SOME EARLY NOTICES

OF THE

INDIANS OF OHIO.

TO WHAT RACE DID THE MOUND BUILDERS BELONG?

By M. F. FORCE.

CINCINNATI:
ROBERT CLARKE & CO.
1879.

SOME EARLY NOTICES

OF THE

INDIANS OF OHIO.

TO WHAT RACE DID THE MOUND BUILDERS BELONG?

By M. F. FORCE.

CINCINNATI:
ROBERT CLARKE & CO.
1879.

SOME EARLY NOTICES

OF THE

INDIANS OF OHIO.

A Paper Read before the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio.

In the latter half of the seventeenth century, after the destruction of the Eries by the Five Nations, in 1656, what is now the State of Ohio was uninhabited. The Miami Confederacy, inhabiting the southern shore of Lake Michigan, extended southeasterly to the Wabash. The Illinois Confederacy extended down the eastern shore of the Mississippi to within about eighty miles of the Ohio. Hunting parties of the Chickasaws roamed up the eastern shore of the Mississippi to about where Memphis now stands. The Cherokees occupied the slopes and valleys of the mountains about the borders of what is now East Tennessee, North Carolina, and Georgia. The great basin, bounded north by Lake Erie, the Miamis, and the Illinois, west by the Mississippi, east by the Alleghanies, and south by the headwaters of the streams that flow into the Gulf of Mexico, seems to have been uninhabited except by bands of Shawnees, and scarcely visited except by war parties of the Five Nations.

In the next half century, the first half of the eighteenth, various tribes pressed into what is now Ohio,

across all its borders. Champlain, in 1609, found on the eastern shore of Lake Huron a tribe called by the Five Nations, Quatoghies, but to which the French gave name Huron. In some of the earlier relations they are called "*Hurons ou Ouendats.*" Ouendat appears to be the name by which they called themselves. About 1650 the Five Nations nearly destroyed the Hurons, or Wendats, and drove the remnant to seek shelter near the western extremity, among the tribes inhabiting the borders of Lake Superior. Afterward, threatened with war by the Sioux, in 1670, they gathered, under the protection of the French, about Michilimackinac, and gradually shifted down to Detroit. In the early part of the eighteenth century, under the name of Wyandots (the English spelling of the name, which the French spelled Ouendat), a portion of them extended their settlements into the northwestern part of Ohio, and became permanently fixed there.

The Miamis pushed their borders into the western portion. Shawnees settled the Scioto Valley. Delawares moved to the valley of the Muskingum. Little detachments of the Five Nations, mostly Senecas, occupied part of the northern and eastern borders. The Senecas who settled in the northern part were called by that name. Those who settled in the eastern portion, near the Delaware and the Pennsylvania border, were called Mingoes. The Five Nations, who called themselves Hodenosaunee (this name is very variously spelled), were called Iroquois by the French, Maquas by the Dutch, Five Nations by the English, and Mengwe by the Delawares. The Pennsylvanians, changing the appellation "Mengwe," which they had heard used by the

Delawares, called the Five Nations "Mingoes." And so the band of Senecas who settled in Ohio, between the Delawares, on the Muskingum, and the Pennsylvania border, went by the name of Mingoes. Parties of Cherokees often penetrated north of the Ohio, between 1700 and 1750, and later a party of them settled among the Wyandots, in the neighborhood of Sandusky. In this paper I propose to speak of only two tribes, the Eries and the Shawnees—to gather from authentic sources such mention as has been preserved of the Eries, and of the earlier history of the Shawnees.

The Eries, so called by the Hurons (Relations des Jesuites, 1654, p. 9, Quebec edition), were called Rique by the Iroquois (Rel. 1660, p. 7, and 1661. p. 29), and "Nation du Chat" by the French. Sagard, who went among the Hurons as a missionary in 1623, says: "There is in this vast region a country which we call the Cat Nation, by reason of their cats, a sort of small wolf or leopard found there, from the skins of which the natives make robes, bordered and ornamented with the tails." (Histoire du Canada, p. 747, ed. of 1636; p. 680, reprint of 1866.)

In a list of the sedentary nations that spoke the Huron tongue (Rel. 1635, p. 33), occurs the "Rhiier," the other being the Five Nations, the Andastoer, etc. In a list of tribes living south of the St. Lawrence and the lakes (Rel. 1640, p. 35), the Eries are mentioned, and in the Relation of 1641 (p. 71) they are named as neighbors of the Neutral Nation.

Dr. Du Gendron (if the book is authentic), writing from the country of the Hurons, in 1644, says: "This lake, named Erie, was formerly inhabited on its south-

ern shore by a certain tribe, called by us the Cat Nation, so named on account of the abundance of wild-cats found there, larger than the foxes of France. This nation has been obliged to retire far into the interior, in order to withdraw from their enemies, who are toward the west. The Cat Nation have a number of permanent towns (*quantité de bourgades arrestées*), where they cultivate the soil, and they have the same language with our Hurons." (Quelques Particularités des Hurons, etc., Paris, 1660; reprint, Albany, 1868, p. 8.)

The same passage is found verbatim, in the Relation of 1648, p. 46.

In 1654, war broke out between the Eries and the Five Nations. "They [the Iroquois] tell us a new war has broken out, which fills them with fear, that the Eries have taken arms against them (we call the Eries the Cat Nation, because there is in their country a prodigious number of wild-cats, two or three times as large as our tame cats, but having a beautiful and precious fur). They tell us that an Iroquois town has already been set on fire and destroyed at the first attack; that this nation pursued one of their armies which was returning victorious from the shores of Lake Huron, fell upon the rear guard of eighty picked men and entirely cut it to pieces; that one of their most distinguished chiefs, Annenraes, has been taken prisoner; in a word, that the Iroquois are inflamed, and are arming to repulse the enemy, and are, therefore, obliged to seek peace with us.

"This Cat Nation is very populous. Some Hurons, who have scattered everywhere since the destruction of their country, have joined them, and excited this war,

which alarms the Iroquois. It is said they have two thousand men, good warriors, though without fire-arms. But they fight like the French, enduring courageously the first discharge of the Iroquois, who have fire-arms, and then pouring upon them a hail of poisoned arrows, which they can shoot off six or eight times before the others can reload their muskets.

"However this may be, we shall remain at peace, and Father Simon Le Moine, just returned from the Iroquois, assures us that they have sent out eighteen hundred armed men." (Relation, 1654, p. 10.)

Father Simon Le Moine, before leaving the Iroquois, held counsel with them, and delivered a harangue after their manner, marking particular passages with gifts of wampum or hatchets, to preserve the memory of what was said. "The eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh presents for the four Iroquois nations, a hatchet for each, for the new war, in which they are engaged with the Cat Nation.

"And, finally, by the nineteenth present, I dried the tears of the young warriors for the death of their great chief, Annencraos, lately taken prisoner by the Cat Nation."

The orator of the Iroquois, in the course of his reply, sent thanks to the governor of Canada "for encouraging them to fight against their new enemies, the Cat Nation." (Relation, 1654, pp. 15 and 16.)

An embassy of Iroquois went to Quebec, in 1655. The orator began with twenty-four belts of wampum. With the fifteenth "he asked for French soldiers to defend his towns against the invasion of the Cat Nation, with whom they are at war." And, at the close of his

oration, he asked for arms to be used against the Cat Nation." (Relation, 1656, p. 6.)

The Relation of 1656 is filled with accounts of the burning and torture by the Iroquois of prisoners taken in their war with the Eries, or Cat Nation, and contains an account of the war itself. Preparations were begun in January, 1656 (p. 29). The narrative of the war is as follows: "The Cat Nation had sent thirty embassadors to Sonntonan [a town of the Senecas], to confirm the peace then existing between them; but it happened that a Sonnontonahronon [the French name for Seneca] was killed by one of the Cat Nation in a chance encounter. This murder so provoked the Sonnontonahronons, that they put to death all the embassadors but five, who escaped. War was now kindled between the two nations. It was a contest who should take the greatest number of prisoners to burn them. Among others, two Onnontagshronnons [the French name for Onondagas] were taken by the Cat Nation. One escaped; the other, a man of consideration, was preserved for burning, but he pleaded his cause so well, that he was given to the sister of one of the slain embassadors. She was absent from the town; but the people gave the captive fine clothes, held feasts for him, and assured him he would be returned to his country.

"When she, to whom he had been given, returned, she was told that her dead brother was restored, and that she should prepare a hospitable reception for him. She, on the contrary, began to weep, and protested that nothing could dry her tears till the death of her brother was avenged. The old men represented to her the importance of the matter, and told her this would bring

on a new war; but she would not yield. At length they were constrained to surrender the unfortunate captive to her, to be treated according to her pleasure. He was in the midst of a feast while this was passing. He was called out and led to the cabin of the cruel woman in silence. Upon his entering, he was surprised to be stripped of his new clothes, and at once saw that he was doomed to death. Before dying, he cried out that they were burning in his person an entire people, who would cruelly avenge his death. This was true. For scarcely was the news brought to Onnontague, before twelve hundred resolute men were on the path to take satisfaction.

"We have already remarked that the Cat Nation bears this name on account of the great numbers of wild-cats in their country. Their climate is very temperate; there is neither winter, nor ice, nor snow. And in summer, it is said, corn and fruits are in abundance, and of great excellence.

"Our warriors reached this country, though very far from Onnontague, without being observed. This excited such terror, that the towns were abandoned to the mercy of victors, who, having burned them, went in pursuit of the fugitives. These were two or three thousand combatants, besides women and children, and, seeing themselves hotly pursued, resolved, after five days' flight, to construct a wooden fort, and there await the enemy, who numbered only twelve hundred.

"They fortified themselves as well as they could. The enemy made his approaches. The two principal chiefs, clothed like Frenchmen, displayed themselves, to strike terror by the novelty of this dress. One of them, bap-

tized by Father Le Moine, and well-instructed, mildly summoned the besieged to surrender, to save their destruction, which would follow an assault. 'The Master of Life fights for us,' said he; 'you are lost, if you resist.' 'Who is this Master of our Lives?' proudly answered the besieged. 'We recognize none but our arms and our hatchets.' Thereupon, the assault is begun; the palisade is attacked on all sides, and is as well defended as attacked. The combat lasts long, and great courage is displayed on both sides.

"The besiegers try to carry the place by storm, but in vain; they are killed as fast as they show themselves. They resolved to use their canoes as shields. They carry these in front, and thus sheltered, they reach the foot of the intrenchment. But it was necessary to clear the great beams or trees of which it was built. They slant their canoes, and use them as ladders to mount the great palisade. This boldness so astonished the besieged, that, their armament being already exhausted, for their supply was small—especially powder—they thought to retreat, and this was their ruin. For the first fugitives being mostly killed, the rest were surrounded by the Onnontaguehronnons, who entered the fort, and made such a carnage of women and children, that the blood was in places knee-deep.

"Those who succeeded in escaping, numbering three hundred, desiring to retrieve their honor, retraced their steps, with the design of surprising their enemy, who should be less on their guard, on their return march. The plan was well conceived, but ill carried out. For, frightened at the first shout of the Onnontaguehronnons, they were entirely defeated. The conquerors, however,

lost heavily, so that they were obliged to remain in the country two months, to bury their dead and heal their wounded." (Pp. 30, 31.)

With this the Eries disappear. They are afterward mentioned only as a destroyed people. Most of the captives taken by the Iroquois were tortured and burned; but some (Rel. 1660, p. 7) were adopted and became members of the Five Nations.

On De Lisle's map, published in 1720, appears, near the southern shore of Lake Erie, the words, "*Nation du Chat, détruite.*" On the same map, villages marked "*Les Tongoria,*" are placed on the Ohio, and on the Tennessee rivers. As Colden, in his History of the Five Nations, published 1727, in his list of names used by the French, and the English, and Five Nations, gives Tongoria as the French equivalent for Erigek, used by the English and Five Nations, Mr. Shea suggests, in his notes to a reprint of Colden, that the Tongorias might be the remnant of the Eries. But I find no mention of them, except the mere appearance of the name on De Lisle's map, and in Colden's list of names.

