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ABSTRACT

Although glass beads are commonly found in historic records and on archaeological sites, there is still little known about the ways that Native American communities perceived, consumed, and used these items. Using historical and archaeological data, this thesis seeks to address this gap by examining the glass beads associated with the 18th-century Overhill Cherokee villages of Chota (40MR2) and Tanasee (40MR62). Examining the historical records for references to beads shines light on the ways that glass beads were put to use by Cherokee communities in diplomacy, trade, and adornment. In the process, glass beads were attached with a great deal of significance in communicating messages, expressing identities, and linking groups together.

Turning to the archaeological data of beads located in mortuary contexts, I examine distributions of bead types across social groups based on age, biological sex, and burial location in order to identify patterns that provide information addressing the question of how glass beads were differentially associated with members of the villages of Chota and Tanasee. I find that, while there are informative aspects to a distributional analysis, beads cross-cut many of the traditionally examined social categories. I therefore argue for the use of Social Network Analysis (SNA) in reconsidering the data. SNA is based on a relational interpretation of the past which helps to consider the networks of interaction at the sites and to consider the processes which produced the observed patterns.

Rather than returning to representationalist interpretations of identities and burials, I suggest that the burials practices were the product of nested identities and communities that linked together the living and the deceased in the materiality of interment. Glass beads were incorporated into this system and helped to connect groups and represent identities.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Despite the recent growth of interest in glass beads from archaeological sites (Blair 2015; Walthall 2015; Wesley 2015; Delmas 2016) and the continued interest in 18th-century Cherokee history and archaeology (Gragson and Bolstad 2007; Marcoux 2010; Boulware 2011; Chambers 2015; Rodning 2015; Smithers 2017), few studies have explored in depth the relationship between the two subjects (Marcoux 2012; Dalton-Carriger 2016). This thesis seeks to fill this gap by investigating the role of glass trade beads found in burial contexts from the Overhill Cherokee villages of Chota (40MR2) and Tannasee (40MR62). Approaching the subject from a social archaeological perspective, I argue that the consumption and deposition of beads in mortuary contexts was influenced by age, gender, social status, burial location, and most importantly by social networks and the social practices of inhumation. Examining the roles of these beads in social practices sheds light on the social organization, cultural practices, and colonial experiences of 18th-century Cherokees. Additionally, examining the horizontal distribution of beads helps to elucidate the organization of the site and the creation of specific social spaces involving both public and private structures and burials within and adjacent to these structures.

Due to their prevalence and seemingly unimportant role, glass trade beads were viewed with indifference by European traders, colonial officials and, to a lesser degree, by archaeologists in the past. Although the past 40 years have shown a greater interest in the material (Spector 1976; Smith 1987; Walthall 2015; Delmas 2016), few studies have fully explored the socio-cultural roles that glass beads played in specific Southeastern Native American communities through internal exchange networks and identity representation (Blair 2015). Their prevalence on
archaeological sites and in historical documents highlights the importance of these items to Native American communities, yet there is still little known about how these communities perceived and consumed these goods. Rather than focusing on beads as a measure of acculturation or as a temporal marker, this thesis proposes that glass beads were an important social entity in the colonial context of 18th-century Southern Appalachia that helped groups to express individual and community identities and navigate the colonial period’s material world.

More specifically, glass trade beads have the potential to bring to the surface a number of topics relating to Cherokee experiences during the colonial period including diplomacy, trade, identity, community, and internal exchange networks. In order to address these topics, I adopt a relational and interactionist approach to the entanglement of people, places, and objects at Chota-Tanasee (Thomas 1991; Knappett 2011, 2013; Hodder 2012; Watts 2013). This approach involves recent theoretical developments of community (Sweeney 2011; Murray and Mills 2013; Harris 2014; Peeples 2018), materiality (Meskell 2005; White 2009; Knappett 2014), and social space (Delle 1998; Cornell and Fahlander 2007; Hillier 2014; Paliou 2014) with the methodological advancements of social network analysis (Brughmans 2010; Knappett 2013; Collar et al. 2015; Mills 2017).

As European traders brought thousands of glass beads, along with other trade goods, to the colonial frontier, these objects worked their way into Native American societies – including Cherokee society – in complex ways that were unfamiliar to Europeans. A major goal of North American anthropologists, archaeologists, and historians of the Colonial South has been to untangle and understand this complex relationship between Native Americans and European-manufactured trade goods (Miller and Hamel 1986; Cusick 1998; Silliman and Witt 2010); and with the move away from acculturation models, increasingly sophisticated approaches to Native
American identity formation, agency, and materiality have flourished. Aided by these developments, this study examines the relationship between Cherokee individuals and communities and the glass trade beads they chose to consume and use for adornment. The seemingly simple relationship between beads and people brings to the surface a number of complex entanglements, however, that allow us to critically consider the relationship between the people, places, and objects of the Overhill Cherokees.

This study also contributes to the past century of research into Cherokee social history (Crane 1929; Corkran 1962; Hatley 1993; Boulware 2011) by critically analyzing one aspect of the construction and negotiation of Overhill Cherokee communities and identities during the middle of the 18th century. With recent works bringing to the forefront issues of identity, community, and spatial relationships (Rodning 2009; Marcoux 2010; Chambers 2015), this study is able to orient these issues around glass beads, providing a unique and materially focused approach. Furthermore, this study provides a focused research project on the two specific towns of Chota and Tanasee in order to emphasize the local-scale interactions, experiences, and practices of Overhill Cherokee communities during this tumultuous period.

Additionally, while attention has been paid by historians and anthropologists to the creation of towns, and the ties created through spatial configurations (Chambers 2006, 2010; Rodning 2015), less attention has been paid to the movement of objects through the social spaces that constitute these towns. As noted by the researchers mentioned above, town and clan identity certainly influenced the ways that communities structured social spaces. However, the materiality of adornment ensures that identity did not solely rest on the spatial associations of town and clan identity (Carr and Neitzel 1995; Fisher and Loren 2003; Mattson 2016). Instead, the acts of consuming, adorning (or not adorning), and being buried with certain beads helped to
represent in a physical way the identities, social networks, community associations, and individuality of Cherokee persons. While town and clan identities were tied to literal space, objects such as glass beads traversed this landscape, transmitting information wherever the adorned person went. To borrow a term from modern sociology (Sheller 2004), glass beads, along with other forms of adornment, acted as a form of mobile publics, where personal identities were brought into the public sphere and, conversely, transferred public social meanings onto personal objects.

Focusing on glass beads and other objects of adornment within burial contexts has the potential to overemphasize the individual burial in the past, neglecting the role of the living in the burial practices and the continued presence of the deceased on the landscape and in the memory of the living. Shifting focus to a relational and interactionist view of Cherokee burials in domestic and public structures, and the objects buried with the deceased, I argue that the dead were linked with the living through the practice and materiality of internment (Brück 2004; Rodning and Moore 2010). Mortuary studies in Southeastern archaeology help to support this claim by countering representationalist interpretations with more nuanced studies of how burials link together the society (Sullivan and Mainfort 2010). Rather than burial goods representing exclusively the status, age, gender or other social category of the deceased, and therefore isolating them from their wider object itineraries, they should instead be understood within the networks of interaction and entanglement that brought communities together materially and through social practice. It is through burials, then, that community identities, materiality, and social space came together. An important caveat, however, is the fact that the communities I examine are those that are specifically entangled with beads.
Although the archaeological analyses are derived from mortuary data, the singular event of inhumation is far from the only story told by the glass beads present at the site. Therefore, a careful examination of the historical data helps to contextualize uses and social practices involving glass trade beads. As beads were brought into Cherokee towns, they were put to use in a number of ways that both reflected and shaped cultural practices of trade, diplomacy and adornment. By examining the journals of traders, documents of South Carolina’s colonial government, and the messages of Cherokee leaders to colonial officials, these aspects of glass trade beads can come to light. Far from representing any loss of “traditional” culture, glass beads were creatively put to use in a variety of ways that highlight aspects of colonial Cherokee experiences that would otherwise go underappreciated.

Ultimately, this thesis is an exploration of the multiple scales at which Cherokees of Chota-Tanasee and glass trade beads came to interact at specific social spaces on the landscape. By adopting the growing method of social network analysis in archaeology, I aim to highlight the ways that glass beads acted to connect peoples and represent communities. Although some variation can be accounted for by categories of age, gender, and status, social network analysis helps to crosscut these traditionally examined groups to highlight the ways that residential association and other forms of community identity structured the materiality of burials. Rather than assuming that glass beads were an insignificant aspect of colonial materiality, it is beneficial to consider the range of their uses and entanglements. Therefore, if we adopt a more complex view of the materiality of glass beads, we will gain a better understanding of the practices of consumption and adornment, the negotiation of identities, the organization of Cherokee communities, the creation of socially significant spaces, and the structure of exchange networks within the Cherokee villages of Chota and Tanasee.
CHAPTER TWO

BACKGROUND

Geographical and Cultural Setting

Chota (40MR2) and Tanasee (40MR62) were and are important Cherokee villages located on the Little Tennessee River in what are known as the Overhill Settlements on the western side of the Appalachian Mountains (Figure 2.1). Areas of Cherokee occupation are divided into five distinct regions including Lower, Middle, Valley, and Out Towns in addition to the Overhill Towns. These designations are based on geographical proximity, socio-cultural and linguistic ties, and colonial period politics, although there was fluidity to populations moving between regions, especially during the later Revolutionary and Federal periods. Historical and archaeological data suggest that Chota-Tanasee were occupied beginning in the late 17th or early 18th centuries, with a period of growth throughout the mid-18th century and a period of decline and ultimate abandonment by the early 19th century (Schroedl 1986:14-15).

As will be covered in more detail in following chapters, there are ethnohistoric data that suggest Chota and Tanasee were two individual villages with unique political, spatial, and social identities; however, this thesis will follow Schroedl (1986) in using a hyphenated version to imply their connectedness when discussing the two sites together. This is also in line with the results of the original excavations, which did not identify a specific temporal difference between the two villages, as indicated by artifactual evidence (Schroedl 1986:29). The most likely chronology according to ethnohistoric and cartographic data is that originally Tanasee was a prominent Overhill town sometime in the late 17th or early 18th centuries. As has been acknowledged (Boulware 2011; Rodning 2015), the title of “town” was not meant to simply designate a cluster of houses; instead, “town” implied the presence of a townhouse and therefore
Figure 2.1. Map of Cherokee Regions (adapted from Rodning 2011:146)
defined “town” as a political entity. As the population of Tanasee grew in the early part of the 18th century, Chota most likely splintered off, established a townhouse and therefore political status, and eventually overshadowed the prominence of Tanasee sometime in the mid 18th century (Schroedl 1986). The two towns therefore shared not only geographical proximity, but also a history, culture, and at least a portion of a population.

Chota-Tanasee were located on a river terrace on the Little Tennessee River along major paths that linked the Overhill Settlements to other regions and towns within Cherokee country, to Virginia, to South Carolina, and to other Native American tribes to the South and West (Figure 2.2). This position as well as the actions of a number of notable chiefs, warriors, and beloved-men brought political and economic prominence to the towns and centered them in the interaction between Cherokees and European colonists. This embeddedness in the colonial network makes Chota-Tanasee a site of interest for archaeologists attempting to uncover the nuanced ways that 18th-century colonialism was experienced by Native Americans of the Southeast. Their prominence in the historical record as well as the extensive excavations conducted at the sites from 1969 through 1974 provide a detailed account of life at these villages and permits the type of high-resolution analysis this study seeks to undertake.

The occupants of the sites existed in a matrilineal and matrilocal society with an economy based on an agricultural mix of North American domesticates and wild game and fish. Although the division of labor was gendered, with farming being the primary role of women and hunting confined largely to men, this division did not imply a high degree of social inequality between men and women. Seeking to maintain a balance, Cherokee culture during this period emphasized the importance of each role, and extended these gendered roles into politics as well. At a basic
Figure 2.2. Map of Overhill Cherokee Towns (Schroedl 1986:6)
level, this division was mimicked in the separateness of public and private politics, with men typically fulfilling roles as head warriors and town leaders while women often fulfilled leadership roles in clans and households (Perdue 1998; Sullivan and Rodning 2010). These practices were not always strictly adhered to, and women often participated in diplomatic talks with European officials, in decisions to go to war, and in hunting expeditions. The importance was placed on balance – between public and private, agriculture and hunting, and peace and war.

Governmental organization mirrored the ethics of community participation, consensus, and equanimity. Issues that the town faced were discussed openly in the townhouse, with all members of the town having the opportunity to voice their opinion and decisions, waiting until a consensus could be reached (Gearing 1956). Although the British emissary Henry Timberlake described their government as a “mixed aristocracy and democracy,” his characterization was most likely a misinterpretation, or at least a Euro-centric interpretation, that did not acknowledge the importance of achieved status, the ability to prove one’s “worth,” and social equality of 18th-century Cherokee society (King 2007:36).

Whereas the public domain was governed by politics and diplomacy, the private domain was governed by familial relations and the clan system. One’s place in Cherokee society was determined by one’s place within one of the seven clans, which existed in all Cherokee towns. Therefore, while towns and townhouses defined local political community identities, the cross-cutting series of clans that existed within each town produced a larger system of nested Cherokee identities. Understanding Cherokee communities and therefore identities requires that attention is paid to both the public and private dimensions of Cherokee society and the ways that these communities were multiple, nested, and overlapping.
Although much is known about the lifeways of Cherokees, from Chota-Tanasee as well as more broadly, there is still much to be gained from a thorough consideration of the glass beads from these sites. Questions persist as to how status and social position were manifested materially and to how Cherokee communities used newly introduced objects to embody social identities. Additionally, there is much to be uncovered concerning the social practices involving beads, from the mundane to the ritualistic, in structuring social interactions and practices. Furthermore, while regional and thematic studies of colonialism are important contributions (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995; Ferris 2009), recent research suggests that site-specific analyses are crucial for investigating local responses to the effects of colonialism and how Cherokee communities manipulated, integrated, and responded to the introduction of new materials (Cornell and Fahlander 2007:3).

**Glass Bead Studies**

The consumption of glass beads may at first appear as a minor factor in the larger picture of colonial and Cherokee history, but beads played an important and often unappreciated role in the cultural transformations of the 18th century (Spector 1976; Panich 2014; Cipolla 2017). These objects were incorporated into the daily practices of Cherokee communities before direct contact with Europeans through trade networks of Native American groups in contact with Spanish colonies (Smith 1987). Once English and Scottish traders, in addition to French traders, came into more direct contact with the Cherokee, glass beads became a regular part of Cherokee adornment, ritual, and trading practices. Therefore, building on the literature covering glass trade beads in colonial contexts, an understanding of the glass beads from Chota-Tanasee is an important component to understanding Cherokee life during this tumultuous period.
The study of glass beads found at Native American archaeological sites has a long history dating back to the early 20th century (Karklins and Sprague 1987) which focuses on a number of questions including temporal seriation, trade routes, elemental composition, and social uses. Throughout most of the 20th century, glass beads were seen as a possible tool for dating sites, since there are temporally sensitive patterns of prominent bead types across time (Kidd 1954; Witthoft 1967). The temporal use of beads in archaeological studies continues into the 21st century as archaeologists seek to expand geographic foci and refine chronological periods (Little 2010; Marcoux 2012). More recent research (Blair 2015, 2017; Dalton-Carriger 2016) applies elemental analyses in order to trace object itineraries and explore the sources and movements of beads from the workshops of Europe to Native American sites.

Beyond Southeastern North American contexts, glass trade bead studies have been used in Alaska (Bundy et al. 2003), Australia (Wesley and Lister 2015), Africa (Gijanto 2011), and Canada (Karklins 1992) to name a few. With the founding of *Beads: Journal of the Society of Bead Researchers* in 1989, the cross cultural study of beads from a variety of ethnographic and archaeological sources has gained in popularity and continues to grow. The inherent and seemingly natural interest in glass beads across the globe emphasizes the importance of this subject for understanding colonial encounters and highlights the usefulness of this artifact class in such studies. Furthermore, these studies emphasize the importance of local context for understanding how these objects were incorporated and used by the society under consideration.

While many of the studies of glass trade beads provide indispensable data concerning site chronology and global trade networks, recent investigations also view beads through a lens that focuses on their interpretive potential for understanding issues of adornment (Gijanto 2011), consumption (Panich 2014), and the process of colonization (Scaramelli and Scaramelli 2005).
other words, glass trade beads are not only materials from which data can be extracted, but are socially important subjects themselves. Ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological studies (Sciama and Eicher 1998; Duncan et al. 2008) help to bring bead studies into living contexts, while other research emphasizes the social practices that produce the patterns visible in the archaeological record (Blair 2015).

Although some of the studies presented here are in Cherokee contexts, no studies have examined the social uses of glass beads within 18th-century Cherokee society in depth. Furthermore, glass trade bead studies have the potential to expand our understanding of the mortuary practices, spatial patterning, and exchange networks in ways that other materials are unable to accomplish. Specifically, the quantity, variety, and ubiquity of glass beads presents the opportunity to contextualize the materiality of social practices and provide a rich and detailed account of how this material fits into the lives of 18th-century Cherokee communities.

Consumption, Adornment, Identity, Community, Social Space

Glass trade beads were only one part of a much larger set of experiences and relationships that were the product of social interactions of 18th-century Cherokee communities. Collections of people, places, and objects came into interaction and formed relationships that imparted socially valuable information, reproduced cultural practices, and situated individual identities within the larger structure of community, town, clan, and ethnic identities. In order to address the importance of glass beads in this structuring process, we must therefore understand the logical procession of glass bead-human interaction.

Guiding the preceding discussion is a perspective that highlights the relational nature of human-object-space interaction and the entanglement of these entities (Thomas 1991; Hodder
2012; Watts 2013). This approach reorients focus to include a more holistic consideration of the influences of places and objects in the creation of social practices and highlights the links between subjects. Tied into this approach is the use of materiality as a concept in archaeology which challenges the view of objects as static things disconnected from their human hosts (Meskell 2005; White 2009; Knappett 2014). Instead, materiality offers an opportunity to move beyond glass beads as chronological markers or proxies for exchange networks and instead investigate more fully the process of meaning creation and social interaction. From studies of identity, community, colonialism, or trade networks, materiality and relationality help to move discussions beyond things, people, and places as independent. Instead, the mutually constituted and dialectical relationships between these entities becomes the focus.

In moving from the individual to the community the logical procession is as follows: individuals consume glass trade beads and use them in practices of adornment which reflect socially mediated identities as performed in specific social spaces that are defined and created by the community/ies. Although slightly convoluted, each aspect of this process is influenced and structured by the others helping to create the links between the people, objects, and places. As is covered in the subsection below, social network analysis provides a means to operationalize this theoretical procession, but first let us consider more fully the concepts involved.

Mullins (2011:134) suggests that consumption is an appropriate framework for viewing “how people socialize material goods … [and] embraces the agency of consumers and recognizes that goods assume meaning in a tension between structural and localized processes.” This view of consumption, as the process of integrating materials into the social world, differs from economically deterministic views of consumption in the modern Western world. As things are selectively incorporated into society, especially when these goods are produced outside of
that society, choices are made that reflect the views and values of that society (including variations within that society). Therefore, using a framework of consumption helps to consider the object itineraries of glass beads and how individual and community agency shaped the relationship between people and beads (Panich 2014).

A major benefit provided by consumption studies in archaeology has been the ability to provide an alternative to acculturation studies (Williman and Witt 2010; Pezzarossi 2014; Cipolla 2017). These recent studies build upon studies of creolization and ethnogenesis (Mullins and Paynter 2000) in order to argue that acculturation emphasizes a hypothetical and static “prehistoric” state of Native American life and a linear progression to the loss of “traditional” culture through the incorporation of European materiality. Drawing from Post-colonial studies (Bhabha 1984, 2004), consumption studies in colonial period Native American archaeological sites emphasize the cultural flexibility, adaption, and survival of indigenous communities. This approach is directly significant for the current study, since the original work and analysis of Chota-Tanasee (Newman 1977:3) sought to “provide a basis for Cherokee acculturation studies.” This is not to say that Newman sought to delegitimize 18th-century Cherokee culture; but instead, by updating his interpretations with a more nuanced consumption-based approach, we can discuss adaptations and foreign material incorporation without the baggage and “acculturation blinders” (Pezzarossi 2014:151) associated with this approach.

