siouan tribes tell of their origin in the east near a great body of water and their migrations down the Ohio River to its mouth. In Omaha, the Ohio River translates as “the river down which they came” (Spencer 2009:146).

In Arkansas the historically described Quapaw bark covered structures might correspond to Fort Ancient houses made with pole construction, which are significantly different from the local small wattle and daub Mississippian houses (Jeter 2002:213).

Rankin (2006) provides linguistic evidence based on terminology for maize and other cultigens that seems to contradict this Quapaw migration scenario.

**Implications for Cultural Affiliation**

The cultural affiliation for sites identified as the Radford or Huffman phases, based on archaeological traits that include limestone tempered pottery with diagnostic rim sherds, is Virginia Siouan. These sites most likely have ties to at least some of the following groups:
- Tutelo
- Saponi
- Occaneechi

Consultation with federally recognized tribes representing the Tutelo, Saponi, and possibly the Occaneechi based on the current tribal membership of these groups should include:
- Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma
- Cayuga Nation

The cultural affiliation for sites identified as Bluestone Phase, Woodside Phase, and Fort Ancient, based on diagnostic shell tempered pottery, rectangular houses, linguistic and oral tradition are also Siouan but most likely have distant ties to at least some of the following tribes:
- Ofo
- Biloxi
- Quapaw
- Omaha
- Ponca
- Kansa
- Osage
Consultation with federally recognized tribes representing these groups should include:
Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe of Louisiana
Quapaw Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma
Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Osage Nation, Oklahoma
EARLY CONTACT PERIOD

Early Contact (AD 1550–1671)

The Early Contact period dates from circa AD 1550 to 1671, the date of the Batts and Fallam expedition. The Early Contact period is characterized by the appearance of European trade goods on Indian sites before any direct contact with Europeans. The only NERI sites with European trade goods are Sandstone Shelter (46SU17/1; Bodmer 2005:40; Fuerst 1981:55; Solecki 1949:367) and McGraw Farm (46RG7; Henderson 2005b:218). Drooker (1997:97) suggested that the single trade bead from Sandstone shelter, reported as amber, dated to AD 1525 to 1600. Surface collections at the McGraw Farm site produced a glass trade bead (Henderson 2005b:218; Fuerst 1981).

Henderson (2005b:218) includes four additional sites as having Early Contact occupations, 46FA129 (Rockshelter), Meadow Creek Bottom (46SU107), 46RG78, and 46SU103. For Site 46FA129, this determination was based on the recovery of a single Clarksville Small Triangular projectile point, while for Site 46SU103, it was based on the recovery of Clarksville Small Triangular as well as Madison points and Radford Series ceramics (Fuerst 1981). Fuerst (1981:105) also considered Meadow Creek Bottom and Site 46RG78 as possible Early Contact occupations due to the recovery of a triangular knife (and Radford Series ceramics) from the former and a bipointed knife recovered from the latter.

South of NERI, at Site 46SU672 in the Bluestone National Scenic River, one Early Contact component was documented (Henderson 2005b:217; Stathakis 2001; Trader 2003). The site produced two glass beads, a green one that may date to between AD 1600 and 1625 and a dark blue or black one that could not be dated (Trader 2003:74-75).
Further up the Bluestone River, an Early Contact component was identified at the Snidow site (46MC1; Henderson 2005b:217; Fuerst 2001). Based on cross dating of the glass trade beads, Fuerst (2004:122) suggests that the occupation dates to AD 1600 to 1650. A blue glass trade bead was also recovered from Barkers Bottom (46SU3) in the Bluestone Reservation (Solecki 1949:378).

Early European trade goods came into the area along the same trade routes that brought marine shell to Late Prehistoric Villages from the Gulf and Atlantic coast. Either slightly before or at the same time as European trade goods reached the village sites on the Kanawha River, Citico Style Rattlesnake gorgets (Figure 33) and Weeping Eye masks (Figure 34) start appearing at Kanawha and Ohio River village sites. Hoffman (2001, 1997) plots the distribution of the two types of shell gorgets (Figures 35 and 36) and shows that they came into the Kanawha valley from eastern Tennessee along the Ohio Branch of the Great Indian Warpath (Hoffman 2001:68) that follows the New River. The distribution of Weeping Eye gorgets in the west parallels Jeter’s (2002:214) late Quapaw migration scenario to a certain extent. Howard (1956:302; Dorsey 1885:673) describes and illustrates a shell mask in style similar to the weeping eye mask from a Kansa war bundle observed at the death Hosasage, a Kansa, in the winter of 1882-1883. Dorsey’s (1885:673) informants said the shell “had been brought ‘from the great water at the east’ by the ancestors of the Kansa.”