The Tuckaubatchies, a subdivision of the Creek Nation, undoubtedly used the Muscogee language, in the latter part of the last century. Yet it seems agreed, that they were not originally Muscogees, but joined the confederacy after the arrival of the Muscogees in Alabama, from the far west. The Muscogees proper, the Cussetahs, and Cowetas, maintained that when they arrived in Alabama, the Tuckaubatchies were not in the country. (American State Papers, vol. 6, p. 785.) The Tuckaubatchies were distinguished by the possession

of some copper hatchets and brass disks, which they regarded with the utmost veneration. These could never be seen, except as they were carried by chiefs, with great solemnity, in the annual corn-dance. A full account of these articles is given by Adair (p. 178), and in Pickett's History of Alabama, pp. 84–86.

Milfort says (p. 265) that, nearly about the same time that the Alibamons were admitted into the confederacy, "an Indian tribe, which had just been destroyed by the Iroquois and the Hurons, came to ask the protection of the Muskoquis, whom I shall now call Creeks. The Creeks received them, and gave them lands in the center of the nation. They built a town, which is at this day of some importance, and which is called Tuket Batchet, from the name of the tribe." It is within possibility that Tuckaubatchies were a surviving remnant of the Eries.

The Shawnees were not found originally in Ohio, but migrated there after 1750. They were called Chaouanons, by the French, and Shawanoes, by the English. The English name Shawano, changed to Shawanee, and recently to Shawnee. Chaouanon and Shawano are obviously attempts to represent the same sound by the orthography of the two respective languages, the French *ch*, being the equivalent of the English *sh;* and the French *ou*, representing the English *w*. Parkman says of the tribe (Life of Pontiac, vol. 1, p. 32): "Their eccentric wanderings, their sudden appearances and disappearances, perplex the antiquary and defy research." Much industry has been used by recent writers, especially by Dr. Brinton, to trace this nomadic tribe to its original home; but I think without success. I propose

to make an additional contribution, repeating what has been gathered by others, adding thereto some fresh citations, but still leaving the problem unsolved.

According to the French accounts, the original seat of the Shawanoes was the southern shore of Lake Erie.

In a letter written jointly by M. de Vaudreuil, governor of Louisiana, and the Commissary of the Marine at New Orleans, February 15, 1744, to the Count de Maurepas, about extending trade with the Indians it is said: "Besides, the Chaouanons, heretofore settled in Canada, and very well known to Monsieur de Vaudreuil, are come to settle among the Alibamos." (Present State of Louisiana, etc., London, 1744, p. 52.) The French applied the name Canada to all the territory held by them, east of the Mississippi, and north of the Ohio. For example, Du Pratz says: "It is of little importance to discuss the limits of the respective colonies, Canada and Louisiana, but we call all north of the Ohyo, Canada." (Vol. 1, pp. 329, 330, ed. Paris, 1758.) So Bossu says, Hennepin, in sailing up the Mississippi, from the Illinois river to the Falls of St. Anthony, passed through Canada, not through Louisiana. (Nouveaux Voyages, p. 184, Paris, 1768.) And the Jesuit Missions, in what is now Western New York, were called stations in Canada.

Colden says, in his history of the Five Nations, published in 1727 (pp. 2–6), that the French arriving in 1603, found the Adirondacks at war with the Five Nations; that formerly, the Five Nations, then a peaceful tribe, living by agriculture, about the site of Montreal, being oppressed by the Adirondacks, migrated to the southern shore of Lake Cadaracqui [Ontario], where they

at first feebly resisted their pursuers. "But afterwards becoming more expert and more used to war, they not only made a brave defense, but likewise made themselves masters of the great lakes, and chased the Shawanons from thence." That (p. 10) they increased their numbers by adopting many of the Shawanon prisoners.

Colden, undoubtedly, took this account from Bacqueville de la Potherie. (Histoire de L'Amerique Septentrionale, etc., depuis, 1534, jusqu à, 1701. Ed. Paris, 1753, pp. 288–295.) This book was first published in 1721, and Bacqueville de la Potherie was in Canada a few years prior to 1700. The same account is given by Charlevoix.

Bacqueville and Charlevoix both borrowed from Nicholas Perrot, whose Mémoire sur les Moeurs, Contumes et Religion des Sauvages, etc., remained unpublished till 1864. Perrot says that the Iroquois had their original home about Montreal and Three Rivers (p. 90), that they fled from the Algonquins to Lake Erie (p. 11), where lived the Chaouanons who waged war against them, and drove them to the shores of Lake Ontario. That after many years of war against the Chaouanons and their allies, they withdrew to Carolina, where they now are (p. 12). The Iroquois, after being obliged to quit Lake Erie, withdrew to Lake Ontario; and that after having chased the Chaouanons and their allies towards Carolina, they have ever since remained there, or in the vicinity (p. 79).

We can not trace this narrative beyond Perrot. He gives no authority, and appears to have none but legends preserved by the Indians. But several facts give color to his statement. He lived among the Indians

from 1665 to 1699, for greater part of the time, in the Northwest, and possessed to an unusual degree their esteem and confidence. No one had better opportunity to learn from them their knowledge or belief concerning their early history. He was in Illinois when a band of Shawanoes emigrated thither, from the valley of the Cumberland, between 1680 and 1690, and was well acquainted with them. And some facts tend to confirm his statements, both as to the Iroquois and the Chaouanons. Jacques Cartier, penetrating up the St. Lawrence, in 1535, to the island of Montreal, found there the town of Hochelaga, constructed and fortified in every detail like the towns of the Iroquois subsequently found between Lake Ontario and Lake Champlain; inhabited by a peaceful tribe, speaking the Iroquois language, and subsisting by agriculture and fishing. When Champlain followed Cartier's route in 1609, Hochelaga had disappeared, and the Adirondacks occupied the ground; but the Iroquois, a warlike though agricultural people, were living on the borders of Ontario, in fortified towns precisely resembling Hochelaga. And in the Jesuit Relation of 1660, p. 6, we read: "Of the five tribes that compose the Iroquois nation, the Agnieronnons [Mohawks] have been often at the top and at the bottom of the wheel, that we find in history few instances of such revolutions." "We learn from their old men that toward the close of the last century, the Agnieronnons were reduced to such extremity by the Algonquins that scarcely a remnant was left; and yet this remnant, a noble germ, thrived so greatly in a few years, that it in turn reduced the Algonquins to the same straits."

The first contemporary mention of the Shawanoes, if indeed it be such, is in L'Histoire du Nouveau Monde, by De Laet. On p. 82, ed. Leyden, 1640, is a list of Indian tribes inhabiting the shores of South river (now the Delaware), and then follows: "Some add to these the Sawanoos, the Capitanesses, Gacheos, and others, who differ but little in manners and customs from those we have described; they cultivate fields, and live on maize and vegetables." It is possible that these "Sawanoos" are the "Shawanons" driven from the lakes some fifty years before by the Iroquois. Colden, in his history, published in 1727, mentions the Shawanoes three times; he spells the name twice Shawanon, once Sawanon. Heckewelder entitles his chapter on this tribe "Shawanos or Sawanos," and adds in a foot-note: "General John Gibson thinks Sawano is their proper name." (Transactions Am. Phil. Soc. p. 69.) "The Indians pronounce it Sawanahaac; I have had them repeat it frequently. Our ancestors from lack of attention wrote Shawanee, and their descendants have followed the example." (Recherches Historiques, etc., Par un Citoyen de Virginie, Paris, 1788, vol. 4, p. 153.) Buckingham Smith, in his notes to the Memoir of Fontaneda, p. 47, says he takes the name from the lips of the people, Sawanwa. Indeed, in the earlier books, *s* is used interchangeably with *sh*, or the French *ch*, in the spelling of Indian names. We find Michilimackinac and Missilimackinac; Nadouessous and Nadouechious; Mississippi and Mechasipe; Mascoutens and Machkoutench, and many others.

And there is an earlier mention than De Laet. On a manuscript map of the discovery of New Nether-

lands, drawn either in 1614 or 1616, and still preserved in Holland, a tribe called "Sawwanew" is placed on the east bank of the Delaware river. A fac-simile of this map is given in Docs. relating to Col. Hist. of N. Y., vol. 1, facing page 11.

That the Sawanoos of De Laet and the Sawwanews of the old Dutch map were in fact the Shawanoes, received some color from subsequent events. In 1694, a portion of the Shawanoes emigrated from the south, and settled above the forks of the Delaware, among the Minnesinks or Minsis, one of the tribes of the Delaware Nation, having first solicited and obtained permission. While the discussion of this request was pending, the Five Nations, in council at Albany, on the 4th of July, 1693, said to Governor Fletcher, who was governor of New York and Pennsylvania: "We are glad that the Shawanoes, who are our enemies, did make their application to you last fall for protection, and you sent them hither to endeavor a peace with us." (Docs. Rel. Col. Hist. N. Y., vol. iv., p. 44.) Governor Fletcher replied, on the 31st of the same month: "You know Albany hath always been the *antient* place of treating, when the Shawanoes come to New York to make peace." (Ib. p. 51.)

If it was the Shawanoes who were living on the Delaware, prior to 1640, they found themselves disagreeably near their old foes. The adjoining nation, the Delawares, were held in subjection as a "squaw nation" by the Iroquois; and the Andastogues, or Andastes, living on the Susquehanna, were engaged in a war with the Iroquois, which was flagrant at least as early as 1607, and continued till the destruction of the Andastogues, in

1672. And the Shawanoes, if living on the Delaware prior to 1640, soon migrated south of the Ohio river.

Father Lalemant, writing from Montreal, in 1662 (Rel. 1662, p. 1, *et seq.*), mentioning the war parties of the Iroquois of the past year, one of which had gone against the Abenaquis, on the Kennebec, and another in Virginia, proceeds:

"Turning a little more to the west, than towards the south, another band of Iroquis sought a nation that lives four hundred leagues from this place, whose only crime is, they are not Iroquois. This nation they call Ontoagaunha, which means, people who do n't know how to talk, on account of the corrupted Algonquin used by them. If we believe the Iroquois who returned, and the captives whom they brought, that is a country which, free from the rigor of our winters, enjoys a climate always temperate, a perpetual spring and autumn. The soil is so fertile, we could almost speak of it as the Israelite spies described the Promised Land. Indian corn there grows to such a size that one might take it for trees; it bears ears two feet long, with grains like grapes. The elk and the beaver being inhabitants of cold countries are not found there. But, instead, deer, buffaloes, wild boars, and other large animals, which we are not acquainted with, fill the beautiful forests, that are like orchards, most of the trees being fruit trees. The woods abound with every variety of gay plumage, especially little parroquets, which are so numerous that we have seen some of the Iroquois return thence with scarfs and girdles made of them. Serpents are found there, six feet long, but harmless. The men, however, are not so harmless, for they have a poison,

with which they infect springs, and even rivers, so skillfully, that the water loses none of its clearness, though entirely polluted. Their villages lie along a fine river that empties into a great lake, as they call the sea, where they have commerce with Europeans, who worship God as we do, use rosaries, and have bells to summon to prayers. From their account, we suppose these Europeans are Spaniards."

Father Marquette, writing from La Pointe, on the southern shore of Lake Superior, in 1670, says, he had some intercourse with a party of Illinois, who had made a journey to La Pointe. He learned much from them of their country, and of the region beyond. He says (Rel. 1760, p. 91), they tell me that "they were visited last summer by a nation, whom they call Chaouanon, and who live to the east-southeast of their country. The young man, who teaches me the Illinois language, saw them, and says they had glass beads, which proves that they have communication with Europeans. They had made a journey of thirty days, to reach the country of the Illinois."

Father Julien Garnier, writing from among the Seneca Indians, July, 1672 (Rel. 1672, p. 25), says: "God has shown great mercy to some baptized adults, among others, a captive Ontouagaunha or Chaouanong, decrepit with age. Ordinarily, only young men are brought captive from such distant nations."

Hence, from 1662 to 1672, there lived somewhere about four hundred leagues southwesterly from Montreal, and a thirty days' journey southeasterly from the Illinois river, a tribe called Chaouanon, nick-named

Ontouagaunha, by the Iroquois, and who had some intercourse and trade with Europeans.