While consumption is an important point in the collective interactions of people and glass trade beads, it is only the start. Through the consumption these objects, individuals enacted and embodied practices of adornment that communicated specific messages and situated them within the community (White 2008; White 2009; Loren 2010). As White states (2008:17), “people used adornment to create and negotiate self-identity and group affiliation along lines of
gender, class, age, and ethnicity… The physical appearance is of particular interest since it reflects personal and cultural ideas about interlaced constructions of identity.” It is crucial to avoid essentialities and deterministic explanations when interpreting practices of adornment. Rather than viewing the practices and objects of adornment as direct markers of status, gender or ethnicity, objects of adornment such as glass beads were a “[tool] people used in the formation, maintenance and reinvention of ethnicity,” gender, age or status (Heath 1999:48). Seeking to navigate the world around them, Cherokees actively used beads in creative ways to express specific information and also to adjust to the shifting political, social, and economic world of the 18th century.

For Cherokee communities of this period, adornment practices were varied and depended on specific contexts and social structures of gender, age, and status; but at the same time, adornment was also organized by the individual and his or her experiences and identity. As the authors cited above emphasize, objects and practices of adornment are not meant to restrict typological definitions of a culture onto expressions of identity. Variety, movement, and individuality shaped this process similarly to demographics. As Loren notes, “at the intersection of time, space and the material, it is through the body that a person experiences the world, forms a sense of self and identity, and mediates social exchanges and social constructions of race, gender, power, and age” (2010:9). Embodiment theory (Fisher and Loren 2003; Joyce 2005; Mascia-Lees 2011; Strathern and Stewart 2011; Smith 2017) helps to emphasize this point. Strathern and Stewart (2011:389) define embodiment as the “patterns of behavior inscribed on the body or enacted by people that find their expression in bodily form. It thus bridges over from the body as a source of perception into the realms of agency, practice, feeling, custom, the exercise of skills, performance, and… performativity.” Too often, archaeological studies of
historical communities are weighed down by the structures of static space as identified through excavations. Therefore, an embodied approach helps to reaffirm the mobility, movement, and fluidity of objects of adornment, and therefore identities.

As is the case here, the vast majority of archaeological and anthropological discussions of adornment quickly progress into questions of identity. The major split for archaeologies of adornment and identity are approaches considered semiotic and other practice-based approaches. On the one hand, studies of group and individual identity emphasize the manipulation of materialized meanings that organize the presentation of the self in context with the wider society (Yaeger and Canuto 2000:2-3; Sweeney 2011:43). Following this logic, studies seeking to identify specific meanings behind adornment imply that, similar to other non-verbal forms of communications, objects of adornment are attached with communicative symbols meant to convey finite messages to a receiver. On the other hand, based on practice theory and habitus (Bourdieu 1972; Giddens 1984), others argue that it is through the structured interactions of peoples and objects that adornment gains significance (Sweeney 2011; Peeples 2018). If it can be argued that objects possess active qualities and can affect behaviors and perceptions (Watts 2013; Bauer and Kosiba 2016), then we must not only consider how persons use things, but how persons are shaped by the things they use. Identities are therefore intricately linked with the materiality of, among other things, adornment.

The materiality approach to identity has significant implications for adornment studies. It shifts focus from a static view of objects having inherent and unchanging qualities to a view that emphasizes that “the context of an artifact’s use is most closely related to its social value” (Mattson 2016:126). Therefore, this approach relies on the importance of social practices in producing social meaning, and the mutually constitutive relationship objects play in this process.
In doing so, this mutual constitution also shifts the material construction of identities from solely the product of the individual to a collective process of interaction and relationships between groups of people (Panich 2014; Heath 2017). Instead of projecting modern notions of consumeristic individualism in which one seeks to define him/herself through the objects he or she consumes, a relational approach to identity reflects more closely the process of identity construction in the past as occurring within a series of nested and overlapping communities.

A potential pit-fall of focusing on the archaeologies of identity formation is the lack of spatial contextualization. While space can be used simply as the backdrop for the actions and interactions of the past, another approach emphasizes the discursive and dialectical relationship between social and spatial relationships (Soja 1980; Pearson and Richards 1994; Wiley et al. 2010; Hillier 2014). Drawing from architecture and urban studies, social space is a concept that aims to capture both the sociality of space as well as the spatiality of social interactions (Paliou 2014). While theoretical developments in this front (Bourdieu 1984; Lefebvre 1991) provided an impetus for considering the active properties of space, social space as a methodology aims to quantify space for archaeologists (Moore 1996; Kosiba and Bauer 2013; Fladd 2017). Beyond the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) in mapping archaeological sites and spaces, spatial syntax has been fruitfully applied to archaeological studies, with minor modifications from its architectural origins (Paliou 2014). Similar to materiality studies, social space and space syntax argue that experiences in the past (as well as today) are shaped by the structure and organization of space and the built environment. Drawing from phenomenology, practice theory, and non-verbal communication studies, proponents of space syntax suggest that there are both consciously created spatial patterns as well as unconscious influences that impose themselves on the experiences and activities of historical persons. Emphasizing the importance of social
practice on the creation of social meanings in space, Fladd states “the ordering of daily practices within space can be used to understand the identities, interactions, and beliefs of the residents” (2017:129).

The intersection of space and cultural habitus were fruitfully combined by Chambers (2006, 2015), who argues that the ways Cherokees and English colonists conceptualized and experienced space shaped the colonial relationships of the period. Furthermore, Rodning (2009, 2015) argues the landscape and built environment of Cherokee towns reflected and shaped their compartmentalization of public and private spaces. Therefore, the placement of burials in specific spaces on the landscape acted to embody these spatially defined beliefs of public and residential identities. Focusing on glass beads in the burial process helps to refine this discussion in order to talk about the ways that portable objects of adornment were tied to individuals and specific locales on the landscape.

Throughout the preceding discussion, communities are mentioned as playing an important role and filter through which experiences are oriented. However, until recently community as a concept in archaeology did not have a clearly defined meaning. Used uncritically in much of the 20th century, the concept of community often was simply grounded in spatial proximity (Yaeger and Canuto 2000:3). Research conducted over the past few decades has challenged this assumption and instead highlights the shared social practices, identity, and material manifestations of community construction as a relational process (Canuto and Yaeger 2000; Varien and Potter 2008; Sweeney 2011; Murray and Mills 2013). As Yaeger and Canuto (2000:9) emphasize, “the community is not a spatial cluster of material remains to be observed, but rather a social process to be inferred.”
As archaeologists turned to studies of communities in the 21st century (Yaeger and Canuto 2000; Owoc 2005; Wilson 2010; Harris 2014), they argued for an experiential and ideational conception of the term, stressing the importance of social processes and social identities as was voiced in the late 20th century by sociologists (Anderson 1983). However, this does not necessarily negate the material and spatial components to this process. Varien and Potter (2008:16), for instance, argue that the things people use and the ways they use them shapes “who they are and their place in the world.” Taking this logic a step further, one can argue that objects and spaces are a part of the community themselves (Sweeney 2011:43; Harris 2014:77). Reorienting the concept of community to include the places and things involved in identity formation allows archaeologists to consider the social practices and interactions that inform and embody communities.

In the context of glass beads identified in burial contexts, communities are defined as the entanglement of people, places, and things through the social practice of inhumation. Although communities were experienced by the residents of Chota-Tanasee outside of this context, it is important to consider that communities are inherently contextual and determined by the situation in which they are enacted. The community includes the deceased, the living participants involved in the burial, the placement of the burial, and the materials contained within. Of specific importance for the present study are the beads interred. As will be covered in Chapter Three, the objects chosen to be included in a burial are not necessarily the personal possessions of the deceased. Instead, included are the objects curated by the living community to supply the deceased in their travels to the otherworld and to be gifted to previously passed loved-ones (Corkran 1969:26; King 2007:35). Therefore, the glass beads present in burials are part of the community linking the dead to the living. Furthermore, glass trade beads were obtained
differentially by the living, so it stands to reason that different communities would have different assemblages of beads to then inter with the deceased.

Moving from individuals and the things they consume and use for adornment to the communities and the social spaces they occupy requires a thorough consideration of the issues above. The relationships and interactions between people, objects, and places highlights the dialectical relationship between structure and agency, and therefore the role of the individual in a larger society in a social “assemblage” or “meshwork” (Harris 2012:90). As archaeologists continue to move beyond anonymous descriptions of general populations to a nuanced understanding of the individual’s relationship with the larger group, it is important that this complex interconnection is examined. Furthermore, expanding on the roles of spaces and objects contextualizes the interactions of individuals and communities, emphasizing the processes and practices of socially created meanings, communities, and identities.

**Social Network Analysis**

Social network analysis (SNA) provides a means to operationalize the relational and interactional perspectives so crucial to the above discussion. As Collar and colleagues (2015:5) argue, “it is the *relationships* that constitute a network, and that change its structure. This makes it clear how fundamental the theoretical assumptions underpinning representations of networks are to network science.” To realize relationships (also termed connections or ties), networks are envisaged as a series of nodes connected by vertices or edges creating topological graphs that visually display the structure of networks and the position of specific nodes (Brughmans 2010:277).
The use of social network analysis moved from its mathematical and sociological origins into the related humanities and social sciences during the 1990s and early 21st century, and has proven to be an innovative way to approach issues of social and material connections in the past (Lemercier 2011; Brughmans et al. 2016; Mills 2017). Archaeologists specifically have found this approach to be beneficial in a number of regions including Western Europe (Knappett 2013; Östborn and Gerding 2015), the late prehistoric Southwest (Borck et al 2015; Mills et al. 2017), the Caribbean (Mol et al. 2015) and the Northern Woodlands of North America (Hart and Engelbrecht 2012; Birch and Hart 2017). The southeast has been slightly slower to adopt this methodology; but recent efforts have pushed regional interest in this direction (Blair 2015; Thompson et al. 2017; Lulewicz and Coker 2018).

Of importance for archaeological social network analysis is its ability to consider phenomena at multiple scales. First, Mills (2017:382) highlights two approaches that focus either on node position or overall network structure. Beyond the conceptual level, this means that certain studies, for instance ego-network or brokerage analysis (which are covered in Chapter Four), can address the significance of specific nodes and their influence on the network (Everett and Borgatti 2005; Peeples and Haas 2013). Other studies (Mills et al. 2013; Birch and Hart 2017), consider the overall structure of the network including cohesiveness, network density, and network topology. Second, social network analysis allows the researcher to incorporate both human and object into the operationalized network. This process operationalizes the theory of “symmetrical archaeology” (Shanks 2008; Harris 2012), which argues against dividing the world into “subjects” and “objects,” by observing multi-modal graphs. Multi-modal network analyses consider nodes of more than one type, meaning archaeologists can consider both people (whether they are represented across whole sites, households, or individual burials) and objects as nodes.
within the network. Third, social network analysis can be used to trace the literal movement of goods through compositional analyses (Blair 2015; Golitko and Feinman 2015) or the inferred movement of people through “communities of practice” analyses (Sonsa et al. 2012; Blair 2015; Östborn and Gerding 2015; Mills 2016).

The “communities of practice” approach is significant for the present study for a number of reasons. Based on Lave and Wenger’s concept of “situated learning” (1991), communities of practice are groups of people that, through habitual or serial action, display a measure of similarity in the way that things are produced. For instance, the variations of potting traditions (Blair 2015) or the firing of bricks (Östborn and Gerding 2015) highlight differences in the socio-cultural practices of production which implies that they are connected to specific groups of people. Both within and outside of anthropology (Stokburger-Sauer and Wiertz 2015; Mills 2016), the communities of practice concept has been extend to include not only objects of production, but also consumable objects. Furthermore, including the social practices themselves, communities of practice is a useful concept in considering burial practices. As people consume and inter objects into burials, the communities of practice and consumption are observable through the objects included and the ways these objects are included.

The flexibility of the SNA methodology implied in the multiple ways that social network analysis can be used provides a number of benefits and is a major reason for the growth of this method in archaeological studies of the past decade. However, there are limitations to this method which must be addressed. The first critique lies in its potential for deterministic and reductionist explanations of social patterning. Since the early 1990s (Emirbayer and Goodwin 1994), social scientists have noted that SNA can remove the agency of the individual and provide a model where actions are determined by the network, rather than the other way around.
Gidden’s concept of structuration provides an answer to this critique, where the network and the individual are mutually constituted (Haines 1988). The second critique is based in the nature of the data themselves (Collar et al. 2015). Even beyond archaeology, there are questions as to how to determine the unit of measure in social and material studies. What is the node? What defines an edge? These questions are the start to any SNA research and affect the process every step of the way. Within archaeology, this is even more difficult for two reasons – the groups under observation are inherently reconstructions and the data provided are inherently fragmentary. The third critique focuses on the ways that social network analysis is used to produce snapshots of relationships. Issues of temporality must be taken into account when addressing network analyses, and if not considered carefully, changes over time can be misinterpreted as differentiations within a single contemporary society.

Despite these critiques, social network analysis provides a method to examine relationships in the past that would otherwise be impossible. This thesis will specifically make use of a number of the options for investigation covered above. Specifically, I will use the uni- and multi-modal approaches to compare the connections created through beads and observe how beads can be understood as being part of the network themselves. It is also important to consider both the individual nodes as well as the wider graph structure. Although the burials were the product of and existed within a network of interaction, ultimately the deceased were individuals with specific histories and identities. Therefore, considering both ego-networks and overall network topology will add to the ways that individuality and collectivity interacted. Whereas graphs of the overall network display the position a node holds within the wider network, an ego-network consists an individual node with all the connections immediately surrounding it, emphasizing a different scale of analysis. Ultimately, as Chapter Five discusses, social network
analysis in this context is used to infer social relations. Without specific ethnographic data concerning who interacts, lives, and trades with whom, archaeologists must rely on the role of objects and spaces in communicating identities. By acknowledging this fact and integrating a view of the social importance of materiality, we can bring glass beads to the surface of discussions of 18th-century Cherokee communities and identities.
CHAPTER THREE
CHEROKEE HISTORY THROUGH GLASS BEADS

Introduction

During the last decades of the 17th and beginning of the 18th centuries, residents of Cherokee towns witnessed a dramatic increase in the number of Europeans who would colonize and immigrate into the region over the next century and ushered in a world of new political, social and material experiences. Communities of Cherokee towns rapidly readjusted to these political and social challenges of European-Cherokee encounters including their incorporation into a capitalist world-system (Dunaway 1996), a series of devastating epidemics (Thorton 1990; Kelton 2007), and persistent warfare (Lee 2004; Tortora 2015). Cherokees of the 18th century were faced with a rise and fall of cross-culturally mediated political alliances that were, at best, tenuous. Colonial competition between nations such as England and France, as well as inter-colonial tensions between Virginia and South Carolina allowed astute Cherokee leaders to position themselves and their towns to benefit economically, while competition between Cherokee communities and other Native American tribes of the North American Southeast challenged any consistent sense of stability.

This chapter is not meant to be an exhaustive account of 18th-century Cherokee history, but instead builds upon the large body of historical studies of Cherokee society (Logan 1859; Royce 1887; Crane 1929; Williams 1937; Corkran 1962; King 1979; Hatley 1994; Perdue 1998; Schroedl 2000; Rogers and Duncan 2009; Boulware 2011). Drawing from these sources as well as the words of traders, politicians, and Cherokees of the 18th century, the main goal is to provide historical context for the subsequent analyses and to provide an historical backdrop to the social history of glass beads in Cherokee society and communities. Understanding the
perceptions of glass beads beyond what is available in the archaeological record is a crucial step in providing informed interpretations in subsequent chapters, therefore a careful consideration of the historical record is an important step in this process.

The sources considered in this thesis are, for the most part, well known and have a long tradition of being used for historical research of the period. The works include James Adair’s *The History of the American Indians* (Braund 2005), Alexander Longe’s *A Small Postscript on the Ways and Manners of the Indians Called Cherokees* (Corkran 1969), *The Memoirs of Lt. Henry Timberlake* (King 2007), William Bartram’s *Travels Through North & South Carolina, Georgia, East & West Florida, The Cherokee Country* (Bartram 2001), and South Carolina’s *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs* (Vol. I & II) (McDowell 1958, 1970). Additional supplemental historical passages are provided by Rozema (2013) and Williams (1928). These resources cover the historical period ranging from Colonel George Chicken’s first visit to the Overhill country in 1725 through William Bartram’s travels through Cherokee Country in 1775. Although there are historical records dating to the Federal period (1794-1819), here I focus on the 50-year period during which Chota-Tanasee were prominent political entities and which saw the growth and proliferation of cross-cultural trade.

Using these sources, I conducted a systematic search for the contexts in which beads, jewelry, dress, clothes and other similar terms were mentioned. This search produced a large sample of historical references to beads, which were then divided into three main identified themes including trade, diplomacy, and adornment. A mix of official colonial documents, journals, memoirs, and histories, the historical sources served different functions that are reflected in the contexts in which beads are mentioned. For instance, while the *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs* reference beads as objects of diplomacy and trade, many of the
memoirs and histories are a type of proto-ethnography that provide detailed accounts of appearance and adornment.

Historical analyses of 18th-century Cherokees often emphasize diplomacy, economics, and warfare from a perspective that is biased toward the actions of European officials, Cherokee town leaders, and other prominent individuals who more often are present in the historical record. Even social histories of the 18th-century Native American southeast, with a focus on those beyond the historical record, can neglect the influence and role of materials in the constructing the past – relegating objects such as glass beads to the realm of archaeology exclusively. Therefore, following a brief historical overview, the majority of this chapter is concerned with the social history of glass beads in 18th-century Cherokee society – aiming to highlight the intersections between the people and objects of the past that can help us to gain an understanding of the materiality of daily lives in Cherokee towns of this period. While the history of glass beads at colonial Cherokee villages is an important gap to fill in itself, it is also vital to connect these objects to the peoples who consumed them, therefore humanizing these objects and examining their materiality. Archaeological studies of material culture can inadvertently socially decontextualize the objects under consideration, therefore a careful consideration of the ways that glass beads were used, consumed, and worn helps to tie the archaeological discussions of this thesis to the actions, perceptions, and culturally constituted practices of living peoples.

**Historical Overview**

Following Schroedl (1986) and Newman (1977), Overhill Cherokee history at Chota-Tanasee is divided into four historic periods including the Contact period (circa 1710-1745), the
Colonial period (1746-1774), the Revolutionary period (1775-1793), and the Federal period (1794-1819). These divisions are based in part on the political-economic approach of European policy toward the Cherokee which shifted from loose and unregulated trade of the Contact Period to the paternalistic oversight of the American government leading up to Cherokee Removal in the 1830s. Since archaeological as well as ethnohistoric evidence suggest that it was during the Contact and Colonial Periods that Chota-Tanasee were at their height, specific attention is paid to the developments of these periods.

The Contact Period is defined by inconsistent contact between Cherokee towns and European traders and gradually increasing interest in the importance of the region for colonial officials in Charlestown. The varied nature of interactions included the destruction of a Yuchi village (Logan 1859:184-185; Bauxar 1957; Riggs 2012), visits by official and unofficial colonial diplomats such as Colonel George Chicken and Alexander Cuming (Mereness 1916; Williams 1928), and the voyage of seven Cherokee officials to England to meet with King George II and the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations in 1730 (Rozema 2013). These exchanges filter through the most important aspects of Cherokee-English relationships as seen by the English and highlight the importance of trade, the strategic position of an Overhill Cherokee alliance, and the attempts to manipulate internal Cherokee politics for the benefit of colonial endeavors.