Figure 33. Citico-style rattlesnake gorget from the Clover site (46CB40).
In burial contexts, rattle snake gorgets are generally associated with females and subadults and weeping eye masks are generally associated with males and subadults (Drooker 1997:61, Hally et al. 1990:133-134, Smith 1987:108-112). A review of previous documentation (Collins 1995; Dorsey 1885; Fosha 1997; Howard 1956; Skinner 1915; 19th century artists) revealed that 80% of the 18th and 19th century people associated with marine shell ornaments were Siouan speakers with most from the Chiwere and Dhegiha groups (Spencer 2007).

During the Early Contact period Spanish trade goods came into the Kanawha and mid-Ohio valley possibly by the same New River route. At the same time the Iroquois were extending their influence into the Kanawha Valley. The nearest Iroquoian sites in West Virginia are the Susquehannock villages located on the South Branch of the Potomac, occupied during the late 16th to early 17th centuries (Brashler 1987, MacCord 1952, Wall and Lapham 2003). Figure 37 shows the distribution of brass trade items relative to NERI and GARI; top-view lizard/beaver effigies demonstrate Iroquois connections, at least by trade. The southernmost extent of the lizard/beaver effigies is the
Marmet site on the Kanawha River. These effigies have been interpreted as beaver pelts (Figure 38) representing possible counters in the Iroquoian beaver pelt trade (Johnson 2001:76). An Iroquoian style nodded pipe has also been found at the Marmet site (Figure 39; Drooker 2002b). These might represent the southern extent of the beaver trade and establish an Iroquoian presence (macromovement, trade) in southern West Virginia during the Early Contact period.
Figure 37. Brass trade items relative to NERI-GARI (Drooker 1996).

Figure 38. Lizard/beaver effigy from the Marmet site (Robert F. Maslowski).

Figure 39. Noded pipe from the Marmet site (Darla Spencer).
The sheet brass, side-view animal effigies found at the Clover and Rolfe Lee sites (Figure 40) on the Ohio River may come from the southern Spanish trade (Drooker 1987:293, figs. 8-12, 8-13; Smith 1987; Waselkov 1989).

Figure 40. Animal effigies from the Rolfe Lee site (Robert F. Maslowski).

The Early Contact period represents an extension of the Late Prehistoric period with the addition of European trade goods. Villages grew in size and became more multicultural. This is indicated by the presence of more foreign pottery types and other exotic native artifact types and more variation in burial customs.

**Implications for Cultural Affiliation**

For the Early Contact period, consultation should be the same as for the Late Prehistoric period with the possible addition of the Iroquoian tribes.

Consultation with federally recognized tribes potentially associated with NERI and GARI should include:

**Siouan Tribes:**
Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe of Louisiana
Quapaw Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma
Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Osage Nation, Oklahoma

**Iroquoian Tribes:**
Tuscarora Nation
Tonawanda Band of Seneca
Seneca Nation of Indians
St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
Onondaga Indian Nation
Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma
Cayuga Nation
Oneida Nation of New York
Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin

Federally recognized tribes representing the Tutelo, Saponi, and Occaneechi based on current tribal membership include the Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma and Cayuga Nation, which are already listed under Iroquoian tribes.
CHAPTER FOUR
CONTACT PERIOD

Contact (AD 1671 onwards)

The Contact period in West Virginia begins in September 1671 with the Batts and Fallam expedition. Thomas Batts and Robert Fallam were commissioned by Abraham Wood to find “a passage to the further side of the mountains” (Briceland 1987:124). Traditional historians have Batts and Fallam ending their journey at Peters Falls on the New River south of the West Virginia/Virginia border (Alvord and Bidgood 1912:189-191; Solecki 1949:329). Briceland (1987, 1991) through his exhaustive analysis of the original Batts and Fallam journal places the end of the journey at Matewan on the Tug Fork. An alternate interpretation, taking into account the archeology and geography of the area, is that the expedition ended at Logan on the Guyandotte River. The Tug Fork is too narrow and does not have any Indian village sites while Logan is built on an Early Contact village and is located at the mouth of Island Creek, which is similar to the falls of the James River that Batts and Fallam use for a comparison.