In 1673, Marquette, who had established himself among the Illinois, sailed down the Illinois river to the Mississippi, and then continued down the Mississippi to the mouth of the Arkansas. He passed by the mouth of the Ohio, which he called Ouabouskigou, without entering it. He says (p. 32 of the Paris reprint, 1845, of the edition of 1681.): "This river comes from the east, where live the people called Chaouanons. They are so numerous, that in one direction, they have twenty-three villages, and in another, fifteen, conveniently near together. They are not at all warlike. They are the people whom the Iroquois are seeking to wage war upon without any provocation; and, as these poor fellows can not defend themselves, they are captured and carried off like sheep."

Upon the map, the Ouabouskigou is traced but a short distance from the Mississippi. On the map, attached to the journal published in 1681, the Mississippi is traced to the Gulf of Mexico; and on it, the Chaouanons are placed on the Ohio, near to the Mississippi. Marquette's original manuscript, with his own map, "*tracée de sa main*" was preserved in the College of St. Marie in Montreal, and was published by Shea, in 1855. On this map "Chaouanon" is placed in the great blank space far to the east of the Mississippi.

Father Jacques Gravier sailed from the Illinois, down to the mouth of the Mississippi, in 1700. His narrative is printed by Shea, from manuscript. Arriving at the mouth of the Ohio, which had already been called the Ouabache, by La Salle, in 1683, he says (p. 10):

"It has three branches; one coming from the north-east, and flowing behind the country of the Oumiamis, is called by us, the St. Joseph, but by the savages, the Oubachie; the second comes from the country of the Iroquois, and this is called the Ohio; the third, on which the Chouanoua live, comes from the south-south-west. The stream formed by the junction of the three flows into the Mississippi, under the name of the Ouabachi."

In the Relation of the Mission of Quebec, for 1700, published by Shea, from the manuscript, is a letter of M. De St. Cosme, giving an account of his descent of the Mississippi (p. 34):

"We went to-day to the Kaouechias [Cahokias], who are still bewailing the attack made upon them by the Chickasas and the Chauanons." (P. 38): "We left Capt. St. Antoine the 00 December, and on the 00, we camped for the night, a league above the Wabache, a great and beautiful river, which empties into the Mississippi, from the left. It comes from the north, and is said to be five hundred leagues long. Its source is near the country of the Senecas, and by this river one can go to the Chauanons, who trade with the English."

Bacqueville De La Potherie relates (vol. 2, p. 114), that a party of Pouteouatemis, going to the east, met, near the strait of Michilimackinak, a canoe filled with Iroquois. Both parties turned and fled from each other. "The Iroquois, in their flight, fell into an ambuscade of forty Sauteurs, who captured them, and took them off. These Iroquois had just made an expedition against the Chaouanons, near Carolina, and had brought with them one captive, to burn. The Sauteurs set the

captive free, and put him in charge of some Sakis, to guide him to the bay (Baye des Puants). This released captive talked largely of the South Sea; said his village was only five days' journey from it, and that his village was near a great river, which coming from the country of the Illinois, empties into this sea." De La Potherie is parsimonious in the use of dates, but by comparing this narrative with page 123, the release of the Chaouanan captive appears to have happened in 1665.

Joutel, companion of La Salle, in his last voyage, says, in speaking of the Shawanoes, in Illinois, they have been there only since they were drawn thither by M. De La Salle; formerly they lived on the borders of Virginia, and the English colonies. (Découvertes et Etablissements des Français, edited by Margry, vol. 3, pp. 502, 503.)

From these statements, which give us our earliest certain knowledge of Shawnees, it appears that in the last half of the seventeenth century, their home was on the upper waters of the Cumberland, or of the Cumberland and the Tennessee.

There was at least a settlement of Shawanoes, perhaps only a village—perhaps of refugees—but, at all events, some Shawanoe dwellers, near Mobile, sometime prior to 1714. M. Perricault, in 1714, falling in with the Taensas, fugitives from their old home, near the Natchez, took them with him to Mobile. There, "M. De Bienville gave to the Taensas the place formerly occupied by the Chaouanons and Taouatchas, two leagues distant from the fort." I find no other reference to this residence of the Shawanoes. (Louisiana, from 1698 to 1722,

by M. Perricault, in French's Hist. Col., new series, p. 126.)

The migration of the Shawnees from the basin of the Cumberland, was to the northwest and the northeast.

The captive Shawanoe, released from the Iroquois by the Sauteurs, returned home, and gave such accounts of what he had seen, that a party of forty of his nation set out to visit the Pottawatamies, living at the Baye des Puants. (Bacq. De La P., vol. 2, p. 131.) No date is given. This party of forty may be the same party that Marquette heard of in 1670, though it would seem, by comparison with page 134, that the visit described by B. De La P. happened as late as 1672.

This visit led to further intercourse. An entire village migrated from their more southern home, and settled on the Illinois river, where La Salle and Tonti erected Fort St. Louis. This migration is stated in Bacqueville de la Potherie, in the early imperfectly-published narratives of Joutel and Tonti, as well as the more accurate publication of Joutel and Tonti from the original manuscripts, in French's Historical Collection. But the collection of manuscripts carefully collected by Margry (Déscouvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Ouest, et dans le Sud), now in course of publication, fixes the date more definitely.

Some Shawanoes were with the Illinois in 1680. For when a party of five hundred Iroquois, armed with fire-arms, and accompanied by a hundred Shawanoes armed with bows and arrows, approached the village of the Illinois, in September, 1680 (Margry, vol. 1, pp. 506–7), news of their approach was first brought by a friendly Shawano, who had been staying with the Illinois, and

who, setting out on his return home, encountered the hostile party (vol. 1, p. 584). In the spring, 1681, "a Shawano chief, who commanded one hundred and fifty warriors, and who lived on the borders of a great river flowing into the Ohio, having learned that the Sieur de La Salle was in the country of the Miamis, sent to him to have the protection of the king. La Salle replied that the chief's country was inaccessible to the French, by reason of its great distance; but if he would come and join La Salle at the end of the year, and aid him to discover the mouth of the Mississippi, he could then be sure of the protection of the king, and aid against the Iroquois and other enemies. The chief agreed to this proposition, and promised to be at the mouth of the river of the Miamies (south end of Lake Michigan), by the end of autumn (vol. 1, p. 529).

The promise, it appears, was not kept according to its terms. The Indians who accompanied La Salle on his voyage down the Mississippi were New England Indians (vol. 1, pp. 549--565). A full list of them, with the name of each, is given, pp. 594--5. Hence Cavalier, La Salle's nephew, is mistaken (fragment of original manuscript printed by Shea) in stating that the Indians who deserted from La Salle were Shawanoes.

The migration appears to have been made while La Salle was on his voyage. For upon his return in summer, 1682, he brought about an alliance between the Illinois on the one hand, and the Miamies, Shawanoes, and Mascoutens on the other, for common defense against the Iroquois (vol. 1, p. 570).

In July, 1682, La Salle, intending to go to Europe to report his discovery, directed Tonti to construct a

fort at the portage of the Illinois river, to protect the village of Shawanoes that he had drawn to him, and had united with the Miamis. Tonti, finding the Shawanoes gone off hunting, and the Miamies ready to flee from fear of the Iroquois, postponed the work, and La Salle, sending his report to Europe, remained, and with Tonti built fort St. Louis on a cliff, and gathered the Shawanoes about it. The Miamies, and afterwards the Illinois, joined him there (vol. 1, pp. 612-13).

This settlement of the Shawanoes among the Illinois and Miamies gave offense to the Five Nations. At a conference in August, 1684, between M. de la Barre, governor of Canada, and Garangula, an Onondaga chief, M. de la Barre complained that the Five Nations had robbed and abused traders passing between the Illinois and Miamies, and other tribes in alliance with the French. Garangula replied: "We have knocked the Twihtwies [Iroquois name for Miamis] and Chictagiks [Iroquois name for Illinois] on the head because they cut down the trees of peace which were the limits of our country. They have hunted beavers in our lands. They have acted contrary to the customs of all Indians, for they left none of the beavers alive; they killed both male and female. They brought the Satanas [Iroquois name for Shawanoes] into their country to take part with them, and armed them, after they had concerted ill designs against us." (Colden, pp. 87–8, ed. 1727.)

When Tonti descended the Mississippi in 1686, in the hope of meeting La Salle at the mouth, he took with him "thirty Frenchmen and five Illinois and Chawanons." (French's Hist. Col. vol. 1, p. 67.) And in 1689, it appears the "Kightages, Twightwighs, and

Sawenochques" [Illinois, Miamis, and Shawanoes] were again in alliance against the Iroquois. (Doc. Hist. New York, vol. 2, p. 138.)

This band of Shawanoes moved west of the Missouri about a century later (American State Papers, vol. 6, p. 11), where Baron de Corondelet, the Spanish governor, subsequently, in 1793, made them a land grant (Ib. p. 591), where they lived till they were removed by the United States to a reservation in the Indian Territory.

Another band, as already mentioned, migrated from the South, and settled on the Delaware river. It appears from the council minutes of New York of 14th September, 1692, cited in Ruttenber's Hudson River Indians, p. 180, that some Minsis (one of the tribes of the Delaware nation), returning from a sojourn among the Shawanoes, brought some of the Shawanoes with them, who asked permission to settle among the Minsis. The council directed the Shawanoes must first make peace with the Five Nations. Negotiations followed, and the migration was made in 1694. By the Roll's Office of Bucks county, Pennsylvania, it appears that in 1733, Shawanoes were still living near the forks of the Delaware, and had a village, and possessed an island, called Shawana Island. (Enquiry into the Causes of the Alienation of the Delaware and Shawanese Indians, London, 1749, p. 29.)

In 1698, another band, probably part of the same migration, settled on Pecquea creek, in what is now Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, beside the Conestogas, a little remnant surviving of the Andastogues or Andastes. This band, before many years, moved to the Alleghany river, and thence into Ohio.

The first notice of this band is the treaty between William Penn, of the one part, and the chiefs of the Indians inhabiting upon and about the river Susquehanna, "and Nopaththa, King Lemoytungh, and Pemoyajooagh, chiefs of the nations of the Shawonnah Indians," and others, made and concluded 23d day of the 2d month, called April, in the year 1701. (Penn. Archives, vol. 1, p. 144.)

On the 21st May, 1728, the governor of Pennsylvania said to the messengers from the chiefs of the Shawanese at Pechoquealin: "William Penn made a firm peace and league of friendship with all the Indians, and the chain has from time to time been tightened. The Shawanese were not then in this country; they came long afterward, and desired leave of the Conestogoe Indians, and of William Penn, to settle in this country. Leave was granted to them both by the Indians and English. They promised to live in peace with us, and the Conestogoe Indians became their security." (Penn. Archives, vol. 1, p. 223.)

The message of Governor Gordon, containing instructions to Henry Smith and John Petty, envoys, says: "Tell Shakellamy, particularly, that he is set over the Shawanah Indians. I hope he can give a good account of them. They came to us, only as strangers, about thirty years ago; they desired leave of this government to settle among us as strangers, and the Conestogoe Indians became security for their good behavior. They are also under the protection of the Five Nations, who have set Shakellamy over them." (Penn. Archives, vol. 1, p. 228.)

On the 29th October, 1731, Jonah Davenport made

affidavit at Philadelphia, that a French agent had every spring for several years past come down to the Shawanee settlement at Alleghany, and consulted with the Indians there. James Le Tort made a similar affidavit at the same time. Attached to the affidavits is a memorandum of the number of Indians. Among them is "3 Shawanese towns on Conumach creek, 45 families, 200 men." Next to this, is the item: "Asswikales, 50 families, lately from S. Carolina to Potowmack, and from thence thither." (Penn. Archives, vol. 1, pp. 299, 300.)

December, 1731, the governor sent a message "to the chiefs of the Shawanese Indians at Alleghany," which begins: "I find by our records that about thirty-four years since, some members of your nation came to Susquehannah, and desired leave first of our brethren, Conestogoe Indians, and that of Col. Markham, who at that time was governor under Wm. Penn at Philadelphia, that they might have leave to settle on Pecquea creek, which was granted."

