

APPENDIX I

An Analysis of
Glass Trade Beads from
the Nuyaka Site, Horseshoe
Bend National Military Park,
Alabama

by

Marvin T. Smith

From

Dickens, Roy S. Jr.

n.d. (1976) Archaeological Investigations at Horseshoe Bend
National Military Park Alabama. Laboratory of
Archaeology, Department of Anthropology, Georgia
State University. Report submitted to the National
Park Service. Page 251-257. ATLANTA.

One good black and white photo in main text (pg 228).

This is an analysis of 24 glass trade beads¹ from the site of the late historic Creek town of Nuyaka, located at Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, Alabama. The beads are described using standard type descriptions. Sizes given are diameters perpendicular to the perforation, unless otherwise stated (it should be noted that due to the handmade nature of the beads, sizes will vary). The provenience of all beads is given in Table 1.

The beads were also compared to collections from other sites in the Eastern United States: the Guebert Site, a Kaskaskia Indian town in Illinois occupied 1719-1833 (Good 1972); Fort Michilimackinac, a French and later British fort in Michigan occupied 1715-1781 (Stone 1974); Chota, an Overhill Cherokee town circa 1745-1799 (Gleeson 1970); Coosawattee Old Town, beads from one Cherokee structure dated ca. 1780 (Smith 1973); the Creek town of Atasi (personal information), and the Creek site of Childersburg (DeJarnette and Hansen 1960). The Nuyaka beads were also compared to beads in a Wichita Indian glass bead sequence, developed from several sites in Texas (Harris and Harris 1967).

All beads in the collection were made by the hollow cane method. In this manufacturing technique, a large bubble of molten glass was pulled out to form a long hollow tube. This tube was broken into sections the length of the beads, which were either left rough, or were tumbled. Tumbling is a process for smoothing the fractured ends of the broken tube (called a cane). Ash was placed in the perforations of the beads, and the beads were then

¹Two additional beads were later found in the ethnobotanical samples. Although these two beads are not included in this analysis, they are described in Chapter VI of the report.

heated and tumbled in a drum to obtain smooth, rounded ends. The ash functioned to keep the perforation from melting closed. For a further description of bead making, see van der Sleen (1973) or Kidd (1970).

Following Harris and Harris (1967:138), beads are further described as simple, compound, or complex. Simple beads are made of one structurally undifferentiated mass of glass. Compound beads consist of two or more concentric layers of glass. Complex beads have decoration, such as stripes, made from glass rods impressed into the surface. Only one complex bead was found at Nuyaka.

Type Descriptions

(1) Opaque white untumbled tubular bead of compound construction. Three specimens: 2.9-3.5 mm. in diameter. A thin transparent clear layer overlies the opaque white.

This bead is probably Childersburg Type 2, Georgia White Cylindrical dated 1750+. It is present at Guebert (Type 119), the Wichita Sites (Type 65, 1676-1820), Fort Michilimackinac (Type C1, SB, T2, Vb), Atasi, and Chota.

(2) Opaque black untumbled tubular cane bead of simple construction. Four specimens: 2.7-3.2 mm. in diameter. This bead occurs at Childersburg (Type 9, Georgia Black Cylindrical 1750-1825), Wichita sites (Type 66 1740-1820), Fort Michilimackinac (Type C1, SA, T2, Vb), Chota, and Coosawattee Old Town.

This bead is a good marker for the last half of the 18th century. (3) Translucent burgandy untumbled tubular cane bead of simple construction. One specimen: 2.7 mm. in diameter. This bead was not found in any report consulted, but is a color variety of Type 2 and Type 5.

(4) Short tumbled tubular red bead of compound construction. One specimen: 2.8 mm. in diameter. This bead is an opaque dull red over a transparent light green core. It is called the Cornaline d'Aleppo in the literature.

This bead occurs at Childersburg (Type 46 1685-1825), Coosawattee Old Town, Guebert (Type 127a), Wichita Sites (Type 51 1700-1836), and Chota. This bead is very common and has a wide chronological and geographical range. Generally, this type is replaced circa 1800-1820 by a similar bead having a translucent red outer layer over an opaque white core.

(5) Short untumbled tubular transparent medium blue bead of simple construction. Four specimens: 2.2-3.0 mm. in diameter. This bead occurs at Childersburg (Type 8, "Georgia Transparent Blue Cylindrical" 1775-1825), Coosawattee Old Town, and Chota. This is a good time marker for the late 18th century.