From the Contact period onward, the historical tribes most frequently associated with the mid and upper Ohio Valley and West Virginia (which includes NERI and GARI) are the Iroquois, Cherokee, and Shawnee. The term Iroquois refers to the Five Nations (Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida, and Mohawk; Engelbrecht 2003:3). Using archeology, oral tradition, historical documents, linguistics, and other relevant sources Engelbrecht (2003:3) traces the development of the New York Iroquois back to AD 1000. Each of the five tribes had distinctive decorated pottery types (Griffin 1952:fig. 20) and smoking pipes (Engelbrecht 2003:52-60). None of these diagnostic artifacts have been found in NERI or GARI and there is no indication that the Iroquois actually occupied southern West Virginia. The Iroquois-speaking Susquehannocks occupied a series of
villages from AD 1590 to the 1630s, on the South Branch of the Potomac River as far south as Moorefield, West Virginia (Wall and Lapham 2003). After a series of wars the dispersed Susquehannocks lost their tribal identity by 1677 when they became submerged politically by the Iroquois and Delaware (Jennings 1978:366).

The Cherokee can also trace their roots back to AD 1000 in the Appalachian summit area of Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee (Dickens 1976). They also have distinctive pottery types and smoking pipes. None of these diagnostic artifacts have been found in NERI or GARI and there is no indication that the Cherokee actually occupied southern West Virginia.

The Shawnee, the southernmost Algonquian-speaking tribe, in contrast to the Iroquois and Cherokee cannot be traced back into prehistory with any degree of accuracy. The Shawnee are divided into five divisions: Chalaakaatha (Chillicothe), Mekoche (Mequache), Thawikila, Pekowi (Piqua), and Kishpoko (Kispokogi) (Howard 1981:25). Griffin (1952:364) and his followers have maintained that at least some of the Fort Ancient villages were Shawnee. Based on early maps of the 1670s, the Shawnee homeland is thought to be the Cumberland River in Tennessee (Howard 1981:6), which is located west of the Fort Ancient area.

The historic Shawnee migrations are well documented. Callender (1978:623, fig. 1) places the Shawnee at Starved Rock in Illinois in 1683. Several bands moved to eastern Pennsylvania to join the Delaware in 1697, others moved into western Maryland (1693 - 1729). The Shawnee then moved into western Pennsylvania and then down the Ohio River. Tanner (1987:41, map 9) places Upper Shawnee Town (1751-1756) at Point Pleasant, West Virginia. Lower Shawnee Town (1736-1758) was located on the Ohio River at the mouth of the Scioto. The village moved to high ground on the Kentucky side of the Ohio River after it was flooded and moved up the Scioto River in 1758. In 1768, a group of Shawnee villages were located on the Scioto River in the Vicinity of Chillicothe, Ohio, and another group, along with several Delaware villages, was located on the Muskingum River (Tanner 1987:59, map13). From 1772 to 1781 Shawnee villages continued to be located on the Muskingum River and the Scioto River, but several villages began moving west into the Little Miami, Mad, and Great Miami Rivers (Tanner 1987:80, map 16). The villages on the Scioto included Cornstalks, Grenadier Squaw’s, Chillicothe 1, Piqua 1, Kispoko, Mequashake 1, and Blue Jacket’s, among others. Tanner’s Map 16 shows an accelerated western movement where Piqua 2 moves to the
Mad River in 1777 and Piqua 3 moves to the upper Great Miami by 1780. Similar movements were documented for other villages as well.

During the 1600s the Iroquois fought against 51 groups or combinations of groups east of the Mississippi (Brandao 1997:63) and eliminated many of the neighboring tribes or incorporated them into existing Five Nation tribes. By the late 1600s the village sites in West Virginia and much of the Ohio Valley were abandoned, well before the first settlers arrived in the area. In the 1700s the Iroquois were at war with the southern tribes including the Catawba as well as the Cherokee (Merrell 2003; Perdue 2003).

In 1722 the treaty of Albany set the boundary between the Iroquois and the English colonists. The lands west of the Blue Ridge Mountains and north of the Potomac River which include NERI and GARI were retained as Indian lands. However, the Iroquois reserved a right-of-way across the ceded land in Virginia so that their war parties could continue their campaigns against the southern Indians with whom the Iroquois were still at war (Miller 1913).

In 1744, in a council at Lancaster, a speaker for the League of the Iroquois asserted that all the world knew that the Iroquois had conquered the tribes formerly living on the Susquehanna and Potomac and at the back of the Blue ridge (this includes NERI and GARI), and that these tribes and their remnants were now a part of the Iroquois and their lands belonged to the Iroquois alone. Among the tribes he named were the Conoy and the Tutelo (Mooney 1894:22). In the 1744 Treaty of Lancaster, the Iroquois ceded all of their land west of Virginia, which they took to mean lands south of the Potomac between the Blue Ridge and the Alleghany mountains. Virginia took it to mean all land west of Virginia to the Mississippi River and north to the Great Lakes.