During the Contact period, Chota and Tanasee received less attention from colonial authorities compared to other settlements in the Cherokee country and tribes closer to Charlestown. However, from the journals as well as maps of the period it is clear that of the two, Tanasee was of greater importance. Colonel Chicken visited “Tunisse” in 1725 and Alexander Cuming visited the same town five years later, noting the “crown of Tannassy” during his
“coronation” at Nequassee by Moytoy of Tellico (Mereness 1916:111; Chambers 2006:12). Nonetheless, political centralization of the Overhill Cherokee during this period was generally centered around Great Tellico under the leadership of Moytoy (Corkran 1962). It would not be until what is considered the “Colonial Period” that Chota-Tanasee would gain in prominence and importance and become the center of Cherokee political activities.

From the European perspective, the Colonial Period is defined by enacting policy based on the importance of the Overhill region as identified during the Contact Period. During this period, the cross-cultural economic and political relationship between the English and Cherokee steadily grew and functioned relatively peacefully. Relations were eventually pushed to the breaking-point during the late 1750s and eventually a series of altercations led to a war which set the stage for the further division between the English and Cherokees (Crane 1929; Hatley 1993; Boulware 2007; Rogers and Duncan 2009). As Boulware (2007:409) notes, the conflicts of the 1740s and 1750s resulted in “confrontations and robberies [that] gave way to murder.” These conflicts came to a culmination with the Anglo-Cherokee War of 1759-1761. This war was not merely a visceral reaction to the individual wrongs committed against Cherokees, however. Instead, it was broken treaties and trade abuses that led to the war. Although a fragile peace was established following the war, the optimism of the first half of the century did not return.

From the Cherokee perspective, this period is defined by the consolidation of power on the part of Chota and an increasingly formal economic relationship between the English colonies and Cherokee villages. While Tanasee was the more prominent of the two towns during the first decades of the 18th century, by the 1740s or 1750s Chota overshadowed its sister town, and became the center of Cherokee political activity. This is in part because of Chota’s status as a “Peace Town,” which meant that visitors to the region as well as leaders from other Cherokee
towns convened there to discuss political issues (Gearing 1958; Corkran 1962). Another factor was the influence and status of leaders such as Old Hop (Connecorte), Attakullakulla, and Oconostota who filled the power vacuum left by the passing of Moytoy in 1741. The interconnectedness of English and Cherokee political and economic ties means that it is difficult to tell whether Chota-Tanasee’s prominence was a product of their role in mediating colonial politics or merely an artifact of the European bias of the historical record. Nonetheless, the Colonial Period saw the rise of Chota-Tanasee’s authority over other towns such as Great Tellico during the late Contact period’s turbulence.

During the Revolutionary period, the American Revolution challenged the alliances that had been built up over the preceding century. In the periods leading up to the Revolutionary War, Cherokee towns, leaders, and individuals were pulled between alliances with the English and alliances with the French and other pro-French Native American tribes. Despite the calls for other avenues of trade, the pro-English faction maintained the majority of political influence in the Overhill Towns. Chota especially was demonstrably pro-English. During the Revolutionary period, however, the lines of trade between Charleston and the Overhill towns were cut off, leaving many Cherokees without firearms, ammunition, and other necessities. The lack of provisions, although significant, was further exacerbated by the campaign in 1776 led by Colonel Andrew Williamson and General Griffith Rutherford during which many of the Middle and Valley towns were burned and destroyed, including their fields and crops (Schroedl 1986:13). Upon arriving at the Overhill settlements on the Little Tennessee River, Williams found the villages abandoned and subsequently burned a number of Overhill towns as well (Schroedl 1986:13).

Throughout Cherokee history, public discourse and policy was established through
culturally reinforced practices, allowing all to have a voice in the decision of the town. Some of the war-driven mentalities of the younger men were counteracted by the voices of peace and patience from the older generations. As war approached, however, and traditional systems of decision-making were challenged by the scale and speed of impending military action, Cherokee society was fractured in the Overhill villages of the Revolutionary period. A younger generation of Cherokees who saw no end to the loss of life and land, led by Dragging Canoe (Tsiyu Gansini), were frustrated by the inaction of the town leaders and brought a faction of similarly-minded Cherokee families to establish a new set of towns further South, known as the Chickamauga Cherokee.

Despite the military actions taken against the Cherokee during the Revolutionary War and the subsequent Cherokee-American wars of the 1780s and 1790s, American politicians and traders wanted to maintain a close economic relationship with the tribe. Therefore, the Tellico Blockhouse was built in 1794 and for the next decade facilitated trade with the remaining towns of the region and provided support for the fulfilment of treaties signed between the two parties. Although the peak of deerskin hide trade had come and gone and overhunting had limited the number of available deer, trading in skins still provided an income to the region, and many of the early settlers of the region gained wealth from trading with the Overhill Cherokee towns. Additionally, the early American government sought to introduce Euro-American economic activities such as farming as well as other practices such as blacksmithing to the Cherokees of the region.

During the Federal period, Chota-Tanasee experienced population decline through factions moving, epidemics, the results of the war, and encroaching white settlers. By the turn of the century, according to Moravian missionaries, only a handful of houses remained of the
former “metropolis” and by 1813, according to a report to Indian Agent Return Meigs, only one Cherokee inhabitant remained at Chota (Schroedl 1986:16). As populations declined or moved, treaties were signed relegating a greater amount of Cherokee land to the American government, and Cherokee towns dispersed into small nucleated farmsteads, the Federal period witnessed a number of great changes to Overhill Cherokee society at Chota-Tanasee.

The historical progression presented in the proceeding section is in line with many fatalistic narratives surrounding Cherokee history leading up to the Cherokee Removal. The emphasis on political, military, or economic histories inadvertently supports this narrative despite providing indispensable information concerning the lives and history of the period. In a fatalist formulation, glass beads and other objects of European manufacture appear as facilitators of acculturation or as a symbol of the impending European infiltration into Cherokee culture. So how can examining the history of glass beads themselves change this narrative?

By adopting a thematic approach to the roles of glass beads in trade, diplomacy, and adornment, the remainder of this chapter will use the words of Cheorkees, European traders, and colonial officials to investigate the ways that glass beads facilitated social interactions. Incorporated into the proceeding discussion are the concepts of object biographies (Kopytoff 1986; Heath 2017) or object itineraries (Joyce and Gillespie 2015). These perspectives emphasize the ways that objects have histories themselves and obtain a collection of socio-culturally defined meanings. Considering the biographies/itineraries of glass beads and the various points of contact between peoples and beads allows the following discussion to consider them as not just passive objects. Instead, I consider the materiality of glass beads in order to consider the intersections of people and beads in specific contexts, thereby uncovering experiences of 18th-century Cherokee towns that might otherwise go unnoticed or
underappreciated. By focusing solely on glass beads in various social situations, we are able to provide an historical cross-section of Cherokee life at Chota-Tanasee and the surrounding region from various communities and identities to the multiple contexts in which beads were used.

**Trade**

“Their chief trade is with those Europeans with whom they are in alliance, in hides, furs, &c. which they barter by the pound, for all other goods” (King 2007:33-34).

From a political economy perspective, it is unsurprising that trade between Native Americans and Europeans has been the focus of much historical and archaeological research (Rothrock 1929; Miller and Hamell 1986; Dunaway 1996; Carlos and Lewis 2001; Braund 2008; Silliman 2010; Stern 2017). The trade of animal hides during the 18th century was a major source of wealth for European colonies and Native American groups, and incorporated both groups into the world economy. Furthermore, in many ways, the new trade system introduced new challenges, opportunities, and perspectives that produced lasting impacts on the structure and experiences of Southeastern Native Americans. The economic growth depended on interpersonal relationships between European and Native American traders and, in many ways, structured the colonial policies and interactions of the 18th century. For Native Americans of the Southeast, colonial trade brought material wealth and expanded avenues for attaining social status through access to and redistribution of exotic socio-culturally valuable objects. Focusing on glass trade beads in this process allows us to focus on the economic interconnectedness of the period and investigate how new materials influenced the system of trade.
There is a challenge to compartmentalizing trade and economics from other social realms as defined within a Western perspective. The division between labor, trade, politics, and community relations was blurred in Cherokee society, instead emphasizing the interconnectedness of these economic and social activities. Throughout documents dating from the 1740s through the 1760s, recorded talks between Cherokee leaders and colonial officials intertwine discussions of war, trade, diplomacy, and interpersonal relationships. This is not to say that Cherokee individuals were inept traders or did not understand the economics of trade. On the contrary, Cherokee traders were able to fetch the best prices for goods and used European competition to their advantage, especially during the Contact and Colonial periods when deer were plentiful and there was greater competition between colonial powers. The confusion arises in the historical record and subsequent research into the subject. Gifting and trading were viewed as closely related, if not interchangeable, throughout the period in the colonial record.

Research into Southeastern colonial exchange, aided by traditions in anthropology, has supported the gift-commodity ambiguity and underemphasized the economic prowess of Native American consumers, focusing instead on gift-exchange and material reciprocity (Mauss 2002; Stern 2012). Glass trade beads, in one sense, are a difficult material with which to challenge this notion. Although present on trading inventories and price regulations (McDowell 1970:172, 446, 456, 566), glass beads did often take the form of gifts in contexts of diplomatic exchanges. If one adopts a wider view of trade that is not limited to a strictly economic framework (Graeber 1996), and instead focuses on trade as a series of movements in which both monetary and social values are exchanged, glass beads help to bridge this gap. Rather than functioning strictly as gifts or as commodities, glass beads linked together European and Cherokee trading partners in a system of economic and social ties.
By tracing the object itineraries of glass beads as they entered Charlestown and eventually ended up in the graves of Cherokee individuals at Chota-Tanasee, the materiality of trade and the social ramifications of exchange come to the surface (Blair 2015; Joyce and Gillespie 2015). Rather than strictly separating monetary and social value, glass trade beads, in addition to other trade goods, existed in a liminal space that passed “back and forth between regimes of value” (Graeber 1996:14). Therefore, examining the paths through which glass beads traveled in the process of trade suggests that, along the way, beads were attached with meanings and values that were the product of social context and gave meaning to trade beyond the accumulation of wealth. This approach can help to challenge the divide between gift and commodity and allow for a more holistic investigation of exchange systems of the colonial Southeast.

Beads arrived in the ports of Charlestown in the colony of South Carolina merely as commodities. Socially anonymous bulk items purchased by merchants in Europe in order to trade with Native American groups, glass beads did not possess the significance that they would later acquire, and instead were viewed as another item to be bought and sold in the growing economy of the Southern colonies. From the ports of Charlestown, the glass beads were purchased by individuals or companies, sometimes the “Indian traders” themselves, but more often through middle men or companies that would outfit traders with the supplies they needed to sustain trade (Braund 2008:446). From the hands of these companies and middlemen, glass beads gradually accrued a closer resemblance to the meaning they took in Cherokee villages. As experienced traders came to the storehouses, either in Charlestown or closer to the villages in which they traded such as the town of Ninety-Six or Fort Prince George (Hatley 1993:85), they would purchase on credit the goods they needed to supply their Native American partners in that
season’s hunt. While the focus was on goods such as powder and bullets, objects such as metal jewelry, cloth, and glass beads were also sold.

The preceding paragraph implies an orderly movement of goods, from the warehouses of Charlestown to stores on the frontier to the hands of traders; however, this was far from a simple exchange. A system of credit, debt, monopolies, price gouging, unobserved trade regulations, competing colonies, and ruthless financial ambition characterized the process along the way. Although this system negatively affected traders and other Europeans involved in the deerskin trade, the brunt of this challenging economic structure was experienced by the Native American trade partners. The most directly experienced aspect of this structure was the system of credit and debt that enveloped Cherokee economic activities. Braund notes that a series of regulations set a limit to the amount of credit that traders were permitted to extend to their Native American partners, measured at 30 pounds of dressed deerskin per year. However, “such restrictions were, of necessity, widely ignored” (Braund 2008:136). Partly, this was an extension of the credit allowed to European traders, passed down to their Native American trading partners. The result, however, was a system in which either colonial-run monopolies or highly consolidated private companies such as Brown, Rae, and Company, a major focus of Braund’s research (2008), saw profits while a system of ever-growing debt entangled those on the frontier.

This system of credit and debt was not perceived as entirely negative, by either European or Native American traders. For Europeans, the system of debt ensured a continued relationship, since Native American traders would have to continue doing business with them exclusively, thereby ensuring a continual supply of valuable processed deerskins. For Native Americans, “debts remained a kind of moving gift which served to tie the creditor to debtor” (Hatley 1993:48). This view of economics emphasizes the relational and social dimension of trade.
Rather than debt representing an abstract notion of goods to be delivered at a later date, debt instead represented a bond of mutual benefit, an extension of reciprocity to those outside the kin-clan-village social structure. While colonial officials viewed this bond primarily through an economic lens, they necessarily framed this interaction in the terms of friendships, bonds, and familial responsibility that structured Cherokee economics.

Even in a more European economic sense, Cherokee individuals and communities were selective consumers and sought to shape which items were available to them. In 1752, Old Hop (Connecorte), the leader of Chota and the de facto leader of all Overhill Cherokees, summed up the items desired of the Overhill Cherokee communities when he sent a request to Charlestown:

“…every Trader of us for the seven Towns over the Hills should each of us bring for his Town six Bags Powder or twelve Bags Bulletts with Guns, Flints, Knives, Hatchets, and every Thing else equivalent that Way as also two Boxes Paint for every Town and Glasses forsooth to dress themselves with. Likewise, Tape and Ribbons to lace their Match-Coats, and silver Wrist Hoops a Sample of which they send per Mr. Langtaniae, also Brochio’s or silver breast Rings for the Bosoms of their Shirts with Plenty of Barley Corn, Beads, and your Purple and white Wampoms, and the forked or three-cornered Wampoms in the Manner of the Northward. In Short with great plenty of all Sorts of trading Goods too tedious to mention.” (McDowell 1958:253)

Although the recorder of this message found the list “too tedious to mention” in full, it is clear that Old Hop and the other Cherokees of Chota had a clear idea of what items they desired, even to the level of sending a specific sample of wrist hoops to locate and send to their town. The fact that Old Hop included objects beyond firearms, hatchets, and other utilitarian goods suggests that
these objects of adornment – paint, ribbons, clothing, jewelry, and glass beads – served a function and were actively desired by Cherokees at Chota.

This desire for objects of adornment is further supported by a request to Charlestown during the construction of Fort Loudon in 1757.

“The Indians are very backward in letting us have any Quantity [of corn]. I have implored some Traders to buy what they can, and I have engaged them at 30 Shilings per Bushel delivered here. I bought last week of the Indians 30 bushels for a Cagg of Rum. All what the Indians want for their Corn is Gartering, [Cadiz], all sorts of Beeds and Vermillion. Captains Demere and Stuart and Postel has hitherto supplyed the Store with those and more Articles” (McDowell 1970:337).

The reason the Cherokees near Fort Loudon were “backward in letting us have any” is difficult to discern. It could possibly be because of the gendered division of labor between agriculture and hunting, with women having charge of the fields (Perdue 1998:72). According to Perdue, Cherokee women did not view items such as the corn they grew as having any commercial value. Instead, food stuffs were typically offered to guests and visitors and seen as a social gift of welcoming. If the trade of corn to the staff at Fort Loudon was either conducted or conceived as within the realm of women, it is interesting to note that, aside from the rum, the objects sought in exchange were also mostly of the realm of Cherokee women – namely cloth, clothing and glass beads (Perdue 1998).

There is little in the way of historical documents that note what happened to commodities such as glass beads as they entered into exchange networks within Cherokee society. Obviously, there were not markets set up within the villages, from which prominent Cherokee traders sold goods to their fellow Cherokee townspeople. Instead, a more likely scenario is a system of
redistribution, gifting, and reciprocity meant to fulfill the Cherokee ethic of equality and also to allow moments of social capital accumulation. It is within the village that Mauss’s arguments fit most prominently. As Graeber paraphrases, “gift giving can be a powerful a way of creating social bonds because gifts always carry with them something of the giver’s self… Social identities of the giver and receiver tend to become entangled in that of the object” (1996:5).

The following subsections will cover more specifically the types of meanings attached to beads and their paths once in the villages, but what is clear is that as beads entered into Cherokee towns, and therefore Cherokee societies, the anonymous glass beads sent in bulk from the workshops of Europe attained a much greater significance. Glass beads may only be one part of a much larger system of trade and exchange between Cherokees and European colonies, yet they help to challenge the notion that Native Americans were economically naïve and help to blur the line between social and monetary value in colonial systems of exchange.

**Diplomacy**

“This is our Way of Talking, which is the same Thing to us, as your Letters in the Book are to you.” (Williams 1928:143)

When a group of seven Cherokee leaders accompanied Alexander Cuming to England in 1730, they explained to the English Commissioners of Trade the use of eagle feathers and other gifts in diplomatic exchanges. They outlined the material dimension to agreements, alliance, and diplomacy and the importance of exchange in forming and maintaining relationships. During this meeting, the two parties established the “Articles of Friendship and Commerce,” which outlined the basic requirements as the Commissioners for the Trade and Plantations saw fit and set the
stage for treaties of the succeeding decades. This material dimension, the presenting of an object in a response to a promise, was not lost on the British in the room. The English Commissioners would state a regulation followed by the presentation of a set of objects to the Cherokee delegation. These regulations demanded that the Cherokees keep the trading path clean (peaceful); avoid trading with the French or Spanish; return run-away African slaves; and turn over Cherokees who kill Englishmen. In exchange, the delegation received red and blue fabric, 400 pounds of gunpowder, 1,000 pounds of bullets and swan shot, 10,000 gun flints, a box of vermillion, 6 dozen hatchets, 12 dozen knives, 4 dozen brass kettles, 10 dozen belts, and the ultimate symbol of alliance in the New World – a belt of wampum (Rozema 2013:7-11).

The English commissioners presented these objects not merely as gifts to the delegation, but using the material logic of the Cherokees in the room, gave these objects to provide a physical tie between the two groups. Following the wampum belt, the translators told the Cherokee delegation that it should “be kept and shewn to all your People and to their Children, and Children’s Children to confirm what is now spoken and to bind this Agreement of Peace and Friendship…” (Rozema 2013:10-11). While wampum has its origins in the Native American groups of the Northeast and is traditionally made of whelk or clam shell, it quickly came to play a symbolic role in the exchange between Native Americans and Europeans in the Eastern Woodlands of North America during the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. In fact, a number of glass beads (specifically Kidd and Kidd types Ia5 and Ia20) visually mimicked wampum and acted as a substitute for English traders and diplomats. Since Europeans had greater access to and control of the flow of glass beads, it is possible that in the above mentioned story, as in other cases throughout the 18th century, wampum was a metonym for a collection of small glass beads sewn to a belt and used in diplomatic exchanges.
The visual and physical symbols provided by the gunflints, cloth, bullets, and wampum belt should not be interpreted only as metaphors for the alliance built between the English and Cherokee. As is made clear during the meeting, the heart of this interaction was an economic one, at least for the English side of the partnership. Clarifying their purpose, the commissioners stated, “The Great King and the Cherokee Indians being thus fastned together by the Chain of Friendship, He has ordered His people and Children the English in Carolina, to trade with the Indians, and to furnish them with all manner of Goods that they want…” (Rozema 2013:8). With this statement, it is clear that the English presented gifts to the Cherokees to provide a sample of the quantity and quality of materials the British could supply to their trading partners. A constant source of anxiety for the British in the first half of the 18th century—the possibility that French traders would siphon off Cherokee trade—meant that this meeting was an opportunity to highlight the items available to the Cherokee delegation, should the chain of friendship remain in place.