The Shawanoes sent a message to Governor Gordon, of Pennsylvania, "June 7, 1732, or thereabouts." The message relates the efforts of the Five Nations, through a series of years, to enlist the Shawanese in a war against the English, and the final refusal of the Shawanese about 1726, and proceeds: "About a year after, they, the Five Nations, told the Delawares and us. Since you have not hearkened to us, nor regarded what we have said, now we will put pettycoats on you, and look upon you as women for the future, and not men. Therefore you Shawanese look back toward Ohio, the place whence you came, and return thither-

ward, for now we shall take pity on the English, and let them have all this land." (Penn. Archives, vol. 1, p. 329.)

In the Remarks, dated 22d September, 1757, upon the Observations of the Proprietors of Pennsylvania, on a paragraph of Sir William Johnston's letter to the Lords of Trade and Plantation, bearing date 10th September, 1757, occurs the following paragraph: "It is well known that the purchase made at Albany in 1754 [by the English from the Six Nations] gave great uneasiness to the Susquehanna Indians, and from the time the county surveyor began to survey Juniata and up the Susquehanna, the Delawares, Shawanese, and Nanticokes then settled on the river began to remove farther back, some to Tirjahoga, some to Ohio." (Documentary History of New York, vol. 1, p 415.)

Sir William Johnston sent envoys to the great Indian Council held on the plains of the Scioto, in the latter part of 1770. An Indian chief called Thomas King was the chief of the party. Sir William Johnston reports, "Upon Thomas King's arrival at Scioto, he assembled all the nations, and first addressed the Shawanese, whom he upbraided for retiring so far down the Ohio, and from, etc. The Shawanese answered, that the Six Nations had long seemed to neglect them, and to disregard the promise they formerly made of giving them the lands between the Ohio and the lakes. That thus distressed, they went on board their canoes determined to go whithersoever fortune should drive them, but were stopped many years since at the Scioto, by the Six Nations, who shook them by the hands and

fixed them there." (Documentary History of New York, vol. 2, p. 990.)

According to Lawson, whose history of Carolina was published in 1709, this detachment of Shawanoes that moved to Pennsylvania, had lived, for a time, in the upper part of South Carolina. By way of illustrating the roving life of the Indians, he says (p. 171, ed. 1714): "And to this day, they are a shifting, wandering people; for I know some Indian Nations that have changed their settlements many hundred miles, sometimes, no less than a thousand, as is proved by the Savanna Indians, who formerly lived on the banks of the Mississipi, and removed thence to the head of one of the rivers of South Carolina; since which (for some dislike), most of them are removed to live in the quarters of the Iroquois or Sinnegars, which are on the heads of the rivers that disgorge themselves into the Bay of Chesapeake."

In Kercheval's History of the Valley of Virginia, (Winchester, 1833, p. 58), we read: "The Shawnee tribe, it is well known, were settled about the neighborhood of Winchester. What are called 'The Shawnee cabins' and 'Shawnee Springs,' immediately adjoining the town, is well known. It is also equally certain that this tribe had a considerable village on Babb's marsh, some three or four miles north of Winchester. Mr. Thomas Barrett, who was born in 1755, stated to the author, that within his recollection, the signs of the Indian wigwams were to be seen in Babb's marsh." Perhaps, this village is the settlement referred to in the following passage, in a letter from Civility, a Conestoga chief, to Governor Gordon, written in 1729: "About two

months ago, the Southern Indians killed and took nine of the Shawaners, living on a branch of the Potomack near the Great Mountains." (Penn. Archives, vol. 1, p. 241.)

At all events, the village near the site of Winchester, was not occupied much after 1729, for it is known from Kercheval, as well as earlier authorities, that in 1738, and afterward, the valley was not inhabited by Indians, but was a war-path used by parties of the Catawbas, going north, and of Delawares and the Five Nations, going south.

The main body of the Shawanoes, that did not migrate to Illinois, or to Pennsylvania, remained in the valley of the Cumberland, alternately at war and in alliance with their adjoining neighbors, the Chickasaws, the Creeks, and the Cherokees. Ramsey says, in his History of Tennessee p. 45):

"M. Charleville, a French trader, from Crozat's colony, at New Orlea s, came, in 1714, among the Shawnees, then inhabiting the country on the Cumberland river, and traded with them. His store was built on a mound, near the present site of Nashville."

On page 79, after stating that the Shawnees "forted themselves, and maintained a protracted war for the possession of their country," till they were expelled by the allied Chickasaws and Cherokees, adds:

"A few years later, in 1714, when Monsieur Charleville opened a store, where Nashville now is, he occupied this fort of the Shawnees as his dwelling." Ramsey gives no authority for the statement.

But Perricault says that in 1714, "I found, among the Natchez, some slaves belonging to the nation of the

Chaouanans, who had been captured by a strong party of Chicachas, Yazous, and Natchez, who, under pretext of visiting their village for the purpose of dancing the calumet of peace, had attacked them in the most base and treacherous manner, and killed their grand chief, with most of his family, took eleven prisoners, among whom was the wife of the chief, and brought them to the Natchez." (French's Historical Collections of Louisiana and Florida, new series, p. 123.)

In the "Enumeration of the Indian Tribes connected with the Government of Canada; the warriors and armorial bearings of each Nation, 1736," printed from the Paris document, in the first volume of the Documentary History of New York, p. 24, the only mention of the Shawnees is under the class "Lake Erie and Dependencies, on the South Side," and is, "The Chouanons, towards South Carolina, are two hundred men."

The French, in their war against the Chickasaws, in 1737–1740, had a party of Shawanons among their allies. On the 17th January, 1790, "The Chaouanons left, to return home. They could not stay longer with us, because in January and February the Cherokees and Flatheads, their neighbors, generally come and attack them." (Journal de la Guerre du Mississippi contre les Checachas, en 1739, finie en 1740, le 1 er d'Avril, par un officier de l'Armée de M. de Noailles, p. 74.)

The name Flathead was commonly given to the Choctaws, though, says Du Pratz, he saw no reason why they should be so distinguished, when the practice of flattening the head was so general. And in the Enumeration just cited, the next paragraph to the Chaou-

anans is "The Flatheads, Cherakis, Chicachas, and Totiris are included under the name of Flatheads, by the Iroquois." The Catawbas, especially, were called Flatheads.

In 1749, Adair met a war party of twenty-three Shawanoes between the Flint and Ockmulgee rivers, in Georgia. They were accompanied by four Cherokees, and after killing two Chickasaws, whom they met, "ran off to the northern towns of the Cherake." (Adair's American Indians, pp. 276–278.)

On page 410, he writes: "Formerly, about fifty miles to the northeast of the Chikkasah country, I saw the chief part of the main camp of the Shawano, consisting of about four hundred and fifty persons, on a tedious ramble to the Muskohge country, where they settled, seventy miles above the Alabahme garrison; they had been straggling in the woods for the space of four years, they assured me." The date is not given, but in the preface he states that he first traded with the "Chickkasah," in 1744.

This restless, wandering tribe, thinned by war, migrated not many years after, to Ohio, and joined there the fragment of the nation that had gone to Pennsylvania, and thence to Ohio. Christopher Gist, in his journey down the Ohio, in 1750, found one village of Shawanoes. This was at the mouth of the Scioto, and contained one hundred and forty houses and three hundred men. (Appendix to Pownall's Topographical Description, London, 1776.)

In the Enumeration of Indians by Sir Wm. Johnston in 1763, which includes none south of the Ohio, and Pennsylvania, the only mention of the Shawanese

is "300, removed to the Scioto and other branches." The map to Pownall's Topographical Description gives two Shawnee towns—one at the mouth of the Scioto, one at the mouth of the Kanawha. Ashe, in 1806, visited the settlement of Shawnees at Shawneetown, on the Ohio, near its mouth, and said they had moved thither from the upper Ohio. Col. John Johnston, in his tables of Ohio Indians, in 1819 (Archaeological Americana, vol. 1, p. 220), gives three settlements of Shawnoese—one at Wapaghkonetta, one ten miles above, and one at Lewis creek, head of the Miami—aggregating two hundred and sixty-five men.

It is suggested by Parkman, and the suggestion continually forces itself, that the Shawanoes may have been a surviving remnant of the Eries, that fled to the south after the destruction of the tribe by the Iroquois in 1655. But the Iroquois, who struck the Shawanoes on the Cumberland, in 1662, spoke of them as a newly discovered people, not as a remnant of their old enemies, whom they had routed seven years before.

The Iroquois also called the Eries "Rigues," and called the Shawanoes "Satanas." Moreover, Marquette, in 1673, described the Shawanoes as a populous tribe, living in many villages, without any suspicion that this nation could be a remnant saved from the destruction of the Eries, eighteen years before. And De Lisle's map, made in 1712, has on it two villages of "Tongorias," and Colden, in his list of names, says Tongoria is the name given by the French to the tribe called "Erigeks" by the Iroquois. The termination "ek" is equivalent to the termination "ronon," meaning tribe or people. And finally, the early notices of

the Eries agree in saying they spoke the Huron tongue, while the Shawanoes belong to the Algonquin family of nations.

It has also been suggested that the original seat of the Shawanoes was the Suwanee river, in Florida. There is little ground, apparently, for this but the resemblance in sound. Yet Dr. Brinton says it is not known that Suwanee is an Indian name; on the contrary, he proposes that it is a corruption of the Spanish name "San Juanito." Such an origin, indeed, has parallel in many names corrupted from early French designations; as Dardanelle, on the Mississippi, from "Dort d'un oeil," given to a place where it was necessary for voyageurs to be especially watchful; the river Zumbro, in Illinois, from Rivière Aux Embarras; and the well-known Picket Wire river, in Western Kansas, from "Purgatoire."

This suggestion was first made by Colonel Johnston, the Indian agent in Ohio, in a letter, 17th June, 1819, and published in the first volume of the Archaeologia Americana. He says (p. 273): "The Shawannese have been established in Ohio about sixty-five years. They came from West Florida and the adjacent country. They formerly resided on Suwaney river, near the sea. Black Hoof, who is eighty-five years of age, was born there, and remembers bathing in the salt water when a boy, Suwaney being a corruption of Shawanoese."

Buckingham Smith, in his notes to Fontaneda (p. 47), says:

"I spoke of this portion of history to a delegation of Shawnees at Washington, in the spring of 1854; and three of them, who had known the chief, and often

heard him speak of the incidents, agreed in relating the following particulars:

"When Black Hoof was a boy, the people in their wandering came to a river, at a place that had the appearance of having once been a settlement. A woman with them, blind with age, said that this should be their ancient seat; and, if it were so, near the bank, at a point she described, there was a spring of water. It was found; and close by, where she directed them to dig, they found a jar, in which was a piece of sea-conch that had been fashioned to wear as an ornament for the neck. She said that when she was a little girl, and the nation was about to move away from there, the young people were called together to see those things buried, that afterward, should they ever return, they might make sure of the spot of their old residence. Black Hoof had the shell gorget, which my informants had all seen, and in his lifetime gave it to a Seneca brave."

The fixing of this place as on the Suwanee river, in Florida, is obviously only Colonel Johnston's interpretation of the incident. But, as has been seen, De Bienville, the governor of Louisiana, placed the Tensas, in 1714, near Mobile, on the site of a village that had been abandoned by the Shawanoes. Bartram, in 1776, found a plantation occupying the site of this village. I have no means of fixing precisely the period between the abandonment of the site by the Tensas and its first occupation as a plantation; but as Black Hoof was six years old in 1740, the date of his visit may very well have corresponded with this period. At all events, it may be safely said that there is nothing in Black

Hoof's account to warrant the assumption that the Shawanoes ever lived on or near the Suwanee river.

It has also been suggested that the original seat of the Shawanoes was on the Savannah river. This is based partly on what is called an Indian tradition, but chiefly on the resemblance of name.

Ramsey (Hist. of Tennessee, p. 79) says: "In 1772, Little Corn Planter, a most intelligent Cherokee chief, narrated that the Shawnees, a hundred years before, by the permission of his nation, removed from the Savannah river to the Cumberland." But Indian tradition has little value. It appears, on page 84 of the same book, that the Cherokees had another tradition, that when they first crossed the Alleghanies to the west, they found the Shawnees there at war with the Creeks. And on page 78, it is said that Gen. Robertson "learned from the Indians, that a century and a half ago (1665), the Shawnees occupied the country from the Tennessee river to where Nashville now is, and north of the Cumberland." The Shawanoes have given to different persons various traditions concerning their origin, but none places their original seat on the Savannah river.