During the 1700s the Cherokee also claimed all of the land west of the New River and south of the Kanawha, which would include all the NERI land west of the river but would exclude GARI (Figure 41). Those lands in West Virginia and Kentucky claimed by the Cherokee were also claimed by the Six Nations Iroquois, Shawnee, and Delaware as their hunting grounds (Royce 1975:13).

The earliest European settlements in southern West Virginia were on the Greenbrier River. The first settlement on the New River was made by Andrew Culbertson in 1753 or 1754 at Culbertson’s Bottom (Miller 1908:171, Maslowski and Woody 1984:183) in the Bluestone Reservation, south or upstream from NERI. The settlement was abandoned because of “fear of Indians” and Andrew Culbertson sold his
land to Samuel Culbertson in 1755. Samuel Culbertson also left because of hostile Indians (Maslowski and Woody 1984:183; Wythe’s Chancery Reports 1794:43). Settlers moved back into the area at the end of the French and Indian War (1763), after the French and their Indian allies were defeated.

During Dunmore’s War, 1774, and the American Revolution, 1775-1783, the Shawnee and their allies conducted raids on settlers in the New River and Greenbrier Valleys. A series of military and settler’s forts were built in southern West Virginia. Fort Culbertson, a military fort, was built by James Robertson on the New River in the Bluestone Reservation, south of NERI in 1774 (Maslowski and Woody 1984:183; Thwaites and Kellogg 1905:95). Robertson’s men scouted the Indian trails because Shawnee raiding parties from villages on the Scioto and Muskingum rivers in Ohio were frequently in the area. On August 11, 1774, Robertson wrote, “There has been three or
four Indians visiting the waste plantations above us on the river they burnt a house about five miles above the fort last Sunday. They left a war club at one of the wasted plantations well made and mark’d with two letters IG” (Thwaites and Kellogg 1905:138-139).

One of the primary Indian trails used by the Shawnee and other Ohio Indians to reach the New River/Greenbrier River area was the Paint Creek Trail (Olafson 1958:5). The trail crossed the Bluestone River at its mouth, traveled through the Glades (in the vicinity of present-day Winterplace Ski Area at the head Glade Creek) and down Paint Creek to Kanawha River. One branch of this trail crossed over to Coal River and followed the Coal River to its mouth on the Kanawha River at St. Albans. This path and their branches were also used by the Iroquois in their wars against the southern Indians. In 1770 George Washington noted in his journal, when passing the Mingo town on the Ohio River, the presence of 60 warriors of the Six Nations on their way to the Cherokee...
country to fight the Catawbas. At short distance above Letart Island he noted the beginning of the Warrior’s Path to the Cherokee country (Olafson 1958:4-5).

Paint Creek received its name from the painted trees that marked the campsites of Indian war parties. Olafson (1958:5-6) noticed that early deeds and land grants were referenced to the Painted Trees. He plotted the locations of the Painted Trees referenced in 25 land grants issued in the 1780s and found there were two locations (Figure 42). The location of the Big Painted Trees was in a bottom on the west side of Paint Creek below the village of Long Branch. It was the point where the Coal River path joined the Paint Creek Trail. The Upper Painted Trees was three and a half miles further up Paint Creek at the mouth of Sand Fork. The two camps located by Olafson (1958) are within seven or eight miles of Glen Jean and NERI.

James Robertson, who commanded the scouts at Fort Culbertson, stated in a letter June 23, 1774, “the most proper place to watch the War Road in the matter of the enemy should they come in is about forty miles below Culbertson’s as they ever have made that a place of rendezvous, killing meat and equipping themselves before they make the attacks on the inhabitants” (Olafson 1958:5).

Figure 43. Doug Wood portrays an Iroquois warrior who interprets a dendroglyph along Mary Ingles Trail, Putnam County, West Virginia (Robert F. Maslowski).
Brandao (1997:33) mentions the Iroquois practice of stripping the bark off trees and engraving a pictorial account of their mission. This would be a dendroglyph. They also left pictographs at battle sites indicating the number of captives taken, the size of their party, and the number of their wounded and killed (Figure 43).