Perhaps the most dubious and misinterpreted claims made by the Commission during the meeting in 1730 was in their understanding of land ownership. According to the Articles of Friendship and Commerce, “…as the King [George II] has given His Land on both Sides of the great Mountains to His own Children the English, so He now gives to the Cherokee Indians the Priviledge of living where they please” (Rozeman 2013:9). To the English commissioners, the Cherokee acceptance of the gifts signified that they accepted this agreement, providing ownership of Cherokee lands to the King. However, this misconception highlights the fact that objects and the exchange of gifts such as glass beads were not a one-to-one correlation with acceptance of the “terms of service.” As Ludovic Grant, the long-time trader among the Overhill Cherokees noted:
I was present when they returned from England and when the presents they Brought over with them were distributed and heard them make their report of all that they had seen but I never heard one word about their Surrendering their Country[.] On the Contrary They brought with them a written paper or parchment which I have seen and read… and there is the answer of the Cherokees to these proposals but not the least tendency towards any Surrender of the land… (Webber 1909:57).

Grant’s comments suggest that, in accordance to their agreement with the Commission, they presented their talks with their people; but contrary to English perceptions, this was not an agreement of surrender. While materials possessed the potential to communicate direct messages, there is more complexity to these items and the process of exchange. To the Cherokees, gift-giving was not necessarily a means of requiring the receiving party’s loyalty or symbolizing the authority of one party over another. Instead, gift-giving and the political power of objects replicated their system of governance in which power was a measure of trust and the ability of individuals to lead rested on their ability to meet the obligations to their community. While the English commissioners attempted to use the language of objects to convey specific responsibilities, they misinterpreted the specificity of object-meaning and merely reproduced the political structure of English colonial government of subordination and authority.

This interaction in London in 1730 helps to highlight the multivocality of objects in colonial contexts. As the English and Cherokees acknowledged, the exchanged objects helped to produce a bond, link, or “chain” between the two parties; however, this does not mean that the same meanings were held by both sides. Instead, it is only within the cultural, political, and social frameworks of each side that the objects were contextualized and brought into social life. This does not mean that the objects were simply *tabula rasa*, open to have meanings attached
and social significance assigned. Instead there existed a dialectical relationship between materials and people, in which the possibilities, limitations, and “physical-ness” of things provided a framework for further definitive moments. This process of socializing objects can be seen on both sides of the exchange described above. The English attempted to utilize the symbolic potential of gift giving to sway the Cherokees away from the French and also to bind them into formal diplomatic agreements. For the Cherokees, the process was more complicated.

Throughout the pre-contact period in the Southeast and beyond, and especially during the Mississippian period, exotic trade goods such as copper and shell objects of adornment were exchanged through networks that helped to provide a material dimension to the power and prestige exerted by chiefs and headmen (Muller 1997; Lulewicz and Coker 2018). The limited circulation of these objects and the challenge of transporting these objects from their source to their final destination helped to elevate their status by highlighting their place as brokers between the outside world and the village. During the colonial period, a greater number of goods, a wider variety of sources and paths, and the shifting political dimension of trade-goods challenged the traditional link between exotic trade goods and prestige. Individuals who perhaps would not have the opportunity for vertical movement during earlier centuries were now able to participate in the exchange of deerskins for trade goods and redistribute these goods in a manner that they saw as beneficial or opportunistic.

As Jessica Stern argues (2017), this saturation was not lost on indigenous leaders such as Old Hop (Connecorte). Politically, economically, and socially astute headmen noted that it was not necessarily the goods themselves that possessed political power, but the trade paths and external contacts that facilitated politically meaningful exchanges. Stern (2017:46) suggests that this logic is what brought Governor Glen to gift a box of maps and a magnifying glass to Old
Hop, in order for him to show his people “that he was successfully linking his town to a vast commercial network.” This action highlights two important dimensions to the materiality of trade goods in the political economy of colonial Cherokee society. The first is the importance of a network perspective to understanding the interconnectedness and entanglement of peoples, objects, and politics. The second point lies in the importance of movement to materiality. Although networks are appropriate for understanding and framing the interactions that take place, their use runs the risk of providing a picture of stasis. By focusing on how objects, people, and connections are the product of movements, networks can be seen as dynamic entities. This helps to historicize and socialize the materiality of trade goods.

Furthermore, Old Hop’s maps and magnifying glass emphasize the dynamic state of materiality in this colonial context. Rather than simply substituting earlier forms of prestige for European manufactured copies, new meanings were identified and represented materially. So while shell beads saw relatively limited circulation within Native American societies of the pre-European contact period and represented inherited or hierarchical status, glass beads were not structured in a similarly limiting way. They could flexibly be used by hunters, traders, dancers, leaders, or warriors to accomplish idiosyncratic political or social goals and materially connect portions of the village population who might otherwise be materially isolated.

Before considering more fully the intra-societal use of beads, let us focus again on the cross-cultural use of beads as a form of diplomatic communication. By the 1750s, both Cherokee and English parties realized the need to simplify and systematize the language of politics and war when discussing these issues with each other. Although the content of the messages exchanged between Chota-Tanasee and Charlestown were complex, glass beads helped to stream-line intent using a system of color-coded meanings. From some of the earliest interactions between the
English colonial government and Cherokee leaders, the themes of light, dark, white, and black were used by Cherokees to signify the quality of the relationship. This thematic approach was integrated into the Cherokee “ways of talking” by exchanging an item to show that the message was received and accompanied many of the talks of the 18th century. If a party wanted to signify that they were in agreement or that they intended to maintain a positive relationship, they would include a string of white beads. Conversely, if the party felt wronged or wished to show their disagreement with a message they would include a string of black beads. For instance, in May of 1759, a group of headmen from 13 different Cherokee towns wrote to Governor Lyttelton, stating: “After reading, this the Governor’s Letter, I send those white Beads and my Medal as a Token that what we Warriours has specified here shall never in any Shape be acted to the Contrary but the Chain always as usual be kept clear and bright as the Day which we have the Headmen putt our Hands to certify it” (McDowell 1970:494).

This system allowed for flexibility, however, and did not reduce complex emotions and sentiments to simple black and white messages. An example can be seen during March of 1758, when the head men of the Lower Towns wrote to Governor Lyttelton in response to the murder and robbery of a group of Cherokees by encroaching white settlers.

Wee send you down these Beads to shew you that the Path is not white and clear as it used to be, but full and full of Blood. Still we shall not kill any of the white People till we see wheather these People will be brought to Justice. As we have got Forts built here we expect to live all as one as you may see by the Beads black and white mixed… The String of white Beads, is your own Talk formerly when the Path was white and clear, but the String of black Beads shew that the path is foul and bloody (McDowell 1970:444).
With this exchange, the Cherokee headmen intended to reiterate the promises made by the English and their failure to uphold this agreement. By sending back the string of white beads that the governor had previously sent to them, the Cherokee leaders expressed both their offense to the attack on their people and also the English complacency.

These examples show the way in which glass beads could be used and moved between parties that rarely met in person. Additionally, the above example highlights one way in which these materials accrued meanings and social contexts as they moved from one location to the next. The beads that accompanied the messages often traveled hundreds of miles and helped to bridge the distance, emphasizing the personal relationships involved in diplomatic exchanges. However, beads were not used solely to communicate over long distances. Meetings between Cherokee leaders and colonial officials often took place on a face-to-face basis, with Cherokees traveling to Charlestown and officials visiting the Overhill towns.

Common historical documents found during the mid-18th century relating to Cherokee-Carolinian interactions are lists concerning gifts given to Cherokee leaders during visits to Charlestown. One such list was made for a group of Cherokees including 10 headmen, 3 women, and 30 “common” men during the summer of 1753. This list orders the gifts in a hierarchical order, starting with the ten headmen who each received a suit, shirt, halt, gun, stroud blanket, shoes, stockings, garters, buckles, silk handkerchiefs, ribbon, buttons, a saddle and bridle. Each group below the headmen received fewer gifts in accordance with their perceived status. These items were in turn brought into Cherokee towns where they were distributed among the residents, acting to link the message of the colonial government with Cherokee communities.

Conversely, when European travelers and traders visited Cherokee towns, they were often greeted with a ceremony meant to welcome them to the village including the exchange of
gifts. Henry Timberlake, for instance, received strings of beads on multiple occasions during his travel through the Overhill towns along the Little Tennessee River stating, “He [Cheulah, the town leader of Citico] then made some professions of friendship, concluding with giving me another string of beads, as a token of it” (King 2007:20-21). As stated in the previous section, gift-giving helps to establish a physical tie between parties, and the Cherokee gift-givers surely intended to link themselves with the visitor through the ceremonial exchange of goods.

Gifts and diplomacy were intricately tied for the Cherokee communities of the 18th century. The quantity, durability, and mobility of glass beads became an ideal medium for this process and helped to embody the connections held between societies. They help to provide a materiality to diplomatic meetings and in the building of trust. When moving between cultures, it was not so important how the beads were used once in their possession, but rather how the process of exchange occurred.

**Adornment**

“The Indians nations are agreed in the custom of thus adorning themselves with beads of various sizes and colours; sometimes wrought in garters, sashes, necklaces, and in strings round their wrist; and so from the crown of their heads sometimes to the cartilage of the nose.” (Braund 2005:201)

James Adair made the above note on the use of glass beads among Southeastern Native American groups in his *History of the American Indians* published in 1775. This work recounted his life working on the frontier of British colonial reach from the 1730s through the 1760s, providing a proto-ethnographic account of the political and social organization of Southeastern
tribes as well as musings on the groups’ supposed linkage with the lost tribes of Israel. Despite a misguided notion of Native American origins and a greater amount of time spent in Choctaw villages, his and other mid-18th century European comments help to contextualize the ways that beads were used in adornment during this period by Cherokee individuals and groups.

Another European who provided a description of the dress and appearance of Southeastern Native Americans was William Bartram, the naturalist from Pennsylvania, who traveled throughout the Southeast during the 1770s. His focus on the characteristics of natural things from flowers to geological formations led him to a detailed description of the materiality of dress among Native American groups including the Creek, Choctaw, and Cherokee. His descriptions are quoted at length below to establish an understanding of the general appearance and dress of mid- to late 18th-century Cherokees.

“...The cloathing of their body is very simple and frugal. Sometimes a ruffled shirt of fine linen, next the skin, and a flap, which coveres their lower parts... it usually consists of a piece of blue cloth, about eighteen inches wide, this they pass between their thighs, and both ends being taken up and drawn through a belt round their waist, the ends fall down, one before, and the other behind, not quite to the knee; this flap is usually plaited and indented at the ends, and ornamented with beads, tinsel lace, &c.

THE leg is furnished with cloth boots; they reach from the ancle to the calf, and are ornamented with lace, beads, silver bells, &c.

AND the stillepica or moccasin defends and adorns the feet; they seem to be an imitation of the ancient buskin or sandal; these are very ingeniously made of deer skin, dressed very soft, and curiously ornamented to fancy
BESIDES this attire, they have a large mantle of the finest cloth they are able to purchase, always either of scarlet or blue colour; this mantle is fancifully decorated, with rich lace or fringe round the border and often with little round silver or brass bells. Some have a short cloack, just large enough to cover the shoulders and breast; this is most ingeniously constructed, of feathers woven or placed in a natural imbricated manner, usually of the scarlet feathers of the flamingo, or others of the gayest colour.

THEY have large silver crescents, or gorgets, which being suspended by a ribband round the neck, lie upon the breast: and the arms are ornamented with silver bands, or bracelets, and silver and gold chains, &c. a collar invests the neck.

THE head, neck and breast, are painted with vermillion, and some of the warriors have the skin of the breast, and muscular parts of the body, very curiously inscribed, or adorned with hieroglyphick scroles, flowers, figures of animals, stars, crescents, and the sun in the centre of the breast… The shirt hangs loose about the waist, like a frock, or split down before, resembling a gown, which is sometimes wrapped close, and the waist encircled by a curious belt or sash.

THE dress of the females is somewhat different from that of the men; their flap or petticoat, is made after a different manner, is larger and longer, reaching almost to the middle of the leg, and is put on differently; they have no shirt or shift but a little short waistcoat, usually made of calico, printed linen, or fine cloth, decorated with lace, beads &c. They never wear boots or stockings, but their buskins reach to the middle of the leg. They never cut their hair, but plait it in wreaths, which is turned up and fastened on the crown, with a silver broach, forming a wreathed top-knot, decorated with an incredible quantity of silk ribbands, of various colours, which stream down on every
side, almost to the ground. They never paint, except those of a particular class, when disposed to grant certain favours to the other sex.

BUT these decorations are only to be considered as indulgencies on particular occasions, and the privilege of youth; as at weddings, festivals, dances, &c. or when the men assemble to act the war farce, on the evening immediately preceding their march on a hostile expedition; for usually they are almost naked, contenting themselves with the flap and sometimes a shirt, boots, and moccasins; the mantle is seldom worn by the men, except at night, in the winter season, when extremely cold, and by the women at dances, which serves the purpose of a veil, and the females always wear the jacket, flap, and buskin, even children as soon or before they can walk, whereas the male youth go perfectly naked until they are twelve or fifteen years of age.

THE junior priests or students, constantly wear the mantle or robe, which is white, and they have a great owl skin cased and stuffed very ingeniously, so well executed, as almost to represent the living bird, having large sparkling glass beads, or buttons fixed in the head for eyes… (Bartram 2001:502-504).

The preceding discussion provides a detailed description of the appearance of Native Americans during this point in history and highlights the ways that European manufactured materials were used by the Cherokee in practices of adornment. Bartram’s description highlights the influence of age, gender, and social position on the clothed appearance of individuals. From his and other descriptions it is clear that glass beads were a central part of dress, literally from the head to the feet. Additional details are derived from Henry Timberlake’s memoire, which was written after his expedition into Overhill Cherokee country in 1761 and 1762. He noted
specifically the hair of Cherokee men, which “is shaved, tho’ many of the old people have plucked out by the roots, except a patch on the hinder part of the head… which is ornamented with beads, feathers, wampum, stained deers hair, and such like baubles” (King 2007:24-25). Mooney (1900) identified this as the topknot, Tsunǐstsāhī, which can be seen in the portrait of Cunne Shote by Francis Parsons in 1762.

Timberlake furthermore describes the appearance of Cherokee dress:

They that can afford it wear a collar of wampum… a silver breast-plate, and bracelets on their arms and wrists of the same metal, a bit of cloth of their private parts, a shirt of the English make, a sort of cloth-boots, and mockasons… But when they go to war they leave their trinkets behind, and the mere necessaries serve them. (King 2007:27).

This description implies that, social situations and social space helped to structure the places and times in which certain dress was deemed appropriate or inappropriate. This description also highlights a contentious aspect to colonial-period Native American adornment, namely the differential access to such goods as silver gorgets, bracelets, and wampum.

Although it seems odd that the European travelers and traders devoted so much time to describing the dress and appearance of their Native American hosts, there are understandable reasons for this interest. The majority of Europeans who visited and wrote about the cultural practices of Native Americans approached the issue from a vantage point of curiosity and colonial efficiency. Most the writers of this genre worked in some capacity as either diplomat or trader, so an understanding of dress could provide a basis for improving economic relations. An unsubtle example of the economic mindset of 18th-century ethnographers is visible in Alexander Longe’s description of Cherokee burial practices in which he stated: “… all the other common
people has vast quantities of all sorts of goods buried with them which is a great advantage to the merchants of South Carolina and especially to the Indian traders…” (Corkran 1969:26).

Although the English did not grasp many of the social and cultural reasons for Native Americans’ interest in the objects of trade such as glass beads, they continued to supply these items throughout the 18th century. Descriptions such as the ones cited above could help to explicate to colonial officials and traders how and why Cherokees chose to devote economic and social energy in acquiring glass beads and other pieces of adornment. These authors also produced their works with the intention of marketing to European consumers who wished to know more about the “savages” of the New World. Simple European interest in the practices of the “Other” was fulfilled by the memoires and writings of Timberlake, Adair, Longe, and others.

Beyond these commercial and functional purposes, there are other interests in adornment that permeate these writings. As Carolyn White states (2008:17), “this physical appearance is of particular interest since it reflects personal and cultural ideas about interlaced constructions of identity.” Interest in appearance and the connection to the cultural practices of a people is not limited to modern anthropologists and archaeologists. Although the 18th-century authors surely did not consider adornment in terms of 20th and 21st century theories of ethnicity, gender, embodiment, or social status, they did address the subjects in ways that provide insights into the material dimension of how mid-18th-century Cherokee individuals dressed and displayed cultural practices through bodily adornment.

Adair and the other European authors’ notes on glass beads also touched on the use of beads in ceremomial practices, the generational gap between young and old in consuming and adorning themselves with glass beads, and the gendered aspect of garment production. Timberlake, for instance, emphasizes the ways that adornment and materiality embodied
differences of age and the respective views of generations in adopting European-manufactured materials. He stated, “The old people still remember and praise the ancient days, before they were acquainted with the whites, when they had but little dress, except a bit of skin about their middles, mockasons, a mantle of buffalo skin for the winter, and a lighter one of feathers for the summer” (King 2007:27). This comment does ignore the role of adornment and dress in pre-contact society, and perhaps serves to perpetuate an idea of acculturation as the loss of culture through the adoption of new materials. It does, however, help to highlight the fact that glass beads and other forms of adornment were not uniformly adopted across Cherokee society. It also helps to provide a framework for tests of the archaeological record, which will be discussed in the following chapters.

On the subject of religious ceremonies, Adair wrote at length about the perceived similarities, both physical and linguistic, between traditional Hebraic religious practices and those of southeastern Native Americans. Although it is not clear whether he was referring to Creek or Cherokee practices, one passage relates the regalia of the religious leader or fire-keeper, which he titles Archimagus, during the re-lighting of the sacred fire. If this passage is an account of Cherokee practices, it possibly corresponds to the Great New Moon Ceremony, which took place in Autumn and was a celebration of the new year through cleansing, fasting, forgiveness of past transgressions, and the relighting of the sacred fire. As Adair noted, “when he [the fire keeper] enters on that solemn duty, a beloved attendant spreads a white-drest buck-skin on the white seat, which stands close to the supposed holiest, and then puts some white beads on it, that are given him by the people” (Braund 2005:130). The first point of interest is in the color associated with this activity, including the beads. According to Mooney (1900), white is associated with peace and happiness in Cherokee color symbolism, which is an important
concept to the turning over of a new year and the starting of a new fire. The second point worth pointing out is the source of the beads. Adair noted that the bundle of white beads provided to the fire keeper came from the village, implying that just as the individuals participating in the ceremonies of the Great New Moon brought foods to feast, they also provided portions of the religious paraphernalia.

The small account of a religious ceremony involving beads provides an insight into the ways that material culture manufactured by Europeans was repurposed and integrated into Cherokee society. This process of integrating European-manufactured glass beads into Cherokee religious and ceremonial practices can also be seen in Mooney’s recounting of the “Mounds and the Constant Fire.” He described the process of building a new mound, whereby they would take, among other materials, “beads of seven colors, red, white, black, blue, purple, yellow, and gray-blue” and place them near the new fire which would be the center of the new mound. In addition to the importance of specific colors, the number seven is also a sacred number for the Cherokee, designating the seven clans and seven directions (the four cardinal directions and additionally up, down, and center). The source of the material does not necessarily matter in this scenario and instead it is the physical properties of the beads that gave them their specific meaning in this context.