I find no certain information concerning any such tribe as the "Savannahs." Archdale says, that before his going to South Carolina, which was in 1695, there had been a civil war between the Westoes and the Sarannahs; that the Westoes were driven out of the province, and the Sarannahs continued good friends and useful neighbors to the English. (Hist. Coll. So. Ca., vol. 2, p. 89.) But I find no other reference to this tribe, unless in Lawson's History of North Carolina. Lawson traveling from Charleston to North Carolina,

in the beginning of 1701, met a party going "to the Congerees and Savannahs, a famous, warlike, and friendly nation of Indians, living to the south end of the Ashley river." (Raleigh, reprint of ed. of 1714, p. 75.)

The Yemassees were at that time "a famous, warlike, and friendly nation of Indians, living at the south end of the Ashley river." They were, at that time, the only tribe along the coast between Charleston and the Savannah river, and occupied the left bank of that river to above Purysburg, until they were vanquished in the war of 1715, and fled to Florida.

The word Savannah or Savanna is an English, and also a Spanish word. In "A New Voyage to Georgia," printed in London, 1737, and reprinted in vol. 2, Collections of Georgia Hist. Soc., it is said, "A Savannah is a large spot of clear land, where there never was any timber grew, and nothing but grass, which is exceeding good stock for cattle," and in Lawson, Bartram, and other early writers, the word Savanna occurs in their accounts of Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, as frequently and as naturally as the word prairie occurs in accounts of the northeastern states. The Yemassees, living about the mouth of the Savannah, and along the coast near to the site of Charleston, seem to have been sometimes called by the English "Savannahs," as, farther north, the English name, Delaware, first given to the river, was afterwards extended to the Lenni Lenape tribe living on its shores.

If the original seat of the Shawnees was not on the Savannah, yet there was a village of them on the river, in the earlier part of the last century. On the map of Guillaume de L'Isle, published in 1720, the Cumber-

land river is called "Riv. des anciens Chaouanons, parceque ies Chaouanans y habitoient autrefois," while the Savannah river is called "R. des Chouanons," and the Chaouanons are placed where Augusta now is. Adair, writing about 1775, says (p. 392): "About four years before the Shawano Indians were forced to remove from the late Savannah town, they took a Muskohge warrior, etc." Savannah town, afterwards called New Windsor, was an English settlement seven miles below Augusta, and in the country of the Euchees. (State of Georgia, 1740, reprinted in vol. 2, Geo. Hist. Coll. p. 71.)

Milfort (séjours dans la Nation Creek, Paris, 1802, p. 282) says, that shortly after the American revolution, a part of the Savanhaugay nation, dwelling on the upper Savanha river, removed to the Ohio, while the other part settled among the Creeks, who gave their lands on the Talapousse. The date is clearly wrong, for this setment was not new, when Bartram visited the Creeks in 1775. Milfort says, he wrote his book hastily, in three weeks, from memory, without notes, and without revision, and that hence events will be found confused.

The Shawnee town among the Creeks, settled by a migration from the Savannah river, and called "Savanucca" by Bartram, "Sauvanogee" by Hawkins, was on the Tallapoosa (Hawkins' Creek Country, p. 34) and, must not be confounded with temporary settlement made on the upper Alabama river, by wandering band of Shawanoes, as mentioned by Adair, p. 410.*

* Mr. Hodgson, in his preface to Hawkins, says, he has the conviction, that the Sauvannogees among the Creeks were Uchees, and Bartram is authority for such belief. But Bartram only passed through the Creek country, and did not visit Sauvanogee, while Adair, Milfort, and Hawkins, long resident among the Creeks, and Milfort, an adopted Creek, declare the people of that town are Shawnees.

Another suggestion has been made, that the Shawanoes were the same as the Uchees. The Shawano village among the Uchees on the Savannah, indeed, moved on to the Tallapoosa, in the Creek Confederacy, at about the same time with the Euchees, and that was soon after 1729. (Hawkins' Creek Country, p. 62.) And their town, Savanucca or Sauvanogee was there in closer relation with the Euchees, than with the other members of the confederacy. But the Euchees were a distinct, compact tribe from the time they were first met by the whites, till their admission into the Creek Confederacy, and as a member of it till after their removal with the rest of the Creeks, to their present home west of the Mississipi. Of their language, Gallatin says (Archaeologia Americana, vol. 2, p. 97): "It is the most gutteral, uncouth, and difficult to express, with our alphabet, and orthography, of any of the Indian languages within our knowledge." The Shawano belongs to the Algonquin family of languages, and its vocabulary shows many close resemblances to the Delaware, Miami, and Illinois; while the Uchee belongs to a wholly different family, and, so far as the printed vocabularies go, there is no Uchee word that at all resembles a Shawano word.

In a word, we first find the Shawano in actual history about the year 1660, and living along the Cumberland river, or the Cumberland and Tennessee. Among the conjectures, as to their earlier history, the greatest probability lies for the present, with the earliest account—the account given by Perrot, and apparently obtained by him, from the Shawanoes themselves, about the year 1680—that they formerly lived by the lower lakes, and were driven thence by the Five Nations.

To what Race did the Mound-builders Belong?

[This paper was written for the *Congrès International des Américanistes*, upon the suggestion of M. Schoetter, Secrétaire Général, and was read before the *Congrès*, at the session in Luxembourg, September, 1877.]

The structures of earth, scattered over the United States, which go by the general name, "Works of the Mound-builders," were evidently erected by people differing materially in some respects from the Indian tribes found in the United States at the present day.

These works are of various character. Some are obviously fortifications; others, signal stations. The truncated mounds, some of considerable elevation, others so low as to be properly called terraces, were used by the Indians whom De Soto found, as substructures for temples and for dwellings of chiefs, and may well have been originally built for such uses, or for the open performance of religious rites. Some of the small mounds are found to be single graves. Squier considers the large conical mounds also as mere graves. But the late Dr. Wilson, of Newark, Ohio, an acute observer, remarked to me that he had commonly found these mounds, when excavated, to present a stratified appearance, having many layers, at intervals, of vegetable mould and charcoal with the indications of animal remains. He considered these mounds to have grown gradually by many successive interments; and, in many,

cases, interments of many bodies or skeletons at one time; each interment being covered over with a layer of earth. President Hayes was present, when governor of Ohio, at the opening of the great mound at Miamisburg, and has told me that he observed a similar stratification in it. The same appearance was presented by the large mound at Cincinnati when it was cut down, and has been noticed in many southern mounds. The possibility is, that some of these larger conical mounds were cemeteries rather than graves. Others, called by Squier and Davis altar mounds, seem to have been heaped up to cover over and bury structures that appear to have been used as places of public sacrifice. The small circular embankments with a mound in the center may be the ruins of dwellings built somewhat after the manner of the huts of the Mandans and Ricarees.

There is a work in Hamilton county, Ohio, a few miles above Newtown, which I have never seen described. The Little Miami river here washes the base of the steep, high hills which border the valley on the west; while an elevated plateau, extending from the eastern hills to the river's edge, separates the upper from the lower portion of the valley. At a point where the plateau is narrow, a way has been cut through it, and the earth carried to the northern face of the plateau has been used in constructing a graded way up to it from the bottom land. Close to the termination of the graded ascent is a circular embankment, about one hundred metres in diameter with a mound in the center. It is the situation that gives interest to the work. The view from it stretches up the valley, and down to Ken-

tucky hills beyond the Ohio river. While standing there, the imagination involuntarily pictured a solemn procession winding through the cut, and up the graded way to the circle and the mound, and there performing sacred rites in full view of the ancient inhabitants of the valley.

Some works are quite anomalous, as the effigy mounds, representing, on a great scale, figures of men, birds, and animals, prone on the earth; and the embankments forming great squares and circles, either separate or combined, and in some cases made more intricate by ancillary works in the form of extensive parallel lines of embankment.

These works cover an extensive region. They are found in Texas, and thence through the gulf states to Georgia and Florida, and thence northwardly, east of the Alleghany Mountains into Carolina. They cover the great valley between the Alleghany Mountains and the western borders of the Mississippi. They are found up the Mississippi as far as Wisconsin and Minnesota. And a few have been found, separated by intervals of many hundred miles, on the Upper Missouri and its affluents.

They are not, however, distributed uniformly. In the Southern States are most of the great truncated mounds and terraces, while defensive are scarcely found; unless the great ditches, peculiar to the southern works, were of this character. The extraordinary collection of great truncated mounds at Carthage, Alabama, was formerly surrounded by a feeble line of embankment, now wholly ploughed away, that might once have been the base of a stockade. The works found on the affluents of the

Upper Missouri, are massive defensive works. Those found in Wisconsin are almost exclusively effigy mounds or isolated conical mounds; and effigy mounds are scarcely found outside of Wisconsin.* Going eastward from the Mississippi, we find in Illinois and Indiana, many conical mounds, both large and small; in Illinois, at Cahokia, the giant truncated mound; and in Indiana, some, though not many are elaborate, defensive works. In Ohio are found the most important works of defense; numerous mounds, some quite large; and a few of them truncated, and several effigy mounds. Besides presenting representatives of every species of work found elsewhese, Ohio contains some of a character found nowhere else, such as the combinations of great squares and circles, and the altar mounds. South of the Ohio, in Kentucky and Tennessee, there is also a marked prevalence of works of a military character.

An attentive examination discovers more minute local distinctions. The Scioto valley, forming a belt running north and south through the middle of Ohio, has for its peculiarity the mounds designated by Squier and Davis as "altar mounds," and also systems of embankments, making inclosures of various mathematical figures, mainly the square and the circle. The distinguishing feature of the eastern belt of the state is the truncated mound or terrace, so rare at the north, yet found in great perfection at Marietta. The distinguishing feat-

*Since this paper was read, I have received from Mr. Charles C. Jones, Jr., of Georgia, an account which will appear in the Smithsonian Report for 1877, of examination and measurement made by him of two bird-shaped mounds in Georgia. So far as I know, these are the first effigy mounds observed south of the Ohio.

ure of the western belt of the state, is the great line of strong and mutually supporting works of defense.

These three belts, corresponding with three valleys, the valley of the Miamis to the west, the Scioto valley in the center, and the Muskingum valley to the east, appear by these local peculiarities to have been the homes of three different, though kindred tribes. They appear, moreover, to have lived in the valleys as fixed abodes, long enough to have learned to borrow from each other. For one small truncated mound, or terrace, is found in the Scioto valley, and a few of the mathematical figures that abound in the Scioto valley are found, but not so perfectly constructed, in the valley of the Miamis. The pipe of peculiar form, called by Squier and Davis "the pipe of the Mound-builders," seems to be a specialty of the tribe of Mound-builders who lived in the Scioto valley.

One specimen, however, of this form, now in the collection of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio, was found by the fort at the mouth of the Great Miami.

Some indications of the character and condition of these people can be found in their works. The first impression we get is of their magnitude. Many of the mounds are more than sixty feet, some are ninety feet high. The mound at Cahokia has a base of eight acres, is ninety feet high, has a summit level of five acres, and contains about twenty million cubic feet of earth. The defensive work on the Little Miami, called Fort Ancient, besides having four miles of embankment in its circuit, part of it being twenty feet high, has, extending out to the front from the main entrance, two parallel

lines of embankment, making a covered way more than a thousand feet long, extending to and embracing a watch mound of considerable size. The works above Newark, Ohio, comprised twelve miles of embankment; those at Portsmouth twenty miles.

We are next impressed with the relation which many works bear to each other, making in some localities a system of works. Three great works on the Great Miami, one at its mouth, one at Colerain, and one at Hamilton, with subsidiary defensive works extending six miles along the river at Hamilton; several advanced works to north and west of Hamilton, on streams flowing into the Great Miami; and other similiar defenses farther up the river at Dayton and Piqua, all put in communication with each other by signal mounds erected at conspicious points, constitute together a connected line of defense along the Miami river. Fort Ancient on the Little Miami stands as a citadel in rear of the center of this line. A mound at Norwood, back of Cincinnati, commands a view through a depression of the hills at Redbank eastwardly to a mound in the valley of the Little Miami; northwardly through the valley of Millcreek and the depression in the lands thence to Hamilton, with the works at Hamilton; and by a series of mounds (two of which in Cincinnati and its suburbs have been removed) westwardly to the fort at the mouth of the Great Miami. So a series of signal mounds along the Scioto from the northern boundary of Franklin county to the Ohio river, a distance over one hundred miles, could transmit by signals an alarm from the little work north of Worthington through the entire length of the valley to the works at Portsmouth.