A Dendroglyph was recorded in Summers County, just east of NERI in the late 1800s at Green Sulphur Springs (Figures 44, 45, 46, and 47) in the Coleman Manuscripts (Coleman 1887). Unfortunately only the cover letter and sketches were in the Smithsonian collections.

The Contact period ends with the 1795 Treaty of Greenville that ended Indian raids in West Virginia and the Ohio Valley. Historical records mention contacts with Indians hunting or traveling through southern West Virginia in the 1800s but there is no mention of Indian settlements. There are documented marginal groups and tri-racial groups (individuals of mixed African, Indian, and White heritage) settlements that included “Guineas” and “Melungeons” located in central and southern West Virginia (Berry 1978; Burnell 1952). The Buffalo Ridge Cherokee, a tri-racial group located in Virginia also have several members in southern West Virginia (Rice 1991, 1995).
Figure 44. Location of H. Gwinn’s where dendroglyph was recorded (Coleman 1887).

Figure 45. Detail of country around H. Gwinn’s (Coleman 1887).
Figure 46. Detail of dendroglyph on north and northwest side of tree (Coleman 1887).
Figure 47. Detail of dendroglyph on west side of tree (Coleman 1887).
Implications for Cultural Affiliation

During the Contact period the Iroquois claimed political authority over the territory that included NERI and GARI. Prior to the American Revolution the Iroquois ceded lands south of the Kanawha River, including that part of NERI west of the New River, to the Cherokee. During this period the Shawnee from Ohio conducted raids into the areas around NERI and GARI. Shawnee villages and raiding parties often included Mingo (Ohio Seneca), Delaware, and other tribes.

As an example of ethnic diversity of Iroquoian villages at this time the Onondaga had people from seven different nations living in their principal villages and the Seneca had people from eleven nations (Engelbrecht 2003:162; Richter 1992:65-66).

Based on the historical evidence, land claims of the Iroquois and Cherokee, and incidents of Shawnee and Delaware raiding consultation with federally recognized tribes associated with NERI and GARI during the Contact period should include:

**Iroquoian Tribes:**
- Tuscarora Nation
- Tonawanda Band of Seneca
- Seneca Nation of Indians
- St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
- Onondaga Indian Nation
- Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma
- Cayuga Nation
- Oneida Nation of New York
- Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin

**Cherokee Tribes:**
- Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians
- Cherokee Nation
- United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians

**Algonquian Tribes:**
- Absentee-Shawnee Tribe
- Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
- Shawnee Tribe
Delaware Nation
Delaware Tribe

These are the 17 tribes originally contacted by the Corps of Engineers for the Marmet Project based on historical evidence for the Kanawha Valley. The same list is used by other federal agencies in West Virginia.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONSULTATION AND TRIBAL LISTINGS

Below is a listing of federally recognized tribes associated with NERI and GARI, grouped by language families. The list includes NAGPRA Representatives and THPOS/Cultural Preservation Officers. This information is current as of October 6, 2010.

Algonquian Tribes

Delaware
President Kerry Holton
The Delaware Nation
P.O. Box 825
Anadarko, OK 73005
Tel: (405) 247-2448
Fax: (405) 247-9393

NAGPRA Contact:
Tamara Francis, Cultural Preservation Director
The Delaware Nation
31064 State Highway 281
Anadarko, OK 73005
Tel: (405) 247-2448 ext. 120
Fax: (405) 247-8905
Email: tfrancis@delawarenation.com

Chief Jerry Douglas
Delaware Tribe of Indians
170 NE Barbara
Bartlesville, OK 74006

NAGPRA Contact:
Brice Obermeyer
Delaware Tribe of Indians
c/o Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Shawnee
Governor George Blanchard
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe
2025 S. Gordon Cooper Drive
Shawnee, OK 74801
Tel: (405) 275-4030
Fax: (405) 878-4543
Website: http://www.astribe.com/

NAGPRA Contact:
Karen Kaniatobe, THPO
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe
2025 S. Gordon Cooper Drive
Shawnee, OK 74801

Chief Glenna J. Wallace
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 350
Seneca, MO 64865
Tel: (918) 666-2435
Fax: (918) 666-2186

Chairman Ron Sparkman
Shawnee Tribe
29 S. Highway 69A
P.O. Box 189
Miami, OK 74355
Tel: (918) 542-2441
Fax: (918) 542-2922

Iroquoian Tribes

Clint Halftown, Nation Representative
Cayuga Nation
P.O. Box 11
Versailles, NY 14168
Tel: (716) 337-4270
Fax: (716) 337-0268