Although Adair commented on gender less than other accounts from this period, he did note a few points that help to make sense of the manufacturing of beaded materials. He stated, “The women are the chief, if not the only manufacturers [of clothes and jewelry]; the men judge that if they performed that office, it would exceedingly depri cate them... In the winter season, the women gather buffalo’s hair… and having spun it as fine as they can, and properly doubled it, they put small beads of different colours upon the yarn, as they work it” (Braund 2005:411).
In addition to the buffalo’s hair, Cherokee women also used mulberry and hemp fibers and needles made from the long bone of deer to weave beaded objects (Duncan et al. 2008). These items were used in conjunction with European clothes, metal needles, and glass beads to create unique items that represented personal as well as communal identities. Adair’s comments also point to the practice of weft-twinning finger weaving which is still used today in weaving sashes by contemporary Cherokee bead-work artists (Duncan et al. 2008). Although Timberlake contradicted Adair in noting that Cherokee men also practiced sewing, his observation nonetheless provided a unique insight into how objects such as sashes, belts, pouches, and necklaces were made.

Adair also commented on a point that would be of most interest to many of the economically-minded European audience. In discussing the objects worn by males such as tinkling cones, beads, metal and brass objects, he commented that “it is a common trading rule with us, to judge of the value of an Indian’s effects, by the weight of his fingers, wrists, ears, crown of his head, boots, and maccaseenes [moccasins] – by the quantity of red paint daubed on his face, and by [his] shirt…” (Braund 2005:202). This observation implies a hierarchical order to the materiality of status and the connection between status and achievement in the colonial trade.

The ostentatious display of material possessions which Adair noted requires a deeper investigation since it is well established that Southeastern Native American society during the post-contact period, and specifically Cherokee society, valued the distribution of goods among the group rather than the individual’s ability to accrue material wealth. A British magazine from 1762 noted the well-known practice of either burying individuals with all of their items or burning their material possessions. “For this purpose their whole customs are calculated to
prevent avarice, which they say embitters life; and nothing is a severer reflection among them, than to say that a man loves his own” (King 2007:121). This avoidance of material difference is further corroborated by Timberlake’s observation of a ceremony of redistribution during his time with the Overhill Cherokee during the 1760s. He noted the practice of “relieving the poor,” in a ceremony where individuals dance, sing, and present “a large skin spread for that purpose, a string of wampum, piece of plate, wire, paint, lead, or anything he can most conveniently spare” (King 2007:36). There is, no doubt, evidence that supports the idea that individual accomplishments and access to trade goods provided a material dimension to the display of status and individual identity, but the ethics of reciprocity and redistribution suggest that it was not as simple as Adair perceived.

The glass beads and other European manufactured goods were not an entirely new concept to the Cherokees. Clothing, hairstyles, tattoos, and jewelry existed well before colonization and these forms were both merged with existing cultural logics and challenged by the quantity and types of new items available. Adair commented on the presence of pre-contact adornment when he stated “before we supplied them with our European beads, they had great quantities of wampum… made out of conch-shell” (Braund 2005:201). Indeed, the presence of shell beads in burials and features that also contain European manufactured trade goods implies that this tradition continued well into the historical periods. The exchange and possession of exotic and rare trade goods such as conch shells, copper plates, and feathers of non-local birds was a pillar of hierarchical materiality during the prehistoric periods of the Southeast. Yet as trade goods were incorporated into Cherokee and other Southeastern Native American tribes during the 17th and 18th centuries, the social power of these objects shifted.
Egalitarianism, political decentralization, and achieved over ascribed status began to dominate, which can be seen in Cherokee society with the mythical stories of the Ani-Kutani, as recorded by 19th- and early 20th-century historians and ethnographers. According to Raymond Fogelson, the story revolves around the abuse of power by a priestly elite class and the subsequent public massacre and overthrow of the Ani-Kutani’s power. Whether this was based on historical events, or more closely represents a parable is not the issue. Rather, this story implies that there was cultural impetus to restrict the abuses of power and attempts to create a power monopoly in society.

The preceding discussion does not imply that status did not exist in Cherokee society, or that it was not materially manifested. For instance, during Alexander Longe’s tenure as a Cherokee trader he noted that the village leader would reward returning warriors or hunters with gifts and a war name. He stated, “the king calls the head senator that has the public store which consists only of beads and dressed deer skins. He brings to the king some of each sort. The king stands up if it be a great warrior and gives each of them a war name and a present” (Corkran 1969:46). This passage implied that there were a number of ways to gain access to material rewards other than one’s ability to lucratively trade with Europeans. Acting as a broker between the public store of beads and individuals, the town leader(s) could redistribute beads in a way that encouraged acts of bravery on the battlefield. Although Longe does not comment on the type of beads that were distributed, it is plausible that specific beads would act to link these individuals with the political leadership of the town. In adorning themselves with these beads, they would visually display their connection to the authority of the town leader and their achieved status.
The ability for beads and other materials to materialize status is supported by two other statements by Timberlake. First, to return to the ceremony of redistribution, he noted that it was not only to assist individuals who were in need that this ceremony took place. He also suggested that “the same ceremony is made use of to recompence [sic] any extraordinary merit” (King 2007:36). If this ceremony is as similar to the practice of redistribution as is implied, it was not only the chief that provided the materials such as beads, but also other prominent individuals in the town. The second point of support comes from Timberlake’s analysis of Cherokee governmental organization. He stated that it was “a mixed aristocracy and democracy, the chiefs being chose according to their merit in war or policy at home…” (King 2007:36). The phrasing that includes chiefs, plural, means that political authority was not vested in a single individual, and that the actions of individuals created their ability to lead. He furthermore acknowledged the role of women, both in war and in politics. This statement challenges the European notion of the period that suggested, in line with Cuming, that a single Cherokee “emperor” could be identified.

The structure and organization of Cherokee communities and politics existed not only through the materials they traded and adorned. Actions, speeches, alliances, and social position were other determining factors in the structuring of 18th-century Cherokee socio-politics. Historical research into 18th-century Cherokee political and social organization often focuses on these factors to an extent that limits an appreciation for the material dimension of the socio-political process. Therefore, glass beads help to reorient our focus on the experiential aspect of life during this period and help to link individual identities and wider communities.
CHAPTER FOUR
MATERIALS AND METHODS

The materials chosen for the thesis vary from written records concerning the ways beads were used in diplomacy, trade, and adornment as cited in Chapter Three to archaeological analyses based on excavations from the late 1960s and 1970s. Since the sites are now submerged under the Little Tennessee River due to inundation of the area, the archaeological materials derive from previous years of excavation. Despite previous analyses that examine both the historical and archaeological materials, much can still be learned from continued focus on the sites and can provide insights beyond those originally possible during excavation. By applying new methods and understandings to the available materials, we can gain a greater understanding of life at Chota-Tanasee and the ways that glass trade beads were integrated into the changing social landscape of these 18th-century Overhill Cherokee villages. The methods and materials chosen for this thesis aim to address questions concerning the uses of glass beads, the role of glass beads in burial practices, and the network of shared materiality between burials across the site. Since we cannot know specifically who interacted, lived, and traded with whom within the village, the patterns presented by the glass beads provide one of the strongest ways to examine shared practices, interactions, and ideas of identity and community.

Original Excavations

Excavations at Chota-Tanasee were conducted in three phases in the 1880s, 1939, and again from 1969 through 1974. Each phase of research was conducted with specific aims and with varying degrees of archaeological accuracy, and only the materials from the 1969 through 1974 phase of research were readily available through the McClung Museum of Natural History.
and Culture. Although the data for this thesis derive from the 1969 through 1974 phase of research, it is important to outline the history of excavations in order to contextualize the present study.

From 1885 through 1889, original excavations took place under the direction of Cyrus Thomas and the Smithsonian Institution’s Bureau of Ethnology. As Schroedl notes (1986:16), this phase of work was “more concerned with the occurrence and content of aboriginal earthworks than the detailed study of village occupations.” Although the exact location of the McGee Mound No. 2, the earthen mound under consideration of Thomas and his crew, is unknown today, this work was part of a larger program by the Smithsonian Institution to identify the source of earthworks and to answer the “mound builder” question. Although no “cultural taxonomic interpretation” was provided by Thomas, the location and context of the mound was at the time thought to be related to the Overhill Cherokee (Schroedl 1986:18). The materials, field notes, and final report are not involved in this thesis’ analysis since they are not readily available and there is no evidence that glass beads were identified.

The next archaeological work done at these sites was conducted in 1939 by the University of Tennessee under the direction of T. M. N. Lewis and Madeline Kneberg as an extension of their investigation into the prehistory of the Chickamauga Basin in Tennessee (Sullivan et al. 1995). Introducing systematic, scientific archaeological techniques to East Tennessee, Lewis and Kneberg sought to obtain a comparative collection of known Cherokee material culture data to compare to other excavations in the Chickamauga Basin. Excavation techniques included multiple test trenches which were expanded upon and a test unit on a low earthen mound. Although a number of refuse filled pits and burials were identified, these data are not included in the present study since excavation and sampling techniques were significantly
different than those of subsequent field seasons. Additionally, the research objective of establishing a comparative collection did not lend itself to a thorough consideration of village layout. Finally, the materials identified in burial contexts from 1939 are not included because they have not been located since at least the 1970s (Schroedl 1986:20).

In 1969 with funding from the National Parks Service, the University of Tennessee returned to Chota-Tanasee as part of the Tellico Archaeological Project in anticipation of the area’s inundation and to expand understandings of East Tennessee’s prehistory (Chapman 2014). Work continued at the sites during the summers through 1974. In total, close to 200,000 ft$^2$ were excavated. As will be discussed in the following section, these excavations were divided into several sections covering different areas of the sites over different years and under the guidance of various field directors. Excavations during the Tellico Archaeological Project phase differ from previous work not only in the scale of excavation but also in the purpose. These excavations sought to more clearly define the village occupation including understanding the sites’ chronologies, differentiating Chota from Tanasee, and understanding the village layout including the townhouse and the various domestic structures. Despite the improved consistency in excavation techniques during this period, there still remain variations in sampling and recording that require careful attention.

The data derived for this thesis are based on the mitigation and excavation of burials identified during the Tellico Project phase of research from 1969 through 1974. As discussed, the research is limited to this period to control for excavation technique consistency and because of the level of skeletal analysis conducted on these remains (Schroedl and Breitburg 1986:127). In total, 113 burials were identified and excavated from 1969 through 1974; 91 burials from 40MR2 and 22 from 40MR62. Of these 113 burials, 28 were identified as male, 37 were
identified as female, and 48 were of indeterminate sex, mostly consisting of subadults. Following Schroedl and Brietburg’s (1986:127) age divisions, the burials were grouped into one of six age brackets ranging from infant to old adult. Based on these groupings, 9 infants (0-2 years), 35 children (3-11 years), 7 adolescents (12-17 years), 17 young adults (18-25), 32 adults (26-50 years), and 5 old adults (50+ years) were identified. Ages for the remaining 8 individuals were unable to be established with certainty. Of these 113 burials, 53 contained glass beads, totaling 35,655 beads (Appendix A).

Additional spatial and contextual information is derived from the data provided by identified structures at Chota-Tanasee. After reconsidering the evidence of structures as designated by post-hole patterns and hearths, Schroedl (1986:218-219) identified a total of 37 structures dating to the Overhill Cherokee occupation of the sites, 34 of which are domestic structures while 3 are public structures including the summer pavilion and two townhouses placed on top of one another, indicating two construction phases. The majority of domestic structures are representative of the common paired winter and summer residential structures that were prevalent in Cherokee towns of this period (Baden 1983; Russ and Chapman 1983). Many of the residential structures include burials in or near the structure, so considering fully this relationship is an important component to understanding the social spaces of the site and the social practices that imbued the landscape.

Although the glass beads from burials were analyzed near the time of the original excavation (Newman 1977; Schroedl and Breitburg 1986; Newman 1986), a horizontal spatial analysis of the beads was not a part of the research aims. This decision was partly due to the scale of the project and the division of attention to other issues, and partly the consequence of
Figure 4.1. Areas of Excavation from 1939, 1969-1974 (adapted from Schroedl 1986:17)
simpler computational and geographic information systems of the time. Therefore, this thesis contributes directly to the original work done at the site by reconsidering the spatial and social role of glass beads from Chota-Tanasee.

The Spaces

In order to analyze the social spaces present at the sites, this thesis replicates the areas of excavation and additionally creates sub-areas to refine the process and conduct spatial analysis at a higher resolution. Certain areas were excavated over multiple years with various systems of identification; therefore, areas were grouped together when possible and subdivided into sub-sections based on residential structure patterning. Specifically, only areas with burials are addressed since not all areas of excavation located and excavated burials. Focus is paid to the association of burials with structures that can elucidate social space and the materiality of burial practices.

During the Tellico Project Phase of excavations, each year designated specific areas of excavation in order to examine specific issues and answer specific questions concerning the occupation of site. From 1969 to 1973, this process produced areas A through K (excluding I) for 40MR2 and areas A through C for 40MR62. For the most part, these were geographically limited excavations that exposed small enough areas to not require the creation of subsections according to residential grouping. However, excavations in 1974 were significantly expanded and exposed a much greater number of burials, structures, post holes, and features that require further division to consider fine-grained the spatial patterning. Furthermore, work in 1974 reexamined areas that had been exposed in previous years. Therefore, all areas that were uncovered in 1974 are considered as one unit, the Village Center.
During 1969, excavations were divided into areas A, B, and C. Area A identified four structures and eight burials (Schroedl 1986:20). Both areas B and C are covered by the excavations of 1974 (Figure 4.3, Table 4.2); and since this thesis is more concerned with the social spaces as they were lived rather than the order in which they were excavated, full consideration of the structures and burials of these sections are included in the section covering the Village Center.

In 1970, area C was expanded and several other excavation areas were opened up including areas D, E, F, G, H, J, and K (Schroedl 1986:23). For clarity sake, no areas were labelled “I”. Area C and area G, similar to area C of 1969, will be covered in the section on excavations from 1974. Area D uncovered a single structure, in addition to other features, but no burials. Due to this lack of burials, area D is not included in further discussions in this thesis. Area E is encompassed by the 1974 excavations. Area F, also expanded upon during the 1971 field season, identified a single domestic structure and two burials.
Areas H, J, and K were placed to the south of the main “Village Center” area. Area H identified 3 burials, area J also identified 3 burials while area K identified no burials. No structures were located in any of the three areas.

Excavations in 1972, located farther south than the previous excavations, were designated 40MR62, and three excavation blocks – Areas A, B, and, C – were excavated (Schroedl 1986:29). Area A, although having located two domestic structures, did not contain any burials and is therefore removed from the current analysis. Area B contained neither burials nor structures. Area C, however, contained all 22 of the burials identified at 40MR62 and additionally identified 4 domestic structures. Excavations in 1973 returned again to the townhouse identified in area C, and is covered below.

Methods were altered in 1974 in order expedite excavations and expose a much larger block of the village (Schroedl 1986:31). With the use of a self-loading pan, the field season began with the removal of the plowzone over an area measuring 122,500 ft². This process uncovered areas excavated from previous field seasons cited above and helped to link together spatially discrete areas. Since the majority of thesis data are derived from this area, special focus is paid to this area of excavation, which I term the Village Center. Although there were sections created during the field season based on excavation areas, I have chosen to produce a new set of subsections in order to represent the social spaces of the village based on my observations. Rather than subsections being produced by arbitrarily defined excavation sections, the present subsections were established by identifying structures and spatially associated burials indicating a relatively clear association between the two. Additionally, some subsections include burial clusters that are not clearly associated with specific structures.
Figure 4.2. Area A Structures and Burials. Red designating burials identified as biologically female, blue male, and yellow unidentifiable.
Figure 4.3. Area F Structures and Burials
Figure 4.4. Area H Burials
Figure 4.5. Area J Burials
Figure 4.6. 40MR62 Area C Section 1 Burials and Structures

Figure 4.7. 40MR62 Area C Section 2 Burials
In addition to Townhouse 1, Townhouse 2, and the summer pavilion, the Village Center contained 25 domestic structures. Seventy-five burials were identified in the area of the Village center. Figure 4.8 visually displays the subsections created for this study, while Table 4.2 describes the location of each burial in this context. Based on the division of structures and burials, 16 distinct subsections were identified.

As is clear from the maps, Cherokee burials are directly linked to the social spaces as they were experienced by living Cherokees. The majority of burials are interred either directly within or adjacent to domestic and public structures, helping to maintain a socio-spatial link between the living and the dead. Rodning (2015:117) phrases it this way, “burials in residential spaces and public structures situate the dead within the spatial realm of everyday life and community life, connecting the past and the present within the built environment of houses and towns.” Therefore burials of clan and town members within or adjacent to structures helped to maintain a link between past generations and the present, and through the social practice of interment, the memory of deceased individuals were maintained within the social spaces of the living. The materials that accompanied individuals into their burials were also a part of this process and provided materiality to the physical and mental connection between generations.

The Beads

Although the glass trade beads were examined as part of Newman’s Master’s thesis (1977) and for the final report on Chota-Tanasee (Newman 1986), the assemblage of beads were re-examined in 2017 by the author as part of the process of creating a final inventory of burial goods to be repatriated to the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Indians. This was also done to improve accuracy and to provide an updated analysis with updated bead typologies. Furthermore,
reanalysis was conducted to systematize the descriptions in order to create regular descriptions of color, shape, size, and decoration.

The typological system used here is a variation of the one introduced by Kidd and Kidd (2012), which uses construction technique and physical characteristics to describe glass beads with a coded system of letters and numbers. At its most basic level, the Kidd and Kidd bead classification system differentiates between wire (or mandrel) wound beads and tube drawn beads. As elaborated by Kidd and Kidd (2012) as well as other bead researchers (Wiegand 2013; Blair 2015), tube drawn beads are produced by heating up the glass (made of silica, an alkali, a stabilizer, and a coloring agent) to a molten state, attaching the molten glass to two pontil rods, and pulling it apart to create a long tube of soft glass. The cooled glass is then either broken to create tube drawn beads (types I and III in the Kidd and Kidd system) or by tumbling the broken beads with an abrasive to round out their edges (creating the II and IV types). Layers of colored glass or colored inlays can be added during this process to give additional decorative elements to the beads. Mandrel or wire wound beads, on the other hand, are created individually by wrapping softened strings of glass around a metal wire (the mandrel) which is subsequently removed. Numerous decorative techniques exist for wire wound beads including inlaid colors, molding, and unique shapes. Wire wound beads express a much greater variety of styles as compared to drawn beads due to their individualized production technique.

From this division between tube and wire wound beads, the Kidd and Kidd system then turns to physical characteristics, the main differences being the shape and decorative elements. For instance, type “I” beads are simple tube shaped beads while type “III” beads are compound (layered) tube shaped beads. The same applies to type “II” simple round beads and type “IV”
Figure 4.8. 40MR2 Village Center Burials, Structures, and Sections.
Table 4.2. Subsections of the Village Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Burials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
<td>69, 70, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 65, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
<td>19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 63, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64, 68, 81, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Townhouse, Summer Pavilion</td>
<td>10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18, 19</td>
<td>60, 61, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>49, 50, 51, 52, 56, 58, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td>67, 74, 75, 76, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>42, 43, 44, 45, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87, 88, 90, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>9, 24, 25, 26, 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compound round beads. Following the first aspect of the Kidd and Kidd system is a letter
designating the type of decoration. For example, “a” designates an undecorated bead, “b”
represents a simple stripe decoration, while “bb” represents a compound stripe decoration. The
addition of an apostrophe to this letter conveys that the stripe is twisted. Finally, a number
follows this letter designating, generally, the color of the bead. This aspect is the most subjective,
so the use of a Munsell Bead Color Book, which is similar to its soil counterpart, helps to control
for the description of color. Wire wound beads are subject to a similar classification system;
however, there are a greater variety of designations due to the numerous shapes and decorations
possible in wire wound beads.

One shortcoming of the Kidd and Kidd system is the inability to quickly and easily detect
bead size. To correct for this issue, I have included an additional element to the Kidd and Kidd
code which includes XS (<2mm), S (2-5mm), M (6-10mm), L (11-15mm) and XL (>15mm).
Aside from the addition of this size designation, an additional alteration to the Kidd and Kidd
system is a minor adjustment of color designation. According to the original Kidd and Kidd
system produced in the 1970s, which included difficult to discern colored pencil drawings, there
are many subcategories of colors that are more likely the product of variation in glass bead
recipes rather than purposeful differences in color. This is especially true for blue beads, of
which there are many sub-categorizations of color. Therefore, using the Munsell Bead Color
Book, these colors are grouped into larger subcategories.