The builders of these works could not have been a sparse population; they must have been to some extent an agricultural people; they must have had, perhaps each tribe for itself, a strong government of some sort, whether a chief or a council, that directed and was obeyed.

Recent investigations show that the mining of native copper was carried on by these ancient people to an extraordinary extent. It is said that in a single district of eighteen square miles on Isle Royale, on the northern shore of Lake Superior, more ore was taken out by them with their crude processes, than has been taken in the last twenty years from the largest single mine on the lake, with all the aid of modern machinery. There is no trace of habitation near the ancient mines. But fragments of native copper from the mines, from which pieces have been chipped off, have been found in the mounds in Ohio. The miners were summer visitors, who necessarily left when winter threatened to close the lake, and returned when the thaws of spring reopened navigation. In such frail boats as they used, they must, with heavy loads, either coast for many hundred miles around the dangerous shores of the lake, or without compass cross its wide and boisterous surface.

They must therefore have been an enterprising people.

They could not in any sense be called a commercial people, though there is evidence of a certain amount of interchange of products. Copper implements from the north, found their way to the south. Sea shells were taken to the interior. Mica was carried from the Alleghany Mountains to the Ohio valley. Flint chips for making

implements were taken from Flint Ridge in Central Ohio, at least as far as Illinois; a few small fragments of obsidian found their way to Ohio from the Rocky Mountains or New Mexico. The interchange of articles does not appear to have been so great that it could not have been accomplished by articles passing from tribe to tribe, each tribe bartering with its neighbor. But in the unique collection of stone pipes found by Squier and Davis in a mound in the Scioto valley, were seven representing the manatee or sea-cow so faithfully that the artist must have been well acquainted with the animal. And the manatee has been found nowhere in the United States but on the coast of Florida. Another pipe represents a bird, supposed to be the toucan, feeding from an open hand. But the toucan is not found in the United States; it is an inhabitant of the West Indies and South America; and at the time of the discovery of America, it was the only bird tamed by the natives. Yet these pipes are made of the same material, and exhibit the same workmanship, as the other pipes of the collection which represent birds and animals common in Ohio. This fact seems to indicate a direct communication of some sort, whether by a single person or more, between Ohio and the southern coast.

The stone carving of the Mound-builders, as found in their pipes and ornaments, and articles of unknown purpose, exhibit greater skill, a better artistic sense, and a greater variety of objects than are found in the work of recent Indians.

It has sometimes been questioned whether or not the Mound-builders were acquainted with the fusible quality of metals, and made castings. In the museum of

the college at Marietta is a copper boss taken from the base of a mound, which resembles others taken from other mounds, except that the outer or convex surface is plated with silver. As remarked by Squier and Davis the silver is not hammered on, but is really united with the copper as by fusion. After an examination of this interesting relic, I think there is no question that the copper is native copper hammered into shape. In the Lake Superior mines, where the Mound-builders obtained their copper, silver is found in connection with it, mostly in minute particles, sometimes in quite perceptible lumps; as is seen in the piece of silver left adhering to a copper javelin in the collection of the Historical Society of Wisconsin. The miners of Lake Superior now, taking advantage of good specimens, hammer them into rings, with the silver on the exterior surface, making copper rings silver-plated by nature. The Mound-builder artisan who made the boss at Marietta took advantage of such a specimen.

The great collection of copper implements recently acquired by the Historical Society of Wisconsin, was claimed to contain some that were not hammered, but cast. The claim is now narrowed to one specimen, a wedge or hatchet. But the claim is by no means undisputed. I do not know how opinion in the society inclines, and I have never seen it. But if this is a casting, and is the work of one of the Mound-builders, it is unique among the several thousand pieces of their copper work now preserved, and not enough to invalidate the statement of Dr. Wilson, of Canada, that, to the Mound-builders, native copper was simply a malleable stone.

Skill of a different sort is manifested in their embankments, found mainly in the Scioto valley, inclosing squares, octagons, circles, and ellipses, which have been ascertained by engineers to be mathematically accurate. As has been well remarked by Squier and Davis, the construction of these circles, many of them more than one thousand feet, one of them more than seventeen hundred feet, in diameter, shows they had some means of measuring angles; and the fact that so many of the squares are precisely one thousand and eighty feet on the side, shows that they had some standard of measurement.

These various facts certainly show a condition of life very unlike the ideas which we associate with the Indians. But the Five Nations, not rebuilding their fortifications destroyed by the French, had discontinued their use before the year 1700. The Hurons were, before that date, fugitives from their ancient homes; and the other sedentary tribes that once inhabited the shores of the lower lakes had been exterminated by the Five Nations. The accepted idea of Indian life has been formed from the Five Nations and the Hurons in their later aspect, from the tribes of the Algonquin family, and from the wandering, tent-living tribes west of the Mississippi.

There have been, however, many phases of Indian life. Between the Digger tribes of Arizona and the Peruvians as found by Pizarro, both belonging to the same stock, members of one family, the American Indian, there is a wide range. Indeed, the nations embraced within the limits of what is now the United

States, presented a considerable variety of condition when first visited by Europeans.

The tribes west of the Mississippi were then, as now, nomads. The great Algonquin family, extending from Nova Scotia to Georgia, and from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, were not much less barbarous. But the Huron-Iroquois family, surrounded and enveloped by the Algonquins, inhabiting the borders of Lakes Erie and Ontario and the eastern shore of Lake Huron, and comprising the Hurons, the Iroquois or Five Nations, the Eries, the Andastogues or Andastes, the Neutral Nation, and others named by the Jesuit missionaries, were sedentary nations. They lived in permanent towns, fortified with strong, high palisades, which were provided with interior platforms for the defenders to stand on, and gutters conveying water to extinguish fire. They occupied large, substantial cabins ; raised abundant crops of maize ; were provident to lay in stores of provisions and fuel for winter use, and had an organized government.

De Soto found the Indians who occupied what is now Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and West Tennessee, living in permanent towns, many of them fortified with palisades, some additionally by towers, some by ditches outside the palisades, raising crops, laying in stores for winter, and governed by chiefs, many of whom had their cabins erected on the summit of truncated mounds, who exercised an authority and received a veneration that present the strongest contrast with the accepted ideas of Indian character.

The Mandans, living on the Upper Missouri, near the mouth of the Yellowstone, were not reached by the

whites till the beginning of the present century. When first visited by the whites they were a mere remnant of a once powerful tribe, reduced by the incessant incursions of the Dakotahs and thinned by small-pox. This little sedentary tribe, an island in the turbulent ocean of wandering tribes that surrounded them, and speaking a language without affinity with any other, was found inhabiting a town situated on a precipitous rocky bluff that projects out into the river, fortified on the landward side by a strong palisade and ditch. The habitations were substantial, earth-covered, circular cabins, fifty feet in diameter. Several families living in a single cabin; the beds arranged around the wall were curtained off by draperies of dressed skins. The shields, arms, and ornaments of the warriors, arranged in stacks between the beds, gave an air of cheerful neatness to the large apartment. The Mandans raised crops of maize, which they bartered to Western tribes for horses and furs, and in turn bartered the horses and furs to tribes that had communication with white traders, for European commodities. They made good pottery, and manufactured a sort of rudely enameled bead that was held in great esteem by the Indians.

While such direct trade as that practiced by the Mandans was not common, yet at all times, among all the tribes, there was nearly as much exchange of articles, either by direct capture in war or by repeated exchanges from tribe to tribe, as would be required to explain the possession by the Mound-builders of articles that came from different quarters. The war-parties of the Five Nations in the seventeenth century brought home from Tennessee, a distance of a thousand miles, ornaments

made of paroquet feathers. Wampum was obtained by tribes that had none, from those who made it. The red pipe-stone of Minnesota was unknown to the Mound-builders, but in the last century pipes made of it were not uncommon in the Ohio valley, a thousand miles from the quarry.

The Pueblo Indians visited and described by Coronado in 1540, remain in good part inhabiting precisely the same towns, and practicing the same customs to the present day. I passed by last summer (1876) the pueblos from Taos to Santa Fé, and halted for a night close by the pueblo of Taos, which can easily be recognized now as the Braba of Coronado. These Pueblo Indians are recognized as the best population of the territory of New Mexico. They are industrious, honest, and chaste. They are brave, yet peaceable; good hunters, yet good traders; the best farmers in the territory, and the only fruit-growers in the Taos valley, and manufacturers of good pottery and coarse blankets. Their houses, four and five stories high, some of them encircling great courts, a single house constituting a town, though now centuries old, are by far the most curious and interesting structures in that region. They have their own government, and the chief is treated with great respect.

When we were seen approaching the Taos pueblo, which, unlike most, is not built surrounding a court, but rather like a terraced pyramid, the chief ascended to the extreme summit, and, standing wrapped in his blanket, harangued his people, ordering them, as we afterward understood, to keep within the building. When an interpreter shouted up to him that the gen-

eral commanding the district wished to see him (for General Hatch, commanding the district of New Mexico, was of the party), the chief descended from roof to roof by external ladders, and welcomed us with dignified courtesy. The young braves gathered about our camp fire, first to sell us venison, apples, fuel, and hay; then to beg tobacco; then to watch us at supper, and as we chatted afterward. They were a remarkably fine-looking set of young men. As the evening wore on, I asked the chief, who was standing by me, through an interpreter, to send the young men off. A quiet word from the old chief silenced at once the gayety of the young braves, and they quietly left.

Next morning I was waked at the break of dawn by a strange chant. Putting aside the curtains of the ambulance, I faintly saw, against the sky, the figure of the chief on the summit of the pueblo, who, soon ending his chant, proclaimed what seemed to be a harangue. Scarcely had he finished, when I saw figures moving rapidly by. It was afterward explained to me that the chant is an act of worship, and the harangue the daily allotment of duty to the various families constituting the five hundred persons who live in the pueblo.

The estufas, or subterranean council-chambers, are still preserved, with the altar-like structure. If the perpetual fire is still kept up, its embers were covered with ashes in the estufa I visited.

The Pueblo Indians, in former times, must have been, as is evidenced by abundant ruins, a numerous people. Their towns are now mostly in the valleys, though some of their hill towns are yet inhabited. Actual history confirms the impression received from

the ruins, that while their valley pueblos were so built as to be in themselves strong defenses, they had other strongholds, places of refuge on the summit of precipitous cliffs. The formation of the country is such that rocks rise like towers from the plain, with precipitous sides, which can be ascended only by climbing a narrow and exposed path. In such cases, the situation is all the defense that is needed. But when the site was not absolutely isolated, but could be approached on one side by nearly level ground, there appear in some instances what look like remains of defensive works. In the bulletin printed by the Department of the Interior, March, 1876, of Hayden's explorations in 1875, is given a ground plan of the ruins at Ojo Caliente which strikingly recalls the defensive works represented in Squier and Davis' work on the Mound-builders. The plan in the same bulletin of the ruins at Rio de la Plata, with its mounds and terrace mounds, its circles and squares, recall, though less distinctly, the works of the Scioto valley. It is stated in the same bulletin (p. 4): "Where the conformation of the ground permits, the squares are *perfect* squares, and the circles *perfect* circles." The old pueblos present in their ruins structures of masonry of great solidity and skill, such as towers with triple walls, "built of hewn stone, dressed on the outside to the curve, neatly jointed and laid in mortar." And it is said (p. 19) that the ruins of Aztec Springs contain nearly one million five hundred thousand solid feet of stone-work.

The Mound-builders and the Pueblo Indians lived in different climates, upon different soil, and in countries differing in features and products. But they ap-

pear to have reached the same stage of development, to exhibit not the same, but equivalent, industries and habits, so that each might have become the other by an interchange of locality.

It may be said with confidence that the Mound-builders reached a stage of advancement intermediate between the Algonquins and the Aztecs, and in the same plane with the Pueblos; and that there is nothing in their condition, so far as we can infer it from their works, that is inconsistent with their having been tribes of North American Indians. The period at which they lived should, however, be considered.