Ray Halbritter, Nation Representative
Oneida Nation of New York
5218 Patrick Road
Verona, NY 13478
Tel: (315) 361-7633
Fax: (315) 361-7619
Website: http://www.oneida-nation.net/

NAGPRA Contact:
Brian Patterson, NAGPRA POC
Oneida Nation of New York
Route 5
P.O. Box 1
Vernon, NY 13475

Chairman Rick Hill
Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 365
Oneida, WI 54155-0365
Tel: (920) 869-2214
Fax: (920) 869-4040
Website: http://www.oneidanation.org/

NAGPRA Contacts:
Sandra Ninham, NAGPRA POC
Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin
P. O. Box 365
Oneida, WI 54155-0365

Corina Burke, THPO
Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin
P. O. Box 365
Oneida, WI 54155-0365

Chief Irving Powless, Jr.
Onondaga Indian Nation
Onondaga Nation Communications
102 W. Conklin Avenue
Nedrow, NY 13120
Tel: (315) 492-4210 or (315) 492-1922
Fax: (315) 469-1725

Chiefs James W. Ransom, Mark H. Garrow, and Monica Jacobs
St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
412 State Route 37
Akwesane, NY 13655
Tel: (518) 358-2272
Fax: (518) 358-4519

NAGPRA Contact:
Arnold L. Printup, THPO
St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
President Robert Odawi Porter  
Seneca Nation of Indians  
12837 Route 438  
Irving, NY 14801  
Tel: (716) 532-4900

NAGPRA Contacts:  
Lana Watt, THPO  
Seneca Nation of Indians  
90 Ohiyoh Way  
Salamanca, NY 14779  
Tel: (716) 945-1790 ext. 3589

Peter Jemison, NAGPRA Coordinator  
Seneca Nation of Indians  
P.O. Box 239  
Victor, NY 14564

Chief LeRoy Howard  
Chief of Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma  
P.O. Box 1283  
Miami, OK 74355  
Tel: (918) 542-6609  
Fax: (918) 542-3684

Chief Emerson Webster  
Tonawanda Band of Seneca  
7027 Meadville Road  
Bascom, NY 14013  
Tel: (716) 542-4244  
Fax: (716) 542-4008

Chief Leo R. Henry  
Tuscarora Nation  
2006 Mount Hope Road  
Lewiston, NY 14092  
Tel: (716) 622-7061  
Fax: (716) 297-7355

Cherokee Tribes

Principal Chief Chadwick Smith  
Cherokee Nation  
P.O. Box 948  
Tahlequah, OK 74465  
Tel: (918) 453-5000
Email: csmith@cherokee.org
Website: http://www.cherokee.org/

Principal Chief Michell Hicks
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians
P.O. Box 455
Cherokee, NC 28719
Tel: (828) 497-2771
Fax: (828) 497-7007
Website: http://www.cherokee-nc.com/

    NAGPRA Contact:
    Russell Townsend, THPO
    Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians
    P.O. Box 455
    Cherokee, NC 28719

Chief George Wickliffe
United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians
P.O. Box 746
Tahlequah, OK 74465
Tel: (918) 431-1818
Fax: (918) 431-1873
Website: http://www.unitedkeetoowahband.org/

Siouan Tribes

Chairman Amen Sheridan
Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
P.O. Box 368
Macy, NE 68039
Tel: (402) 837-5391
Fax: (402) 837-5308

Principal Chief Jim Gray
Osage Nation
627 Grandview
Pawhuska, OK 74056
Tel: (918) 287-1128
Fax: (918) 287-5562
Website: http://www.osagetribe.com/

    NAGPRA Contact:
    Dr. Andrea Hunter, THPO
    Osage Nation
    627 Grandview
    Pawhuska, OK 74056
    Tel: (918) 287-5671
    Fax: (918) 287-5376

81
John Berrey, Quapaw Tribal Business Committee Chairman  
Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma  
P.O. Box 765  
Quapaw, OK 74363  
Tel: (918) 542-1853  
Fax: (918) 542-4694  
Website: http://www.quapawtribe.com/

Chairman Earl J. Barbry, Sr.  
Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana  
P.O. Box 1589  
Marksville, LA 71351  
Tel: (318) 253-9767  
Fax: (318) 253-9791  
Email: earlii@tunica.org  
Website: http://www.tunicabiloxi.org/

NAGPRA Contact:  
Earl Barbry, Jr., THPO  
Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana  
P.O. Box 1589  
Marksville, LA 71351  
Tel: (318) 240-6451
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