Generally, the most common bead type is the small round monochrome bead commonly
termed seed bead (Kidd and Kidd type IIa). Of the 35,655 beads identified in the current
analysis, 23,473 (66%) are the small monochrome tumbled beads (IIa-S type). This is expected
and consistent with other sites from this period (Marcoux 2012). Additional common bead types
include medium tumbled monochrome beads (IIa-M, n=3613), small tube-shaped beads (Ia-S, n=1803), and medium tumbled beads with simple stripes (Ib-M, n=1629). A full description of the beads present at the site is presented in Appendix B.

**Social Network Analysis**

For the present study, social network analysis allows us to consider the ways that burials were materially connected, whether purposefully or inadvertently, thereby acting as a proxy for social relationships of varying kinds. Additionally, social network analysis permits an opportunity to establish the relationship between people and objects by focusing on beads as active agents in the networks, rather than just passive objects. Considering the ways that beads are connected to other beads is just as important as the insights provided by the ways that burials are connected to other burials.

In order to operationalize the methods provided by social network analysis, I approach the social connections from two vantage points – from a unimodal and bimodal perspective. This dualistic approach is common (Blair 2015; Lulewicz and Coker 2018) and allows me to consider two of the possible connections between people and glass trade beads. Each of the analyses is based on the Kidd and Kidd bead types.

The first perspective is unimodal, meaning that the nodes under consideration are all of a single type – namely, burials. Within this perspective, two separate approaches are addressed. The first is a simple analysis of co-presence of beads shared between nodes and the weight of connections between burials. Weight in social network analysis is the measure of the number of connections a node possesses. Therefore, the greater the number of shared bead types, the greater the weight between two nodes. Accounting for the shared presence of certain bead types
provides a base-line for investigations; however, this method does not account for proportions of beads and the overall similarity between assemblages. The second approach therefore investigates these connections in more depth by considering more fully the similarity between assemblages. A common method for addressing similarity in archaeological social network analysis is the Brainerd-Robinson similarity coefficient (Brainerd 1951; Robinson 1951; Blair 2015; Birch and Hart 2017; Mills 2017; Peeples 2018). The Brainerd-Robinson coefficient accounts for the proportions of categorical types present in each assemblage in order to provide a measure of similarity ranging from 0, no similarity, to 200, perfect similarity. Using a script in R developed by Peeples (2011), these data are transformed into a matrix representing the coefficient for each burial relationship. From here, the matrix is imported into Gephi, free and open-source Social Network Analysis software, in order to visualize and explore the connections. Following the lead of recent researchers (Newman 2006: Blair 2015), I mainly use the modularity function built into Gephi in order to explore the networked communities as represented by the similarity coefficient. However, I also use the concepts of network density and edge weight to examine the degree of interconnection and the strength of connections. Overall, the unimodal approach to network analysis is an important component to understanding overall network topology and the network at a macro-scale.

The second perspective uses a bi-modal approach to examine the interconnections between people and beads. This perspective differs from the previous one in that both bead types and burials are nodes, whereas in the uni-modal model the bead types acted as the links or connections between burial nodes. Also known as affiliation networks (Mills 2017:383), the bi-modal network highlights the roles beads play in linking peoples together or the affiliations between burials and beads. Aside from challenging the “anthropocentrism” (Harris 2012:88) of
material culture studies, the bi-modal approach also more clearly demonstrates the bead types that link together specific populations of communities, therefore re-centering the glass beads within the discussion. A further benefit of the bi-modal network is its ability to contribute to “ego-network” analyses of the overall community. Rather than focusing on the entire network structure, ego-networks focus on specific nodes in order to understand the local differences within the network. Specific for this study, the ego-networks provides the chance to examine how specific glass bead types link together groups of people. For example, I examine whether there are any specific beads that group together individuals based on age, sex, or residence. In sum, the bi-modal approach refocuses attention to account for beads as active entities in the networks of communities present at the sites. Furthermore, it provides a micro-scale analysis, accounting for specific beads, or specific burials through the use of ego-networks.
CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF GLASS BEADS

Distribution

There are two types of glass bead distributions that I examine in this section – demographic distribution and spatial distribution. As was outlined in the historical analysis section, the practices of adornment varied along lines of gender and age; therefore, examining how the quantity and variety of beads were differently distributed along these lines can highlight the roles of traditional internal divisions within Cherokee society in delineating social identities. Additional important information for this section is in the variation of prominent colors and the diverse uses of beads within the burials. Finally, I consider the most common types for each of the social categories as compared to the assemblage of all beads from the site. Taken together, these demographic distributions provide insights into variations along lines of demographic communities. As discussed in Chapter Two, identities are nested and overlapping, with age and gender providing one of the sources of individual and community identity. So although burials and adornment are idiosyncratically associated with specific individuals, it is important to examine the ways that gender and age provide a base from which other identities interact.

For those identified as males, 16 (57%) contain glass beads, averaging a total of 837 beads and 8 unique bead types per burial. Of those identified as female, 18 (49%) contain beads, averaging 597 beads, and 6 unique bead types; and for those unable to be identified within a specific sex, 27 (56%) contain beads. Aside from three burials, the remaining burials identified as neither male nor female are all subadults including infants and children. These burials average a total of 427 beads and 7 unique bead types. In order to compare the distribution of bead quantity and variety, Figures 5.1 and 5.2 utilize boxplots to visualize the relative quantities of each category. After removing outliers (specifically 40MR62 B1 and B6, a female and male with
over 4,000 beads respectively), the main difference visible in the number of beads interred is that males have an observably greater number of beads per burial. This is true not only for the number of burials containing beads (57% against 49%), but also for the average number of beads and the average number of unique bead types.

In order to examine potential differences along lines of age, the individual groups mentioned above were combined in order to more clearly compare the groups (Figures 5.3 and 5.4). Therefore, infants and children were grouped together as subadults. Adolescents and young adults were grouped into a single young adult category, and adults and old adults were combined to form a single older adult category. These groups are based on more inclusive categorizations as compared to the divisions put forward by Schroedl and Brietberg (1986) and on the ethnohistoric record. Subadults include those that are less likely to participate in war, hunting, or politics while young adults are expected to participate more actively in these activities. Based on ethnohistoric data, older adults are less likely to be as active in visual displays of accomplishment while participating more heavily in both public and private politics.

Of the 43 subadults, 32 (74%) possess glass beads with an average of 385 glass beads and 7 unique bead types. Among the 24 young adults, 11 (46%) possess glass beads, averaging 1415 beads and 9 bead types. Finally, within the adult grouping, 16 (43%) contain glass beads, with an average of 433 beads consisting of 4 unique bead types.

Although limited to descriptions of quantity and variety, the above descriptions provide useful information about the distribution of beads between demographic groups. First, as mentioned above, it is clear that men on average possessed beads more frequently, in greater
Figure 5.1. Total Number of Glass Beads Based on Sex

Figure 5.2. Total Number of Unique Glass Beads Types Based on Sex.
numbers, and with a greater variety than did women. The burial data are supported by the ethnohistorical record which suggests that men had a greater socio-economic motive to attain materials and display them as a representation of their embeddedness in the Cherokee-English trade. This is not to suggest that men were of a higher status, but that the materially manifested form of status as seen through glass beads and other European manufactured goods encouraged men to visually display wealth in different forms than women. The fact that young adults possessed the greatest number of beads is also supported by the ethnohistoric record, in that objects such as glass beads were more closely associated with youth rather than old age. This is an interesting point that requires us to consider the difference between economic and political prominence in 18th-century Cherokee society.

As is indicated by ethnographic and historical data, the older portion of the population possessed a greater share of the political power in Cherokee villages. Therefore, one would expect political prominence to be materially displayed through a greater number and greater variety of beads. This is not the case as presented by the data – older adults possessed fewer beads and bead varieties on average as compared to young adults. The direct correlation between social prominence and demographic grouping is also challenged by the frequency and variety of beads associated with subadults including children and infants. Although containing a smaller quantity of beads generally, children and infants’ burials contain a greater variety of beads in proportion to the total number of beads. As will be discussed in the social network analysis portion of this chapter, this is most likely the product of the social practice of burial, whereby the materials involved in the inhumation of individuals are not solely the possession of the individual and rather are gifted to the deceased by the living community.
Figure 5.3. Total Number of Glass Beads Based on Age

Figure 5.4. Total Number of Unique Glass Bead Types Based on Age
One avenue to support the “burial as a social practice” perspective is through the forms in which beads are interred. Based on burial forms, field notes, and photographs, we can get a general idea of the various ways that beads were provided to the deceased. As is expected, the vast majority of bead occurrences take the form of necklaces (n=41). Due to preservation it is difficult to discern the specific number of necklaces for each individual; but clearly, beaded necklaces were the most common form of beaded objects. Often, according to the field records, these beaded necklaces were in specific patterns consisting of alternating colors to create a uniform pattern. Unfortunately, considering the possible meanings of these patterns is beyond the scope of this research and would require in depth ethnographic data. The next most common bead form is in a general scatter of beads near the skull (n=5). In the majority of cases, this situation occurred when the individual was an infant or child, suggesting that rather than composing a garment, necklace, or beaded piece that the beads were interred loosely over the individual’s head as they were being buried. This aspect of bead use most closely corresponds to the social practice perspective and supports the idea that beads were often gifted to young individuals during burial ceremonies.

The next most common forms include beads at or below the waist suggesting a beaded garment (n=3) and beaded bags often with other burial goods included in the bag (n=3). Of note for these groups is the fact that beaded bags are solely associated with males, while beads in the vicinity of the pelvis or legs suggesting a beaded garment are present only in burials of females, infants and children. Other beaded objects include a hexagonal steatite pipe found with MR2 B13, an adult male aged 35 to 45. Since both pipes and glass beads are closely associated with diplomacy and politics, it is interesting that B13 was one of the few burials located adjacent to the townhouse in Section 6 of the Village Center. The example of B13 helps to tie together the
age, sex, and burial location to produce a relatively simple interpretation of glass beads’ social uses. Rather than being a part of a garment or jewelry, the 20 Ila40-S beads associated with B13 are part of diplomatic and political paraphernalia that act to tie the adult male’s actions and role in life with his place on the landscape and the materialized memory of interment.

Although these descriptions suggest that beads had specific and translatable functions to modern contexts, it is important to highlight the ambiguity with which beads functioned. One example can be seen in MR2 B5, an adult male with a beaded bag. The contents of the bag include lead shot, lithic projectile points, ochre, an iron strike-flint, and a single glass bead (type WIIv-L, a translucent powder blue wirewound short barrel bead – Figure 5.5). Not only was this bead the only one of its type found at either site, but rather than being a part of the beaded bag, it was included with the other functional items within the bag. The trader Alexander Longe stated that the items interred with the deceased were meant, in part, to “serve them in their voyage” (Corkran 1969:26). Therefore, it is probable that the Cherokee communities involved in the burial of this individual viewed this bead as having characteristics beyond just decoration.

Although this example suggests that individual beads held potential social and personal significance, the majority of beads present at the site are common across the various demographic groups. For instance, the most common bead types are simple monochrome tumbled white, blue, or black beads including Ila13-S, Ila13-M, Ila40-S, Ila40-M, and Ila6-S. These types, in addition to darker blue (Ila55-S) and compound red on grey (IVA2-S) beads, crosscut the divisions of age and gender and suggest that many groups contained the same types of beads. Distributions of certain bead colors, however, do potentially present differences between the groups under consideration.
Table 5.1. Identifiable uses of beads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>N/A (Subadults)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necklace(s)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity of Skull</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaded Bag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At or Below Waist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm Bands, Bracelets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached to Pipe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By combining the various colors as designated by the Munsell Bead Color Book into a simplified system of nine colors (blue, white, black, red, clear, brown, green, pink, and yellow), the demographic groups were compared to look for any clearly identifiable differences. As Figures 5.6 and 5.7 show, females were buried with a much greater number of blue beads as compared to males. Meanwhile, male burials contained a relatively equal amount of blue and white beads. The male burials additionally contained a greater number of beads aside from blue and white including clear, red, and green.

According to Mooney (1891:342), color symbolism played an important role in the materiality of beliefs for the Cherokee. Mooney states that the major colors corresponded to a direction and held symbolic meaning with red being the color of war, blue being the color of defeat or trouble, black being the color of death, and white the color of peace. Aside from these colors, Mooney is uncertain about the color symbolism for brown, yellow, and pink. It is interesting to note the correspondence between war and peace colors with males while females are more closely associated with the color of defeat or trouble. In a separate section in Mooney’s *Sacred Formulas of the Cherokee* (1891:347), he states that the blue spirit associated with the North is invoked to “defeat the schemes of an enemy or bring down troubles upon him…” Therefore, the color blue is perhaps not meant to represent necessarily the condition of the deceased, but rather to “serve them in their voyage” (Corkran 1969:26). A further explanation provided by Mooney for the color blue is his suggestion that “blue is the emblem of sorrow and disappointment” (Mooney 1891:378). Clearly, there are multiple meanings to the color symbolism associated with beads, and at this point, concrete interpretations are evasive.

It is clear, nonetheless, that there are definable patterns in the data. Turning to categories based on age, it is significant to note that black beads make up a much larger portion of subadult
Figure 5.6. Bead Colors of Females

Figure 5.7. Bead Colors of Males
burial bead assemblages as compared to the other groups (Figure 5.8). Associated with this is MR2 B4, the burial of a pregnant young adult woman, which accounts for 878 of the 999 black beads associated with females. As stated above, black is associated with death, but why it is more specifically associated with the burials of children is unclear. Conversely, white beads are much more common with burials of older adults (Figure 5.9), suggesting that the burial practices associated with older adults is connected to sentiments of peace and happiness. An additionally interesting factor is the relative lack of colors other than white for older adults. This may suggest that, as with subadults, the beads included in the burials of older adults were not their own, since it would be expected that they would have a wide variety of bead types in their personal possession. Instead, the fact that the vast majority are white beads suggests that they were actively curated by the living community in preparation of the burial. Moving forward, comparing this data to other Cherokee sites would contribute to this interpretation of how bead colors potentially correspond to demographic groups.

The above analysis considers gender and age as the main factors in influencing the distribution of bead types, in contrast to the arguments of the background chapter, however, that imply a more complex relationship between materiality and community identities. Therefore, I now turn to the distribution of beads across geographic space in order to examine residential associations and the role of social space in bead distributions. Using the concept of social space, this section analyses the ways that overall quantity and variety of beads are differentially distributed within the areas of excavation. The purpose of this analysis is to examine the role of residential association in characterizing the distribution of beads. This type of analysis provides evidence for the potential spatial distribution of higher status households and their access to European trade items such as glass beads.
Figure 5.8. Bead Colors of Subadults

Figure 5.9. Bead Colors of Older Adults
The Village Center area is the focus of this analysis since it contained largest contiguous excavation, providing data about a series of residential and public structures. As can be seen in Figures 5.10 and 5.11, Section 10 and Section 2 dominate the distribution of beads found, with 5,955 and 1,942 beads respectively. They also contain a total of 47 and 31 bead types, respectively. Although Section 13 contains a total of 2,459 beads, they are mostly associated with a single burial, B53. Aside from these two sections, the quantity and variety of beads are diffused across the Village Center, suggesting that residential area had only a minor influence in the number and types of beads found with potentially high-status residential areas at various points in the town. Rather than households or sub-sections in general providing the main influence for the number and variety of beads, it seems that individual burials provide the strongest variability. Where burial location does seem to have the strongest correlation to quantity and variety is with burials excavated from 40MR62 (Tanasee). Burials here have a much higher than average occurrence of beads, number of beads, and number of varieties (Figure 5.12 and 5.13).

40MR62 Area C Section A suggests that burials in this portion of the sites for one reason or another possessed a greater quantity and variety of glass beads. There is little ethnohistoric data available that would suggest why burials at Tanasee (40MR62) would contain more. If anything, the historic record implies that Chota played a larger and more significant role in Cherokee-English diplomatic and economic relations. Therefore, an alternative possibility is the influence of temporal difference between the prominence of the two towns. Appearing on historical maps, trade journals, and other historical documents of the first half of the 18th century, the accepted narrative implies that Tanasee was more important up to a point in the mid18th century, when Chota subsequently overshadowed its sister town. Based on Dalton-
Figure 5.10. Number of beads in residential structures in the Village Center.
Figure 5.11. Number of bead types in residential structures in the Village Center.
Figure 5.12. Number of beads in burials from 40MR62 Area C Section A

Figure 5.13. Number of bead types in burials from 40MR62 Area C Section A
Carriger’s (2016) analysis of elemental composition, however, there is little archaeological evidence of temporal difference between Chota and Tanasee as indicated by the glass beads. Testing IIa40 and IIa13 beads for seriations in the elemental composition, Dalton-Carriger found that the majority from both sites to be from the mid- to late-18th century, with a few from earlier periods dating back potentially to the late 16th and early 17th centuries. Additionally, Newman’s analysis of European-manufactured artifacts found only two burials with temporally diagnostic artifacts – Burial 47 and Burial 10 from Chota, both of which date to the Colonial Period (1746-1774). With the available information, therefore, it is unclear whether temporal or a different factor accounts for the quantity and variety found at Tanasee. Future research would benefit from identifying temporal variation between the two sites in order to test this hypothesis.

**Social Networks**

The insights provided by the previous section highlight the varying ways that grouping the burials informs our understanding of the relationship between beads and social collectives. Gender, age, and burial location help to structure the variations of bead quantities and varieties across the site in subtle but nonetheless noticeable ways. There are obvious limitations to this approach, however. These considerations do not account for the contents of the bead assemblages or the types of beads buried with the individuals. Furthermore, questions focusing on individuals and the materiality of each burial are not fully considered using more traditional approaches of demographic and spatial distributions. By applying social network analyses to the data, this section addresses the shortcomings cited above and seeks to expand our understanding of the construction of communities and identity through the medium of glass beads.
As used here, social network analysis is an exploratory methodology, meant to visualize and make sense of large and complex datasets. Therefore, I use a suite of social network analyses to present informative examples concerning the glass beads from Chota-Tanasee. In total, four separate methods are used – two unimodal approaches and two bi-modal approaches. These methods are meant to span the various scales of observation available from single burial to site-wide questions.

The unimodal approach considers each burial as an individual node on the graph and the edges (or connections) are dependent on the similarity of glass beads between the two nodes. This approach is further divided between two different metrics of similarity. The first simply considers the co-presence of bead types between burials. The edges between nodes are weighted in a way so that burials containing multiple similar bead types have a greater measure of similarity and therefore a more weighted edge. The second metric of similarity is based on the commonly used Brainerd-Robinson similarity coefficient (Birch 2017, Blair 2015, Borck et al 2015, Golitko and Feinman 2015, Ostborn and Gerding 2014). The Brainerd-Robinson similarity coefficient is a measure of similarity which accounts for all the bead types present at the site and the portion of bead types shared between two assemblages in order to provide a measure of similarity ranging from 0 (no similarity) to 200 (perfect similarity). The Brainerd-Robinson coefficient, therefore, accounts not only for the shared bead types, but also the portion of the assemblage consisting of shared bead types and produces a single similarity “score” for the relationship. Using a script developed by Mathew Peeples for R (Peeples 2011), I formatted the burial assemblages and bead types into a contingency table which I then ran through the script to produce a matrix of similarity values for each assemblage. I then imported this similarity matrix
into Gephi which converted the data into a graph of nodes and edges, with the connection and weight of that connection represented by the thickness of the edge.