The growth of trees upon the works gives one indication. Squier and Davis mention a tree six hundred years old, upon the great fort on Paint creek. Barrandt speaks of a tree six hundred years old on one of the works in the country of the Upper Missouri. It is said that Dr. Hildreth heard of a tree eight hundred years old on one of the mounds at Marietta. Many trees three hundred and four hundred years old have been observed. Some of the works therefore must have been abandoned six or eight hundred years ago. It is quite possible they were abandoned earlier, for these surviving trees may not have been the first to spring up on the abandonment of the works. Some certainly were in use to a later period. It is stated in the appendix to Brackenridge's Louisiana, in an account of the great mound at Sulzertown, Mississippi: "When the present proprietor took possession of his plantation upon which the fortification stands, about twenty years ago, the country around was covered with lime brakes. There was at that time no timber growing on the forti-

fication of more than a foot diameter." In the Smithsonian Report for 1872, is an account of a tract of twenty-one acres covered with mounds. This tract of twenty-one acres is covered with a grove of walnut trees, while the adjoining forest is of ancient white oaks on one side and pine on the other. The ground has not been abandoned long enough to be covered with forest uniform with the adjoining forest.

Hence, so far as indications are given by the growth of vegetation, it is not necessary to hold that any of the works were abandoned more than one thousand years ago ; and with most of them it is not necessary to hold that they were abandoned till centuries later, and some of them must have continued in use, either by the builders or by later intruding tribes, until a comparatively late period.

Though it is true that earthworks overgrown by forest will last a great while, this fact is qualified by other facts. The streams that flow into the Mississippi, like that great river, are continually changing their course. The current wears away the soft alluvium on one side, and deposits it on the other, so that these streams are continually, though not rapidly, swaying to and fro across their valleys, between the hills that confine them. Since the settlement of the country, within the past fifty or sixty years, these works have been in various places encroached upon and partially washed away. Yet, from the general entirety of the works, from the paucity of instances where their contour is at all infringed upon, we are restrained from assigning a very great antiquity to them.

So the hillsides fronting the valleys are subject to the

wash of every rain. The water draining into every lower spot, is continually forming and deepening gullies, and so eating into the hills. The defensive works are on spurs of high land, jutting out into the valleys, having almost precipitous slopes. The works are embankments of earth running around the edge of these spurs. In a situation so exposed to be washed, and be cut through by gullies worn on the steep hillside, it is surprising to observe how little destruction has happened, and how perfectly the lines of embankment follow the contour of the surface as it now is, in minute detail.

The copper mines of Lake Superior, being only places of resort, not homes, of the Mound-builders, must have been deserted before their homes were abandoned. They unquestionably maintained their homes longer than they were able to maintain their hazardous expeditions to these distant localities. Yet wooden beams and wooden vessels used by the miners are still found in the mines. And while Mr. Gilman, after very careful examination, came to the conclusion that the mines were probably abandoned as long as eight hundred years ago, Dr. Lapham, of Wisconsin, a very careful observer, thought (but I have no doubt erroneously) that they must have been worked as recently as the settlement of the Northwest by the early French discoverers.

The absence of all tradition concerning the mounds among the recent Indians has been urged as proof of their remote antiquity. But Indian tradition is short-lived and evanescent. Except the Creeks, there is scarcely a tribe that has a trustworthy tradition of their own annals a century old. The expedition of De Soto

is a striking instance of the faint hold tradition had among them. It is hard to imagine anything calculated to make a deeper and more lasting impression on them than the sudden appearance among them of an army of strange beings of different color; bearded, wearing garments and armor of unheard-of pattern and material; mounted on animals that were beyond all experience; armed with thunder and lightning, striding across the continent with a thousand manacled prisoners as slaves, destroying their strongest towns and laying waste their country, and finally wasting away and driven down the river to the great sea, helpless fugitives. Yet when Europeans next visited the country, a century and a half later, they found not a vestige of a tradition of De Soto.

Besides, the Indians often changed their place of residence. In their continued warfare, entire tribes were not unfrequently exterminated. Jacques Cartier found the Iroquois at Montreal in 1535. Champlain found them between lakes Ontario and Champlain in 1612. After the destruction of the Eries in 1655, the tract now the State of Ohio, was uninhabited until the next century. The nations known as Ohio Indians, moved into it after 1700. The Shawnees first appear in history in the region which is now Tennessee and Kentucky, but they had migrated there from elsewhere. The Creeks and Alabamas arrived in what is now Alabama and Georgia, after the expedition of De Soto. Hence, even if they were a people who preserved traditions, they might well be without traditions concerning the mounds found in their hunting grounds.

But superstition is more permanent than tradition.

Marquette, in 1670, found among the Indians of Lake Superior a superstition that spirits guarded the copper found on its shores, and would destroy whoever should venture to remove it.

It is possible, that after the destruction of the race who removed copper from the shores, the tradition of the event gradually wasted away, leaving the superstition in its place. And so it is possible, that Marquette, two centuries ago, in finding this superstition, found the residuum of an evaporated tradition of the expulsion of the Mound-builders from Lake Superior.

A very remote antiquity is sometimes argued for these works from an assumed fact as to their situation. The rivers of the Ohio basin, cutting successive channels in the lapse of ages, have left three successive benches of land on their margins. The lowest bench, or bottom land, is mostly overflowed at high water. It has been asserted that the Mound-builders constructed no work on the first or lowest bench. Hence, it is argued, the present bottom lands had not been formed, but were yet under the water when the Mound-builders lived, and hence they lived at an earlier geological epoch. But the assumed fact is not fact. The works at Piqua, when visited by Long, extended to the water's edge. The lines of embankment at Portsmouth were carried down on the lowest bench to the water. The large mound on the Ohio shore, a few miles below Maysville, is on the second bench, but the works connected with it extend on to the first or lowest bench, though above high water. On the Kentucky shore, about four miles below Maysville, three mounds stand on the first or lowest bench. I have some relics which came, according to the state-

ment of the person from whom I bought them, from a mound that he had explored on the first bench at Warf's bottom in West Virginia.* The truth simply is, that the Mound-builders aimed to build, just as we do, so as to have their structures above high water. And they sometimes failed as we do; for Squier and Davis mention two instances where high water invades the works. It is a fact which strikingly illustrates how identical the surface of the ground is now with what it was then, that wherever the Mound-builders had a town, there the present population also have a city or a town.

It may, therefore, be fairly held with some confidence that the disappearance of the Mound-builders did not begin further back than a thousand years ago, and that their extinction was not accomplished till centuries later.

Those learned in comparative philology say, that all the multitudinous languages and dialects spoken in America, from the Esquimaux to Patagonia, constitute one family, have a common root and origin; and that all the nations and tribes speaking these languages constitute one race. While these several hundred languages are the same in organism and structure, they differ so in vocabulary that many of them have not a single word in common. Now, the growth of language is a slow process. The languages of Europe have grown up under stimulus, as if in hot-beds under glass. Their germination and history can be traced; their age can be measured. How long must it require for a barbarous people to develop and complete near four hundred dis-

* Capt. Holloway, of Cincinnati, who lived many years on Mercer's bottom, below Gallipolis, tells me there were many mounds there on the lowest bench.

tinct languages? The period must, at all events, be so great, that one thousand years ago is, in comparison, freshly recent, almost of the present day.

Scanty as the facts are, they seem to lead irresistibly to the conclusion that the Mound-builders were tribes of Indians, more advanced than the Algonquins or the Dakotahs; but much less advanced than the Aztecs or the Peruvians, and on the same plane with the Pueblo Indians, and that they were living in full prosperity in the time of Charlemagne.

Efforts have been made recently to find some peculiarity in the crania of the Mound-builders. The first step in ascertaining the character of the crania of the Mound-builders, is to get a Mound-builder's skull. But, as the recent Indians frequently used the old mounds as burying places, it is necessary to distinguish between intrusive and original burials. This can always be done where care is used, as the intrusive burials are always near the surface. But care has not always been exercised.

The late Dr. Foster, of Chicago, declared, in his Prehistoric Races of the United States, that he had discovered the type of the Mound-builder's skull, and that it was a degraded type, resembling the skull of Neanderthal. This theory was based upon nearly a dozen skulls and fragments in his possession. Four of them were taken by Dr. Harper from the works near Merom, Indiana; one came from a mound at Dunleith, Illinois, opposite Dubuque; the rest were found near Chicago.

It appears from Mr. Putnam's paper, in the fifteenth volume "Proceedings of the Boston Society of Natural

History," that, besides the mounds, there are at Merom also some stone graves, made by placing thin slabs on edge along the sides and ends, and covering with flat stones; and that Dr. Harper took three skeletons from these stone graves. Graves of this sort are not uncommon along the Ohio, Cumberland, and Tennessee rivers. But this form of burial is so unlike the mound burial, that it seems to be the usage of a people different in habits from those who constructed the mounds. They seem also more recent; for, as a rule, the skeletons found in these superficial, slightly constructed graves, are in much better preservation than those buried under mounds. Moreover, some skeletons in these graves are affected by venereal disease, which was introduced into North America by Europeans. And, in at least one of these graves, a bullet was found in the skeleton, imbedded in the bone. (Smithsonian Report for 1874, p. 373.) And, in fine, the Indians used this mode of burial down to the present century in Illinois. (Jones' Antiquities of Southern Indians, p. 220.)

The skulls and fragments found near Chicago were dug from little mounds—the loam of the prairie heaped up two and a half feet high. The Indians sometimes heaped such mounds over the dead. And, indeed, Dr. Foster says some of these very mounds were the burial places of Indians and half-breeds; and while there are no traces of the Mound-builders, other than these supposed mounds, in the neighborhood, the place was a resort for the Indians of the Illinois and Miami confederacies after the establishment of a French post there about the year 1680.

As for the skull found at Dunleith, three were taken

from a mound there twelve feet high. Of two, we have no information. The third, the one described by Dr. Foster, was buried two feet under the surface, in a grave made of wood and stone. This was obviously not an original, but an intrusive interment; and therefore, according to accepted influence, was the grave, not of a Mound-builder, but of a modern Indian.

Dr. Foster's argument is very good, except that he failed in the first step: he failed to get crania of the Mound-builders.

Morton, after a careful examination of the four thoroughly ascertained Mound-builder crania, considered them identical with those of the recent Indians. The one indubitable skull found by Squire and Davis was a remarkably well-developed skull of the same class. Dr. Lapham, the explorer of the mounds of Wisconsin, found but a single skull which he could positively say belonged to the Mound-builders. Another was found in 1874, and is now in the cabinet of Milton College. The difference between them and the skull of the present Indian is said to consist of a different projection of the zygomatic arch, a more obtuse angle of the cheek bones, less angular orbits, a more massive lower jaw, and a flattened occiput.

The two skulls found in Minnesota, and now in the Historical Society of that State, do not appear to differ sensibly from the crania of the present Indian. Dr. Joseph Jones, whose "Antiquities of Tennessee" was printed by the Smithsonian Institute, October, 1866, classes the crania of the mounds and those of the stone graves together, taking them to be the same. He says (p. 72): "Whilst the crania of the stone-grave and

mound-building race of Tennessee and Kentucky possess in a marked degree those characteristics which distinguish the American race from all others, at the same time they appear to belong to the Toltecan division of the American nations."

Dr. Jeffries Wyman, speaking of a collection of twenty-four crania sent from Kentucky, says (Fourth Annual Report, Peabody Museum): "A comparison of these crania with those of the other and later Indians, shows that they have certain marked peculiarities, though these are better appreciated when the two kinds are placed side by side, than from any tables of measurement or verbal description." He describes the differences, but he finds no difference in the facial bones, as observed in Wisconsin, but variations in the other portions, which were not observed in the Wisconsin crania.

A paper by Dr. Emil Bessels, in the bulletin of Hayden's Exploration, above mentioned, describes some crania taken from the Pueblos; then adds, that when the paper had been finished, he saw opened, at the Smithsonian Institution, a box containing relics from a Tennessee mound, among which were two crania. He adds: "The resemblance between the crania from these two different localities (Tennessee and New Mexico) is so great that they might readily be confounded."