(6) Short tumbled tubular transparent medium blue cane bead of simple construction. Five specimens: 2.9-3.8 mm. in diameter. These beads may simply be well worn specimens of Type 5, instead of being truly tumbled. However, this tumbled type occurs in the Wichita sequence (Type 61 1740-1820). These are probably grouped with Type 5 in Childersburg Type 8, "Ga. Translucent Blue Cylindrical."

(7) Small tumbled black donut shaped seed bead of complex construction. Six white stripes are inlaid parallel to the perforation. One specimen: 3.7 mm. in diameter. I was unable to find this bead in the literature, however it is similar to Type 91 in the Wichita sequence which has four white stripes and is dated 1740-1767. This four stripe variety also occurs at Fort Michilimackinac and Chota.

(8) Small tubular untumbled opaque light blue cane bead of simple construction. One specimen: 2.7mm. in diameter. This bead is similar to Type 5 except for color. This bead is also found at Fort Michilimackinac (Type C1, SA, T2, Vc) and it may be present at Chota (incomplete description).

(9) Small tumbled barrel shaped opaque light blue seed bead of simple construction. One specimen: 3.0 mm. in diameter. This bead is the same color

as Type 8. It occurs at Fort Michilimackinac (Type Cl, SA, Tl, Va) and may be Type 68 at Guebert.

(10) Opaque white tumbled barrel shaped seed bead of compound construction.

One specimen: .26 mm. in diameter. White core with clear exterior layer.

This bead occurs at Guebert (Type 109a), Wichita Sites (Type 5 1700-1836), Coosawattee Old Town, Fort Michilimackinac (Type Cl, SB, Tl, Va), and Atasi.

This is an extremely common bead type of no chronological significance.

(11) Opaque white tumbled barrel shaped seed bead of simple construction.

Two specimens: 2.0 mm.-3.1 mm. in diameter. These beads may be patinated examples of Type 10, in which the thin clear outer layer has weathered away.

In conclusion, eleven types of beads were described from the Nuyaka site. All types that could be compared with examples in the literature date from the late eighteen to early nineteenth century, which coincides with the historical evidence for occupation of the site during the period 1777 to 1813. The absence of certain bead types which are common on earlier sites suggests that the site was not occupied earlier than 1777 in the historic period. Similarly, the absence of certain bead types, such as the red over white form of the Cornaline d'Aleppo and the blue faceted "Russian" bead which appeared during the period 1800-1820, indicates that the site was not occupied after 1831-1814.

Table 1: Distribution of Trade Bead Types at Nuyaka

<u>Provenience</u>	<u>Bead Type Number</u>	<u>Number of Specimens</u>
Back dirt 100R850	6	1
Feature 1	1	2
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
	5	2
	6	3
	7	1
	11	1
Feature 4	1	1
	2	2
	5	2
	6	1
	10	1
	11	1
Feature 9	2	1
	8	1
	9	1
Total		<u>24 beads</u>

References

DeJarnette, David and A.T. Hansen

1960 The Archaeology of the Childersburg Site, Alabama. Florida State University Notes in Anthropology, No. 4. Tallahassee.

Gleeson, Paul, editor

1970 Archaeological Investigations in the Tellico Reservoir, Interim Report 1969. Report of Investigations No. 8. Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Good, Mary Elizabeth

1972 Guebert Site: an 18th century historic Kaskaskia Indian Village in Randolph County, Illinois. Memoir II, Central States Archaeological Societies, Inc.

Harris, R. K., and Inus M. Harris

1967 Trade beads, projectile points, and knives. In, A Pilot Study of Wichita Indian Archaeology and Ethnohistory, edited by Robert Bell, et al. Southern Methodist University Anthropological Research Center, Dallas.

Kidd, Kenneth, and Martha Ann Kidd

1970 A classification system for glass beads for the use of field archaeologists. In, Canadian Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History No. 1. National Historic Sites Service, National and Historic Parks Branch, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa.

Smith, Marvin T.

1973 Analysis of Glass Trade Beads, Little Egypt Site 9 Mu 102 Excavation Unit Five. Manuscript report on file at Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia.

Stone, Lyle M.

1974 Fort Michilimackinac 1715-1781: An Archaeological Perspective on the Revolutionary Frontier. Publications of the Museum Anthropological Series Volume 2, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

van der Sleen, W.G.N.

1973 A Handbook of Beads. Reprint of 1967 edition. Liberty Cap Books, York, Pa.