While the Brainerd-Robinson approach has the benefit of providing a more holistic measure of assemblage similarity by accounting for proportions and relations to the overall site assemblage, the co-presentation metric is also included. Aside from acting as a base-line for the Brainerd-Robinson analysis, the co-presentation approach also helps to avoid the limitations of small sample size for rare bead types (Mills 2017:387). As can be seen in Figure 5.14, the majority of beads either occur in a single burial or within a limited number of burials. Therefore, all the beads that occur in a single burial are not considered in either of the measure of similarity. Furthermore, the majority of beads consist of a small number of examples. With the Brainerd-Robinson coefficient, some of this detail can get glossed over in favor of a single measure of similarity. Therefore, the co-presentation approach helps to balance this shortcoming by providing a greater amount of detail.

The second approach, which is considered multi-modal or bi-modal, further increases the amount of detail provided by the data. Rather than only burials being represented by nodes within the graph, both bead types and individual burials are posited as nodes. This “symmetrical” approach (Shanks 2008) permits the opportunity to more fully consider the ways that specific beads acted to link together individual burials. To do this, each burial and bead type was provided an identification number and attached to the corresponding number when a connection occurred. Therefore, no burials were directly linked and no beads were directly linked. Instead, it is through the relationship of the two types that connections are established. The edges were left unweighted so as to not bias the occurrence of common beads, thereby misrepresenting the importance of rare beads. The multi-modal approach permits an opportunity to move beyond
considering solely the ways that people are linked. Instead, it provides a means to consider the importance of glass beads in the materiality of community construction.

Within this approach, two scales were considered. The first is a macro-view of the entire network topology. After removing the most common beads, including IIa40-S, IIa13-S, IIa40-M, IIa13-M, and IIa6-S, from the list of connections due to their disproportional occurrence in burials, the remaining beads and burials were imported into Gephi in order to produce the overall graph for Chota-Tanasee. From here, I examined the topology to identify beads that act as network brokers or other importantly situated nodes. Network brokers, or brokerage, refers to “the process through which individuals or larger groups mediate interactions between actors that would otherwise not be directly connected” (Peeples and Haas 2013:233). The second scale focuses on individual nodes and their positions or connections in their immediate surroundings on the graph. This approach is also framed as “ego-networks” and considers which individuals are more closely tied to their immediate network and which individuals display a greater degree of individuality in respects to their bead assemblages. Although each of the four types of
networks considered provide valuable information, it is only through synthesizing all the information that a full understanding of the relationships can take place.

Figure 5.15 displays the base graph for co-presence of shared bead types across both sites. As discussed above, the nodes represented are the individual burials containing glass beads while the edges, or connections linking nodes, represent a shared bead type or a variety of shared bead types. The thickness of the edge is based on the weight of the connection, measured by the number of shared bead types. The size and color of the node is determined by the degree, or the number of connections a node possesses. After removing the most common beads, IIa13-S and IIa40-S, the remaining beads were totaled by the number of occurrences and were tied to the burials which contained at least one of each type. The position of the nodes is determined by the Yifan Hu layout algorithm built into Gephi. This algorithm is a force-directed model that uses the number and weights of connections to influence node placement on the graph. Therefore, the distribution of nodes within the graph is a product of the closeness of similarity between nodes and groups of nodes.

This graph helps to visualize the fact that there are two main clusters of nodes on the top left and bottom right portions of the graph. Furthermore, there are nodes that are only loosely connected to the larger cluster of nodes in the center, such as MR62 B17, MR2 B70, and MR2 B78 in the bottom right hand corner of the graph. An important caveat, however, is that there are no clearly identifiable cliques, or groups that are completely connected to each other while being separate from the main cluster (Collar et al. 2015:19). A final important piece to note is the role of the largest and darkest group of nodes that act as network brokers at the center of the graph. These nodes help to act as a bridge between the upper left and lower right groups through their
Figure 5.15. Co-presentation of Bead types
sharing of bead types between both groups. Who are these individuals that link the separate groups? Can age, sex, or burial location shed light on this question?

As Figure 5.16 shows, subadults are more greatly represented in the brokerage circle, with five of the eight individuals being aged 11 years or younger. Although the subadults represented in the brokerage circle do not possess the greatest number of beads, the variety of types deeply embeds them within the graph. For instance, MR62 B9, the node with the highest degree, contains only 332 beads; however this burial also contains a total of 20 types. Additionally, MR62 B2 contains only 148 glass beads with a disproportional 15 glass bead types. Although Burials such as MR2 B32 and MR2 B6 do contain a large number of beads (2,020 and 4,665 respectively), their brokerage position is a function of the number of varieties present (28 and 23 respectively) rather than the number of beads.

Considering these results within the burial practice framework, it is clear that these individuals, subadults ranging from infants to 11 years of age, are not brokers in the traditional sense. Rather than considering these as important or prominent individuals with a high degree of social capital or political importance, the variety of beads included in the burials suggest that the practice of people pooling together resources represents the individuals’ familial and social connections in life. Potentially they were part of a prominent family with access to a wide variety of beads, or perhaps the loss of a child brought together a larger cross-section of the population in the burial ceremony. Either way, the fact that subadults are positioned as brokers suggests that the burial practice and connection to the living greatly influenced the materiality of glass beads in burials.
Figure 5.16. Network Brokers Age. (subadults yellow, young adults red, and adults blue)
More so than age, the most illuminating category is burial location. As Figure 5.17 shows, the majority of broker-nodes are located at site 40MR62, Tanasee. Of the eight nodes, six are located within 40MR62. Additionally, MR2 B32, the green node in Figure 5.17, is from 40MR2 Area J, which is located much closer to 40MR62 than to the majority of 40MR2. Therefore, for the sake of argument, it can easily be stated that Area J more likely represents an extension of Tanasee, rather than Chota. Considering the socio-political importance of Chota during the mid-18th century, it is surprising that the pink nodes representing the Village Center are not better represented in the brokerage position. Considering the historical and archaeological evidence, it is unclear why Tanasee would be so highly represented in the broker-position. Identifying temporally sensitive comparable materials perhaps can address this in the future, due to Tanasee’s proposed early importance.

Accounting for the co-presence of glass bead types between burials provides an important step in determining the overall structure of the network. However, this is not the only way to account for the similarities within the community of burials from Chota-Tanasee. The Brainerd-Robinson similarity coefficient accounts for the proportion of shared beads between each burial as compared to the overall collection of beads from the entire site and provides a single measure of similarity as displayed with a correlation matrix. Each burial is compared to all other burials and a score ranging between 0 and 200 is produced based on the proportion of shared bead types, allowing all burials to be compared with a single score.

Using the R script designed by Peeples (2011), the similarity matrix output is imported into Gephi which then uses the connections and weight to produce the graph. Since this graph included all similarity connections, ranging from 1 to 200, a threshold was arbitrarily set at a score of 20 in order to eliminate the weak connections that would otherwise misrepresent and
Figure 5.17. Network Brokers Location. 40MR2 Area A (blue), Area H (orange), Area J (green), Village Center (pink), 40MR62 Area C (yellow).
overcrowd the final graph. From here the modularity algorithm built into Gephi is used which examines the network for various modules, or clusters, that are identified as similarity communities. Modularity is a concept introduced in SNA by Newman (2004, 2006) for identifying network “communities.” Within Gephi, this is built into the system in which an algorithm determines identifiable clusters of nodes based on the presence and weight of connections. The modularity is represented visually by both node color and node position, again using the Yifan Hu force-directed layout. Node size is determined by the degree of the node and edge thickness is determined by the weight of the connection. The edge color is determined by the nodes which they connect. An edge with the same color as the modules means that the edge is connecting nodes within that module, while an edge that is a blend of two module colors means that it is connecting nodes between two modules.

The graph presented in Figure 5.18 illustrates a number of clearly identifiable modules and a number of weakly defined and dispersed modules. For instance, the green module at the top of the graph is tightly clustered with a high edge weight between many of the nodes. Similarly, the magenta module is clearly defined but with a greater number of loosely defined connections with nodes that are not a part in the immediate proximity of the main cluster. Whereas the above section was concerned with the role of brokers and the ways that sub-sections were linked together, the Brainerd-Robinson approach instead focuses on the groups themselves, and how individual nodes act as hubs from which the sub-networks are oriented. It should be expected, then, that the graph based on the Brainerd-Robinson coefficient is representative of some sort of community – whether that is based on age, sex, residential proximity, or a less clearly defined community of consumption.
Figure 5.18. Brainerd-Robinson Similarity Modules
Since the location of the burial appears to be the most determining factor in the previous section, does this apply here as well? Figure 5.19, using the same color coding for the various areas at the sites as is used in Figure 5.17, displays the similarities based on the Brainerd-Robinson coefficient. Surprisingly, little of the modularity is accounted for by the location of the burial. The large cluster at the top of the graph is a mix of burials from 40MR62 Area C, 40MR2 Area A, Area H, and the Village Center. Similarly, the remaining modules all consist of various site areas from both Chota and Tanasee. Perhaps most interestingly is the distribution of nodes from the Village Center area of 40MR2, represented with pink colored nodes. Burials from this section of excavation, which include the townhouse in addition to 22 other residential structures and is divided into 16 subsections based on these structures, is widely dispersed across the graph and in each module. This distribution suggests again that the Village Center contains a wide variety of beads, which is the focus of the following section.

In order to consider the similarities on a smaller scale of the sites, the previous steps used for the entirety of both sites were repeated after removing burials that were not from the Village Center area. Figure 5.20 represents the network following the modularity analysis for the Village Center. Although burials from the Village Center area were dispersed and weakly connected when contextualized within the whole of the sites, it is clear that there are still important connections and clusters identifiable within the Village Center. Figure 5.20 clearly shows that there are significant groups of similarly composed bead assemblages within the Village Center that require attention. Although not included in in the present discussion, a graph was produced which tested for the influence of burial location on the structure of the modules. Little to no influence was identified with the graph; therefore, focus was turned to the influence of sex and
Figure 5.19. Brainerd-Robinson Similarity Coefficient with node color representing burial location; 40MR2 Area A (blue), Area H (orange), Area J (green), Village Center (pink), 40MR62 Area C (yellow)
Figure 5.20. Similarity Network Modules, Village Center
The influence of sex on the measure of similarity between assemblages accounts for a degree of the modularity identified in Figure 5.21. In Figure 5.21, the colors of the nodes represent the sex of the individual with blue representing males, magenta representing females, and yellow representing unidentifiable individuals. The edge colors are determined by the nodes which are connected. If connecting two nodes of the same biological sex, the edge will also be that color, but where edges connect burials between the sexes, the color is a blend between the two. It is somewhat surprising that there are very clearly defined correlations between the modularity analysis and the sex of the individual, as is highlighted by the boxes in Figure 5.21, since sex appears to play little to no role in the modularity of the site as a whole. Nonetheless, the evidence presented by this network graph suggests that gender plays, in some form, a significant factor in determining the similarity of bead assemblages found in the Village Center at 40MR2.

The preceding sections, in some ways, neglect the role of specific bead types in the process of linking individual nodes together. Therefore, this section seeks to reorient the focus around the beads themselves. By adopting a bi-modal or multi-modal approach, both the beads and the burials are placed as nodes on the graph, allowing the specific bead types to come into clearer focus.

The first graph is the overall network including all burials and all beads excluding IIa13-S, IIa13-M, IIa40-S, IIa40-M, and IIa6-S due to their disproportional representation in the network and their tendency to drown out the importance of other, less common beads. In order to visually clarify the difference between beads and burials, both the color and shape of the nodes
Figure 5.21. Similarity Network and Sex, Village Center: males (blue), females (pink), unknown (yellow)
are representative of the node type with burials being red circles and bead types being blue triangles. The size of the node, rather than being a measure of the node degree as is the case in the previous graphs, is a measure of the node’s betweenness centrality. Betweenness centrality is a measure of the number of times a node lies on the shortest path between two other nodes, essentially measuring the nodes importance in the flow of information, objects, or other considerations in network analysis (Mills 2017). Node position is again determined by the Yifan Hu force-directed algorithm.

The graph presented in Figure 5.22, while dense and containing a large amount of information, is nonetheless informative and an important starting point for this section of the analysis. First, it shows, similar to many of the site-wide graphs, that the majority of nodes exist within a single large central cluster, suggesting that the vast majority of beads and burials share features with one another. This point should not be overlooked and viewed as the absence of significance. Instead, this point highlights the fact that the vast majority of the site was closely connected with a large amount of overlap regardless of age, sex, or burial location. Second, it highlights the nodes that are structurally important to the overall network. While node importance is already relatively known from the node degrees of earlier graphs, the role and significance of specific bead types introduces important new information concerning the network. For instance, it is clear that IIa55-S (tumbled monochrome medium blue seed beads), IVa2-S (tumbled compound red on clear seed beads), IIj2-L (tumbled black beads with twisting white stripes), and IIb18-S (tumbled clear seed beads with straight white stripes) play an important role due to their betweenness centrality and their degree. Third, this graph visualizes the beads and burials that are linked to the overall network only through a single connection on
Figure 5.22. Bi-modal graph
the periphery of the network. For beads, this helps to emphasize the burials with a large number of unique beads that only occur once within burials at the site. And for burials, it highlights the importance of specific bead types in linking burials to the wider network. Finally, this graph presents the limited number of burials and beads that are disconnected from the wider network (MR2 B5, MR2 B53).

In order to make sense of the large graph in Figure 5.22, it is important to refine the scale and focus on the ego-networks within this graph. In order to accomplish this, individual nodes are selected from the larger graph and a depth of two is selected in the ego-network filter built into Gephi. This depth provides the selected node as the center point with both nodes immediately connected as well as nodes with a degree of separation of two. In other words, burials are presented with both the bead types included in that burial as well as other burials containing each of the bead types, and the reverse situation for bead types. The first set of ego-network graphs presented here are based around individual glass bead types. For instance, bead type IIj2-L of Figure 5.23 is directly connected to all burials containing this bead type. From there, all other bead types present in these burials are included, thereby displaying how IIj2-L is connected to other beads.

The graphs presented in Figures 5.23 and 5.25 help to explicate the ways in which communities are materialized through certain patterns of bead types. For instance, IIj2-L is linked to a total of eight burials, seven of which are sub adults including infants and children. While this information in itself is useful, it can be further expanded upon. For example, MR2 B7 and MR2 B2 are linked together not only through IIj2-L but also WIIc5-L and WIIc6-L. This is of interest since these individuals are not only of the same age group, but within the same area of
Figure 5.23. Ego-network for IIj2-L
excavation (40MR2 Area A). This is not meant to imply that there is a direct correlation between shared bead types and spatial proximity or the ability of burial location to account for communities of similarity. For example, MR62 B10 is closely connected with four other burials from 40MR2, yet is geographically distant from these burials. A final point about the IIj2-L ego-network concerns the beads that are only loosely connected to IIj2-L. When compared to the IIb18-S ego-network below it in Figure 5.25, there are relatively few beads present in single burials, as is visible in the “starbursts” radiating out from the burials. As discussed below, I suggest that this is a function of the importance to individual status for age groups other than subadults. With these insights, it is clear that the ego-network approach provides a much finer resolution for analysis while limiting what can be said about the larger network.

Figure 5.24. IIj2-L, WIIc5-L, and WIIc6-L Type Glass Bead

The IIb18-S ego-network in Figure 5.25 displays a similar amount of information for a different set of burial nodes. Aside from MR2 B19, which is both unidentifiable by sex or age, the majority of burials including this type of bead are of the young adult type if we include adjacent age groups including adolescents and adults aged below 25. However, burial location rather than age is an even more defining characteristic for this bead type. Five of the eight burials
Figure 5.25. Ego-networks for IIb18-S
are from 40MR62 (Tanasee) including individuals from Structure 4, 6, and the general vicinity of Area C. Considering the potential temporal differentiation between 40MR2 and 40MR62, future research would benefit from more fully examining the possible temporal sensitivity of this bead type. Another interesting point emphasized by the Iib18-S Ego-network is the number of unique bead types per burial. The large number of unique beads per burial is perhaps related to the importance of individual accomplishment and the materiality of status for young adults aiming to prove themselves in war, hunting, and trade. Although it is not possible to know specifically the social practices that moved beads from circulation to inhumation, it is helpful to contrast subadults with young adults. Whereas subadults are positioned as brokers and help to link otherwise disparate groups, young adults are characterized by unique bead types and large numbers of single-occurrence bead types. I suggest that this is a product of social practices of burial in which subadults are more often gifted with beads in death while burials of young adults more often contain beads owned during life.

Figure 5.2. Glass beads common in the Iib18-S Ego-network: Iib18-S, Iibb17-M, Iia36-S

By reversing the orientation of the ego-networks and placing the burials as the central nodes of the ego-network we can consider other questions. For instance, Figure 5.27 shows the ego-network of MR62 B6 with a depth of two, therefore showing all the beads present in this
Figure 5.27. Ego-Networks MR62 B6
burial (excluding the most common ones eliminated from this analysis) and the other burials connected through these bead types. Examining the data presented by this ego-network, it becomes clear that burial location appears to plays an important factor in the types of bead present in this burial. In addition to the ego-node, the burials that are present in 40MR62 Area C Structure 6 are encircled in order to show residential association. Including the ego-node, five of the seven burials from this structure are represented in this graph. It is worth noting that MR62 B6 is a young adult male interred with the most number of beads and second highest number of bead types at either site. It is therefore unsurprising that there are a large number of connections between node MR62 B6 and other burial nodes. What is surprising are two aspects to this burial. First, only one bead (IIbb7-M; a tumbled black bead with compound red on white stripes) is a unique bead type from this burial. This is surprising considering the number of beads and bead types as well as the demographic characteristics of this individual. My above analysis concerning the ego-network of IIb18-S suggested that young adults were more likely to demonstrate a large number of unique bead types as compared to other age groups, which is in direct contrast to the data presented by MR62 B6. Second, of the seven burials within Structure 6 of 40MR62 Area C, five are represented within this ego-network (including MR62 B6). Again, it is difficult to determine specifically the social practices involved; however, it is clear that this individual was of an important status for their immediate familial network as well as their extended clan/village network. Sharing bead types with a large number of people and having beads types that almost exclusively exist in other burials implies that this individual played a major role in the network of exchange and interaction. Whether they were gifted these beads, or owned them in life (or a combination of both) does not detract from the embeddedness of this individual.
Making sense of the social importance of a material such as glass beads requires that multiple scales, methods, and perspectives are accounted for. While distributional analyses provide a level of comparability often lost in social network analysis, they accomplish this goal at the expense of creating categorical groups from which to compare. Social network analysis, on the other hand, allows the data to speak freely and challenges categorical assumptions. For instance, while some graphs imply that young adults are more likely to possess a greater number of unique bead types, other graphs directly challenge that assumption. And while some graphs suggest that sex or age play a primary role, others imply that burial location is the most important factor in sharing bead types. What is clear is that in a situation as idiosyncratic as archaeological burial data, social network analysis provides a means to explore the data in ways that do not heavily impose assumptions.

The networks and distributions considered in this chapter imply that a range of social and practice-based influences shape the final deposition of beads in burial contexts from Chota-Tanasee. The thread that unites the above analyses is the importance of the living in the process of inhumation. The archaeological data are not simply the product of the individual who was buried; rather, the living communities who participated in the process played an active role in linking the living and the deceased communities through the materiality of burial practices. This is not to suggest that glass beads were the sole or even primary way that the deceased were connected to the living communities. In fact, as stated above in this chapter, only 53 of the 113 burials contained beads. Therefore, the communities I identify and explore are limited to those containing beads. Nonetheless, their presence in a large number of burials across the sites allows us to consider directly how these items specifically affected the materiality of communities through burial practices.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The importance of glass bead studies to colonial period archaeological sites should not be understated. These objects clearly played an important role to the Cherokee communities who chose to consume them and adorn themselves with them. If we are to take a wider definition of community to include the objects that characterize social interactions, glass beads are clearly an important component to the communities present at Chota-Tanasee. The historical records suggest that glass beads were used in a variety of contexts that linked Cherokees to colonial officials, traders, and other Cherokees in a system of exchange and interaction. In fact, glass beads played an active role in shaping cross-cultural communication through the language of gifting and reciprocity, and helped Cherokee communities to conceptualize trade, diplomacy, and adornment during this period.