So that Morton and Squier and Davis regard the crania of the Mound-builders as identical with those of the now living Indian tribes. The two crania in Minnesota, though I have seen no detailed description, appear to be the same. The two—or, perhaps, three—

authentic crania found in Wisconsin, differ from those of the living tribes, in the facial bones. The twenty-four found in Kentucky differ from the existing type, slightly, in the crown of the skull, but not at all in the facial bones. While those found in Tenneesee are identical with the crania of the stone graves, which belong to the recent Indians, and with the crania of the Pueblo Indians. The result is that the crania of the Mound-builders belong to the family of the American Indian, and that no peculiarity or characteristic has yet been detected which is common to them, and different from the characteristics common to the crania of the tribes now living.*

Mr. Henry Gilman, of Michigan, has made some discoveries, the full significance of which has not yet been determined. In some mounds, near Detroit, he has observed that fifty per cent. of the skeletons exhumed are characterized by flattened tibiæ, and that the flattening, or deviation from the normal or modern type, is, in some cases, excessive, quite exceeding any observed in the most ancient European skeletons. In these skeletons he also observed the perforated humerus. And in these mounds he found a number of skulls with artificial perforations, not trepanning—as in the ancient crania of France and Peru—but perforations made after death, in the top of the skull, as if for the purpose of hanging them up for preservation. These discoveries of Mr. Gilman have stimulated inquiry and examination, and the result is, that of skeletons exhumed from other

*This result is strikingly confirmed by an exhaustive discussion of crania from mounds and stone graves, by Lucien Carr, in the Eleventh Annual Report of the Peabody Museum, of Cambridge, published 1878.

mounds throughout the country, only thirty-three per cent. have an observable flattening of the tibia, and these to a much less extent than the Detroit mounds. Only thirty-one per cent. present the peculiarity of the perforated humerus; and only a single perforated skull has been found, and that in California, remote from the region of the Mound-builders. Mr. Gilman wisely abstains from theory, as yet, concerning these striking local peculiarities, but carefully notes the facts.

Did this people wholly disappear, leaving no lineage, and was the great region which they had filled taken and occupied altogether by other tribes?

Two facts observed in the tribes found here by the Europeans have a bearing upon the possibilities of this inquiry. One is the usage among them to adopt not only individual captives into their families, but also to receive remnants of reduced tribes into their tribes or confederacies. The Five Nations received the Tuscaroras, fugitive from Carolina, into their confederacy, making it thereafter the Six Nations. It is true the Tuscaroras were a kindred or affiliated tribe. But the Creeks received and incorporated into their nation the surviving remnants of the Alabamas, the Uchees, and the Natchez, tribes wholly different from them and from each other.

The other fact is that sedentary tribes, when conquered, retrograded. The Hurons, after they were driven from their homes by the Five Nations, abandoned the practice of living in fortified towns. Even the Five Nations never rebuilt their palisaded works after they were destroyed by the French. The Andastogues, as they were first called by the Jesuit missiona-

ries, afterward called Andastes, living on the Susquehanna in strongly fortified towns, were classed among the partially cultivated tribes. After a continued war with the Five Nations, lasting nearly a century, they were finally destroyed in 1674, and the few survivors, the Conestogas of Pennsylvania, lingered a poverty-stricken clan, and disappeared in the next century. The Natchez preserved their language after their incorporation into the Creek Nation, but forgot all their other distinctive usages.

Hence it would be in accordance with what we know of the Indians, if individual members of the Mound-builders were adopted into the tribes that succeeded them, and if some remnants of the Mound-builder tribes survived, dropping their customs and industries, either as separate clans or incorporated into the intruding tribes.

The industrial efforts of the Mound-builders and of the later Indians differed not in character, but in degree. The older workmen were more skillful, but they worked in the same crafts. Even in the earthworks, that gave name to the older tribes, the later tribes were not absolutely unpracticed. Many works that were once attributed to the Mound-builders have been subsequently ascertained to be the work of later or now-living tribes. The burial mound of Blackbird, the Maha chief, on a bluff on the Missouri, is well known. Mr. C. C. Jones, in Georgia, excavated a mound that covered a skeleton accompanied with articles of European manufacture. Bartram describes a collection of mounds that he passed in Georgia which were the graves of Uchees slain in battle about fifty years previously. A number of small mounds in Wisconsin that had been

supposed to be the work of the Mound-builders, were found on examination to be merely the ruins of mud-covered huts of the Iowa Indians. In Indiana and Kentucky, mounds have been found so filled with human remains as to seem mere heaps of skeletons covered with earth. In these mounds the skeletons are generally not entire, but bones are promiscuously mingled. The state of preservation of these bones prevent our ascribing to them any great antiquity. They may mark the burial place of battle, or they may present such interments as were practiced by tribes of now living Indians. Du Pratz describes the custom of the Choctaws of preserving the skeletons of the deceased till many accumulated, and then heaping the accumulation in a pile and covering them with earth, making a mound. Lafitau describes the custom of the tribes of the Five Nations of preserving the bones of the deceased until an annual feast, when all held by a tribe were buried with great solemnity in a common ditch.

The defensive earthworks of Northern Ohio were classed among the works of the Mound-builders till Colonel C. Whittlesey called attention to the differences of construction, and to the fact that these are the only structures of earth in Northern Ohio. These defensive works are small and simple, generally inclosing few acres, and often consisting of a single line drawn across the neck of a jutting point of highland. The embankment of these works is so slight that it never could have served as more than a base for a palisade. Squier and Davis held them to be frontier works of the Mound-builders. But Mr. Squier, after a thorough examination of similar works in New York, came to

the conclusion that they were only the remains of the palisaded forts of the Five Nations, or of some tribe who used the same mode of protection.

In the other particulars the resemblance is closer. The crania of the Mound-builders have all of them a flattened occiput, which indicates that infants were with them, as well as among the later Indians, kept strapped to a board. C. C. Jones found one indubitable Mound-builder skull in Georgia, with a forehead artificially flattened. So that, among them, as among the later Indians, some tribes, as, for example, the Choctaws and Catawbas in the south, flattened the forehead, while others did not.

The extraordinary care lavished upon the carving and ornamenting of the stone pipes found in the mounds, indicate that with that people, as with the later Indians, smoking tobacco was not only practiced, but was a ceremonial as well as an indulgence.

So late as the latter part of the last century "chungke" was a favorite game among the southern Indians. It was played by two men on a long smoothed piece of ground, around which sat the tribe as spectators. They used, in playing, sticks bent at one end like the Roman letter f, and a circular disk of hard stone. Du Pratz describes the game as played by the Natchez, but does not give its Indian name. Adair, who lived among the Creeks and Choctaws, and frequently visited the Cherokees and Chicasaws, says this game was played by all the Indians; that it was their ancient game; that the discs, being of hard stone, must have been wrought with incredible labor; that they have been handed down from generation to generation, and were kept with care

and veneration as public property. Adair says, the name of the game was "chungke." Bartram speaks of the "chunk-yards" among the Creeks, where their games were played—smooth rectangular spaces, inclosed by a low embankment, whereon the spectators sat. The name is preserved in Mississippi by the name of the "Chunkey river" in the part of the state formerly the home of the Choctaws. When the Mandans were first visited by Lewis and Clark in the beginning of this century, the Mandans, in their remote home were found playing this game on a smooth place kept for the purpose, and calling it by the same name, "chungke."

Just such stone discs are found in the mounds, and the game was played in localities where trails of the Mound-builders lingered. The game may have been played by the Mound-builders, in their inclosures resembling the "chunk-yards" of the Creeks; and the various facts connected with the game indicate that it, if not the name also, the word "chungke," was derived by the later Indians from their predecessors.

Among the stone implements of the Mound-builders are the stone tubes that have baffled conjecture.

Mr. Rau has recently suggested that, especially as some of them are so wrought as to have a mouth-piece, they may have been used by the doctors among the Mound-builders, as sections of reed were used by the medicine-men of the later Indians. Being placed upon the spot to be treated, the operator, by suction of his mouth, produced a partial vacuum in the reed tube, and an effect was produced as in cupping.

There is no distinguishable difference between the ordinary stone implements of the Mound-builders and

those of the later Indians. No one can say of any stone hatchet, axe, scraper, hoe, javelin, or arrow-head, whether it was made by the older or the later people, unless the locality in which it was found removes the uncertainty. No one can determine from the appearance.

Pottery found in the mounds is of various qualities. Some found by Squier and Davis, in the Scioto valley, is finer than most of the pottery of the later Indians. But the Natchez made pottery of such quality that Du Pratz had a set made by them for his own table use. And the pottery of the Mandans is as good as that of the Mound-builders, except the fine specimens found by Squier and Davis, near Chillicothe.

In some respects, the Indians bordering on the Gulf of Mexico differed widely from the more northern tribes, and possessed traits and habits which we attribute to the Mound-builders. The march of De Soto, in 1540, is described by the Gentleman of Elvas, and by Biedma, who accompanied him, and by Garcilaso de la Vega, who gathered his materirls from conversations with many of the survivors. All accounts speak of chiefs having their houses upon "mounts," "hillocks," "ridges ascended by stairs," and "mounts made by art;" and they found such habitations from Florida to the western shore of the Mississippi. Garcilaso de la Vega gives such a detailed account of the mode of building these mounds that it is clear his informants believed they were constructed by the Indians whom they found using them.

The authority exercised by the chiefs, and the reverence and obedience rendered to them by their people, are in striking contrast with the habits of the tribes now living. Chiefs are sometimes spoken of as borne

in canopied litters by their people. The haughty Tuscaluza, when he received De Soto, sat on a pile of cushions, while his attendants stood about him, one holding aloft a colored shield to screen him from the sun. When the chief of Guachacoza, on the lower Mississippi, sneezed, all the Indians present bowed their heads, spread out their arms, and saluted him with—"the sun preserve you, the sun make you great." When a chief died in Guachacoza, it was the custom to bury women and servants with him.

As late as 1720, among the Choctaws, men worked in the fields, and hired themselves as laborers to the French colonists. The Natchez and Tensas kept the perpetual fire in their temples. The temple of the Natchez was on a truncated mound or terrace, with a graded ascent. At the annual corn feast, the chief, or Great Sun, was borne in a litter, to an arbor, built for him on a low mound or terrace, constructed for the purpose, and there blessed the corn for his people. The person of the Great Sun was sacred. The subordinate chiefs were an hereditary aristocracy, and differed from the common people, not only in rank, but in caste. When the Great Sun died, it was a privilege and an honor to be admitted among those who were killed and buried with him.

Taken in connection with these facts, Galatin's observation that there was a surprising number of radically different languages along the Gulf of Mexico, between the Mississippi and the Atlantic coast, acquires a new significance. Galatin suggested that the compression of tribes indicated by the variety of language in a small compass, was due to the formation of the country; the

sea on two sides and the river on the third preventing expansion. Yet the river was no barrier, and the whole north was open, unless the northern tribes compressed the southern within their territories.

Now we have already observed the strong line of large and permanent earthworks along the Great Miami, which, with Fort Ancient, on the Little Miami, and similar works in Highland county, and along Paint creek to the Scioto, made a strong permanent line of defense, facing the west and north with detached works twelve and twenty miles in front. In Kentucky and Tennessee are similar works, but fewer, on a smaller scale, less massive, and isolated, not built with reference to each other. In the states bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, while the truncated mounds with graded ascents are numerous and of extraordinary size, there are few traces of defensive works, except indications of stockades, and unless the large ditches found there were meant for such use.

This succession and variety in the character of the works would be accounted for, if the invading tribes from the northwest—which was the Germany, the *vagina gentium*, of the Mound-builders' empire—swept the Mound-builders from Illinois and Indiana in open field contests. That the Mound-builders of Ohio, defended by their strong line of permanent works, maintained a long war till they were exterminated, or reduced and driven across the river. That the war was continued, but in a more desultory way, in Kentucky and Tennessee, till all that was left of the race was compressed into the tract bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; and that there, thinned and reduced, and mingled with the

conquering tribes, they lost some of their industries, but preserved some of their traits.

The present state of information, therefore, leads to the conclusion that the Mound-builders were tribes of American Indians of the same race with the tribes now living; that they reached a stage of advancement about equal to that of the Pueblo Indians; that they were flourishing about a thousand years ago, and earlier and later; and that at least in the tribes near the Gulf of Mexico were preserved some of their customs and some of their lineage, till after the discovery of America by Columbus.