There are a number of limitations and possible future directions which should be addressed. First, the data used for this project are derived from burial contexts specifically. As mentioned in this thesis, beads were used in a variety of contexts beyond just mortuary practices. Therefore, future studies would benefit from considering other contexts in which beads were stored, processed, and otherwise used. Second, since this thesis focuses specifically on beads found in burial contexts, burials not containing beads (53%) were absent from considerations. This is not meant to imply that these individuals were not part of the communities of burial practice, but rather that it was beyond the scope of the present study. Third, considerations of bead color were limited to the primary color of the bead, therefore considerations of bead decorations and polychrome beads were not fully explored. Further ethnographic and ethnohistoric research may shed light on the symbolic importance of specific color combinations that evaded conclusions in the present study. Fourth, beads were only one aspect of adornment
and consumption at these sites. Similar network-based studies would benefit from comparing and contrasting the present findings with other materials. Finally, this project was focused specifically on the two sites under consideration. Comparing these findings with other Cherokee or colonial period sites presents the opportunity to create a wider, regional scale investigation, thereby contextualizing the present study. Since there are unforeseeable questions and research projects that can utilize these data, a major aim of the project was to provide a detailed and complete database for the McClung Museum from which future researchers could draw. Therefore, while this thesis introduced a new exploration of these data, future projects will continue to be able to draw upon these sources to produce new interpretations.

A number of generalities can be drawn from the analysis of the archaeological data. First, burials of men (especially young men) contained the greatest number of glass beads. These often consisted of types, I argue, that they most likely possessed in life which served to mark their status as hunters, warriors, or traders. Second, subadult burials including children and infants had the highest frequency of burials containing beads and contained the greatest number of bead types per burial as a proportion of their total number of beads. Since the ethnohistoric record suggests that glass bead acquisition was accomplished through external trade and accomplishments beyond the village, I argue that the variety of beads included in the burial of children is a function of the social practice of inhumation. The beads acted to link the community of the living with the recently deceased and brought a wider community together in pooling a collection beads. This bead donation mirrors what Timberlake described as the ceremony of redistribution. Rather than redistributing only the necessities, objects of adornment were also divided within the village wide community in ways that linked them together and created a shared sense of self and community identity. Third, older adults have the fewest number of beads
and the lowest number of bead types. This further emphasizes the role of burial practice in shaping the archaeological record. Although they would have had the longest time to acquire glass beads, the fact that they were not interred with them suggests processes were at work which limited the taking of personal possessions to the grave. Fourth, the variability of beads in space is relatively limited. Site 40MR62, and Tanasee more generally, possibly acted as a material hub for redistribution since it was here that many of the network brokers and burials containing a large number of beads were buried. However, this is potentially the result of temporal changes between the two sites. This hypothesis will require further investigation and can be aided with temporally sensitive data similar to that produced by Dalton-Carriger (2016) and Blair (2015).

Similarity networks suggest that, at least within the Village Center of Chota, residential proximity had surprisingly little influence on the types of beads and the strength of similarity. Instead, patterns along lines of gender and age appear to have a stronger influence on similarity.

In sum, it appears that glass beads cross cut society at Chota-Tanasee at many levels, sometimes mirroring demographic groups, occasionally mirroring spatial distributions of burials, and sometimes suggesting levels of material status. What is clear is that, being found in almost 50% of burials, glass beads were a major part of exchange and adornment in both life and death. They were used idiosyncratically and with a social flexibility that expressed multiple meanings at various times. Although there are no clearly defined communities of bead consumption or communities of practice, the data are still enlightening. They support a nuanced view of communities as a series of nested forms of individual and collective identities, employing age, gender, status, residential association, and other forms of identity. More importantly, focusing on beads in burials as part of a social practice helps to reinforce the conceptualization of communities as a process rather than an entity. Through the exchanging, trading, and gifting of
beads to the recently deceased, communities were formed and reinforced. Interment and the materiality of the burial was a process and practice of the community, whether that community was a fleeting collection of mourners who otherwise did not regularly interact or a close-knit family unit. Although glass trade beads arrived at the ports of Charlestown as anonymous bulk items meant by Englishmen to please their trading partners, they quickly attained a much deeper meaning once in the villages of Chota-Tanasee. Examining the uses and networks of glass trade beads is an important step in reconsidering the history and experiences of 18th-century Overhill Cherokee communities.
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APPENDIX

The following appendices present summary data for the burials and for the beads identified during analysis. Both the skeletal materials and artifacts from burials were previously housed in the McClung Museum of Natural History and Culture at the University of Tennessee and are now in the possession of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indian’s Tribal Historic Preservation Office. A more complete data set including which beads were associated with each burial is archived with the McClung Museum’s Archaeology Lab under the direction of curator Dr. Timothy E. Baumann. Future studies desiring access to these data should be in contact with both the McClung Museum and the EBCI THPO.
### Appendix A. Burial Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Burial</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Structure/Section</th>
<th>Beads (No. Types)</th>
<th>Bead Arrangement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45 +</td>
<td>Old Adult</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>159 (1)</td>
<td>arm-band around left humerus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 +/- 6 months</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>51 (12)</td>
<td>2 necklaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10 +/- 9 months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>879 (3)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38-45</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>572 (4)</td>
<td>beaded bag, bracelet(s), necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12-18 months</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>544 (18)</td>
<td>necklace(s) (up to 6 strings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>444 (14)</td>
<td>necklace(s) (3 strings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69-72</td>
<td>Old Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 6</td>
<td>62 (1)</td>
<td>above right shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 6</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td>attached to pipe (2 strings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41-46</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47-50</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 4</td>
<td>9 (1)</td>
<td>Pit fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 3</td>
<td>147 (6)</td>
<td>Unclear, near head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 3</td>
<td>106 (9)</td>
<td>necklace (1 string)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 3</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-47</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-41</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 +/- 6 Months</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>54 (6)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>45 (2)</td>
<td>necklace (1 string)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>271 (5)</td>
<td>unclear (near pelvis) and single bead in vertebral column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 +/- 6 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2020 (28)</td>
<td>necklace (1 string)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12 +/- 6 Months</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 2</td>
<td>597 (2)</td>
<td>necklace (1 string)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 2</td>
<td>205 (8)</td>
<td>necklace (1 string)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 2</td>
<td>163 (2)</td>
<td>unclear (vicinity of skull and neck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 10</td>
<td>2169 (21)</td>
<td>necklace(s), around skull and face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 10</td>
<td>106 (6)</td>
<td>necklace (1 string)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-9 Months</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 10</td>
<td>506 (5)</td>
<td>unclear (vicinity of skull)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 10</td>
<td>1068 (9)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 14</td>
<td>116 (5)</td>
<td>unclear (probable necklace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30 +/- 5</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25-32</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 8</td>
<td>55 (10)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-43</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 13</td>
<td>2334 (3)</td>
<td>beaded bag, around knee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-43</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 11</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>probable necklace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 11</td>
<td>1061 (5)</td>
<td>beaded bag(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 8</td>
<td>22 (2)</td>
<td>necklace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 10</td>
<td>2106 (6)</td>
<td>Unclear (probable necklace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-42</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 2</td>
<td>977 (7)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 2</td>
<td>341 (12)</td>
<td>necklace(s) (2 strings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 1</td>
<td>41 (1)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>23+</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>unmapped</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>pit fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>unmapped</td>
<td>637 (1)</td>
<td>vicinity of knees (part of garment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 9</td>
<td>20 (2)</td>
<td>necklace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 9</td>
<td>19 (1)</td>
<td>necklace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 9</td>
<td>96 (5)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-47</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>unmapped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 13</td>
<td>125 (2)</td>
<td>necklace(s) (3 strings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 3</td>
<td>334 (1)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12 +/- 6 Months</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 8</td>
<td>55 (6)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 5</td>
<td>26 (3)</td>
<td>unclear (vicinity of pelvis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>Old Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15 +/- 6 Months</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-47</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15 +/- 6 Months</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Sect. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4646 (13)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>148 (15)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38-30</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>705 (11)</td>
<td>necklace(s), around knees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 (2)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4665 (23)</td>
<td>necklace(s), possible beaded bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 +/- 6 Months</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44 (10)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>312 (5)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 +/- 6 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>332 (20)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 +/- 9 Months</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1235 (6)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 +/- 6 Months</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140 (2)</td>
<td>unclear (vicinity of skull)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 +/- 2 Months</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>729 (4)</td>
<td>unclear (vicinity of skull)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40-47</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>unclear (vicinity of pelvis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23-28</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>564 (6)</td>
<td>unrecorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Old Adult</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>pit fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>97 (2)</td>
<td>necklace (1 string)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Old Adult</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>pit fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1628 (11)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 +/- 1 year</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>920 (10)</td>
<td>necklace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-6 Months</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>unmapped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanasee</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>unmapped</td>
<td>868 (9)</td>
<td>necklace(s) (up to 6 strings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B. Beads from Chota-Tanasee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kidd and Kidd Type</th>
<th>Bead Description</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ia14-M</td>
<td>Opaque powder blue simple tube beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia19-S</td>
<td>Translucent medium blue simple tube beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>3.5 to 5</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia2-S</td>
<td>Opaque black simple tube beads</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia20-S</td>
<td>Translucent medium blue simple tube beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>5 (8.8%)</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia3-S</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray simple tube beads</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia5-S</td>
<td>Opaque white simple tube beads</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
<td>9 (15.8%)</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa-S</td>
<td>Tumbled seed beads of indeterminate color</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa13-M</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled simple round to oblong beads</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>17 (29.8%)</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa13-S</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2.5 to 4.5</td>
<td>34 (59.6%)</td>
<td>8176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa20-S</td>
<td>Translucent butterscotch tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa21-S</td>
<td>Translucent pink tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa22-M</td>
<td>Translucent deep brown tumbled simple oblong bead</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa23-S</td>
<td>Opaque surf green tumbled simple seed bead</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa26-S</td>
<td>Translucent bright mint green tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa28-M</td>
<td>Translucent dark jade green tumbled simple round to oblong bead</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa35-S</td>
<td>Translucent sky blue tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa36-M</td>
<td>Opaque shadow blue tumbled simple round to oblong beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>4 (7.0%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa36-S</td>
<td>Opaque shadow blue tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>2.5 to 4</td>
<td>8 (14.0%)</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa40-M</td>
<td>Opaque robin's egg blue tumbled simple round to oblong beads</td>
<td>turquoise blue</td>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>17 (29.8%)</td>
<td>2183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa40-S</td>
<td>Opaque robin's egg blue tumbled simple seed bead</td>
<td>turquoise blue</td>
<td>2.5 to 4.5</td>
<td>23 (40.4%)</td>
<td>10853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa41-S</td>
<td>Opaque aqua blue tumbled simple seed bead</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa43-S</td>
<td>Translucent bright cerulean blue tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa44-M</td>
<td>Translucent bright navy tumbled simple round to oblong beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa44-S</td>
<td>Translucent bright navy tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa46-M</td>
<td>Translucent powder blue tumbled simple oblong beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa46-S</td>
<td>Opaque powder blue tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa50-M</td>
<td>Translucent dusty blue tumbled simple round to oblong beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Size (mm)</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa55-M</td>
<td>Translucent medium blue tumbled simple round to oblong beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>7 to 8</td>
<td>6 (10.5%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa55-S</td>
<td>Translucent medium blue tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>2.5 to 4</td>
<td>12 (21.1%)</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa6-L</td>
<td>Opaque black tumbled simple round to oblong beads</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>10 to 12</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa6-M</td>
<td>Opaque black tumbled simple round to oblong beads</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>6 (10.5%)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa6-S</td>
<td>Opaque black tumbled simple seed bead</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>2.5 to 4.5</td>
<td>17 (29.8%)</td>
<td>3167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa61-S</td>
<td>Translucent dark rose brown tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa9-M</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray tumbled simple round to oblong beads</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa9-S</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray tumbled simple seed beads</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (7.0%)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb'18-M</td>
<td>Translucent gray tumbled oblong beads with spiral white stripes</td>
<td>clear with stripes</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb'2-L</td>
<td>Opaque black tumbled round beads with spiraling white stripes</td>
<td>black with stripes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb'3-M</td>
<td>Opaque black tumbled round to oblong beads with spiraling white stripes</td>
<td>black with stripes</td>
<td>8 to 8.5</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb'6-M</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled round to oblong bead with spiraling red stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>6 (10.5%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb'7-M</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled round to oblong beads with 3 groups of 3 spiraling blue stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>8 to 10</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb'9-M</td>
<td>Translucent surf green tumbled round to oblong bead with white spiraling stripes</td>
<td>green with stripes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb18-M</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray tumbled round to oblong beads with straight white stripes</td>
<td>clear with stripes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (7.0%)</td>
<td>1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb18-S</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray tumbled seed beads with simple straight white stripes</td>
<td>clear with stripes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 (12.3%)</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb19-M</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray tumbled oblong bead with white stripes</td>
<td>clear with stripes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb29-S</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled seed beads with alternating red and blue straight stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb31-M</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled round to oblong beads with alternating red and blue stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb31-S</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled seed beads with alternating red and blue straight stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb32-M</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled round to oblong beads with alternating red and blue stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>7 to 7.5</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb33-S</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled seed beads with alternating red and green simple straight stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb40-M</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled round to oblong beads with alternating red, blue, and green simple stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>7 to 8</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb52-M</td>
<td>Translucent dark emerald green tumbled round bead with white stripes</td>
<td>green with stripes</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb53-M</td>
<td>Translucent pale green tumbled round beads with simple straight white stripes</td>
<td>green with stripes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb59-M</td>
<td>Opaque robin's egg blue tumbled round to oblong with straight red stripes</td>
<td>turquoise blue with stripes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb67-M</td>
<td>Translucent medium blue tumbled oblong beads with white stripes</td>
<td>blue with stripes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIbb12-M</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled oblong beads with compound blue on red stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIbb13-M</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled round to oblong beads with compound blue on red stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>7 to 8</td>
<td>5 (8.8%)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIbb17-M</td>
<td>Opaque white tumbled round to oblong beads with compound red on blue stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>6 to 7</td>
<td>7 (12.3%)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIbb22-M</td>
<td>Opaque aqua blue tumbled round bead with compound red on white stripes</td>
<td>blue with stripes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIbb23-M</td>
<td>Opaque shadow blue tumbled round to oblong beads with compound red on white stripes</td>
<td>blue with stripes</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIbb24-M</td>
<td>Translucent robin's egg blue tumbled round to oblong beads with compound red on white stripes</td>
<td>blue with stripes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIbb27-M</td>
<td>Translucent dark blue tumbled oblong bead with compound red on white stripes</td>
<td>blue with stripes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIbb28-M</td>
<td>Translucent dark blue tumbled oblong beads with blue on white compound stripes</td>
<td>blue with stripes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIbb7-M</td>
<td>Opaque black tumbled round bead with compound red on white stripes</td>
<td>black with stripes</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIa1-S</td>
<td>Opaque antique rose on black compound tube beads</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIbb1-M</td>
<td>opaque antique rose on black compound tube bead with black on white compound stripes</td>
<td>red with stripes</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIj2-L</td>
<td>Opaque black tumbled round beads with twisting white stripes</td>
<td>black with stripes</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>8 (14.0%)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVa1-M</td>
<td>Opaque antique rose on black compound tumbled round beads</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>8 (14.0%)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVa1-S</td>
<td>Opaque antique rose on black compound tumbled seed beads</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVa2-M</td>
<td>Opaque antique rose on colorless gray compound tumbled bead</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVa2-S</td>
<td>Opaque antique rose on colorless gray compound tumbled seed beads</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>11 (19.3%)</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVb16-S</td>
<td>Opaque white on light blue compound tumbled seed bead with alternating red and blue stripes</td>
<td>white with stripes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVbb1-L</td>
<td>Opaque antique rose on black compound tumbled round bead with compound black on white stripes</td>
<td>red with stripes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVbb1-M</td>
<td>Opaque antique rose on black compound tumbled round to oblong beads with black on white compound stripes</td>
<td>red with stripes</td>
<td>8 to 8.5</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVbb1-S</td>
<td>Opaque antique rose on black compound tumbled seed beads with black on white compound stripes</td>
<td>red with stripes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb-L</td>
<td>Opaque black wire wound round beads</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>5 (8.8%)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb-M</td>
<td>Opaque black wire wound round beads</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb-S</td>
<td>Opaque black wire wound round beads</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb1-L</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray wire wound round beads</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>11 to 20</td>
<td>6 (10.5%)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb1-XL</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray wire wound round beads</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb10-L</td>
<td>Translucent dusty aqua blue wire wound round bead</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb13-L</td>
<td>Translucent aqua blue wire wound round beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb16-L</td>
<td>Translucent deep blue wire wound round beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>4 (7.0%)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wib2-S</td>
<td>Opaque milky white wire wound round bead</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Size Range</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb3-L</td>
<td>Opaque pale blue wire wound round bead</td>
<td>pale blue</td>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>7 (12.3%)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb3-XL</td>
<td>Opaque pale blue wire wound round beads</td>
<td>pale blue</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wib6-L</td>
<td>Translucent mustard gold wire wound round beads</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb8-L</td>
<td>Translucent butterscotch wire wound round beads</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>13 to 15</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIb9-L</td>
<td>Translucent surf green wire wound round beads</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIc-S</td>
<td>Opaque black wire wound oval beads</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>5 (8.8%)</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIc1-M</td>
<td>Opaque white wire wound oval beads</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIc1-S</td>
<td>Opaque white wire wound oval beads</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>7 (12.3%)</td>
<td>1077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIc2-L</td>
<td>Opaque pale blue wire wound oval beads</td>
<td>pale blue</td>
<td>10 to 18</td>
<td>5 (8.8%)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIc9-S</td>
<td>Opaque powder blue wire wound oval bead</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIId4-L</td>
<td>Translucent ultramarine wire wound tube &quot;donut&quot; bead</td>
<td>purple blue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIa1-L</td>
<td>Opaque white wire wound &quot;corn&quot; beads</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIdc-L</td>
<td>Opaque black wire wound faceted beads</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>10 to 15</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIdc10-L</td>
<td>Translucent medium blue wire wound faceted beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>10 to 11</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIc12-L</td>
<td>Translucent medium blue wire wound faceted beads</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIc2-L</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray wire wound faceted beads</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>5 (8.8%)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIc2-M</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray wire wound faceted beads</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIc3-L</td>
<td>Translucent sky blue wire wound faceted bead</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIc4-L</td>
<td>Translucent gold wire wound faceted bead</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIc5-L</td>
<td>Translucent mustard gold wire wound faceted beads</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>10 to 17</td>
<td>7 (12.3%)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIc6-L</td>
<td>Translucent terra cotta wire wound faceted bead</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 (10.5%)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIc7-M</td>
<td>Translucent jade green wire wound faceted bead</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIId-L</td>
<td>Translucent surf green wire wound &quot;raspberry&quot; bead</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIId1-L</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray wire wound &quot;raspberry&quot; bead</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIe1-L</td>
<td>Translucent colorless gray wire wound &quot;melon&quot; bead</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIe4-L</td>
<td>Translucent terra cotta wire wound &quot;melon&quot; bead</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIIb-XL</td>
<td>Opaque white wire wound round bead with brown and dark green dots inlaid in surface</td>
<td>white with decorations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIv-L</td>
<td>Translucent powder blue wire wound short barrel bead</td>
<td>light blue</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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