

partments. Still, they are distinct facets. And just because clans are at bottom pieces of social machinery and have been generally supposed to be the warp of the social fabric as such, whereas at Zuñi the bulk of strictly social functioning takes place through the medium of kinship and the house, while the functioning of the clan is to a surprisingly large extent expressed in the domain of religious ceremony, it seems to me that the formulation which I have made is significant and in the main justified. The very facts which Dr. Parsons adduces in her discussion appear on the whole to accentuate the same formulation.

That I have passed almost wholly over the economic relations of Zuñi clans is true, but due only to ignorance and the impossibility of covering all phases of a rich culture in two brief periods of investigation. We need data on the economic life not only of the Zuñi, but of all the pueblos and of most American tribes. There is probably no phase of native life that has been so unreasonably neglected by American anthropologists. I have merely sinned with the majority. Still it is hardly likely that the economic functions of clans can be of primary importance at Zuñi, else between Cushing, Stevenson, Dr. Parsons, and myself, something of moment would have emerged. I think it characteristic of the situation that the one thing which Dr. Parsons is able to point out as being felt by the Zuñi as specifically clan owned, namely the *ettowe* or fetishes, are religious property.

As to the third charge, that I have undervalued the attitude of the Zuñi themselves toward clanship, I have nothing to say except that I have tried to depict their attitude as I found it, and that the clan seemed to rest surprisingly lightly on their consciousness. This, however, being a matter of valuation, is one of integration, rather than one to be advanced by an analytic discussion of individual items, which might go on endlessly. If my judgment is in error, it remains for Dr. Parsons or some other investigator to assemble all possible data on the point and to strike a new balance which shall bear on its face the marks of being more justly proportioned.

A. L. KROEBER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

AN HISTORICAL NOTE ON THE WESTO INDIANS

WHO were the Westo Indians of the seventeenth century South Carolina frontier? In view of the rôle played by this folk in the period of the first settlement the question has an interest for the historical student measured neither by the size nor by the permanent importance of the tribe. It is, however, one of those questions which he expects the

ethnologist to answer for him. In this instance an answer has in fact been given which bears an aspect of plausibility, and which is stamped with the authority of well-warranted scholarship. According to J. R. Swanton, who has extended his researches in the early history of the southern Indians to the manuscript sources, including the South Carolina colonial archives, the Westo were almost certainly identical with the eastern group of the Yuchi. In this conclusion F. G. Speck, the principal student of the Yuchi, has concurred.¹ It is the purpose of this note to set forth a number of reasons for rejecting Dr. Swanton's theory, and to suggest another solution. In so far as the deductions are not strictly historical they are put forward tentatively, and it is hoped will receive the criticism of professed ethnologists.

What are the ascertainable historical facts with regard to this tribe? When the first settlers reached the South Carolina coast in 1670 they found the small tribes from Port Royal to Kayawah terrorized by "another sorte of Indians that live backwards in an intier body & warr ag^t all Indians . . . havinge gunns & powder & shott"—"a rangeing sort of people reputed to be the Man eaters." Such was their prestige that the Savannah river, on which they were seated, though not at the mouth, was called the "Westoe bou signifying the enemies River." The universal fear which the Westo inspired greatly facilitated the planting of the Charles Town settlement, by ensuring the friendship and coöperation of the coast Indians. Until 1674 the colonists were involved in small wars with the Westo. In that year Henry Woodward, agent for the proprietors in the Indian trade, made a "discovery" of their chief settlement, which he called in his relation "Hickauhaugau." This he described as a palisaded town on the western bank of the Savannah, enclosed in a sharp bend of the river (perhaps in present Screven county, Georgia). He learned that the Westo were enemies of the Cherokee and Kawihta and Kasihta, as well as of the tribes of the coast; and that they had goods from the north (Virginia). Woodward opened a trade with them, and from 1674 to 1680 the Westo alliance formed the cornerstone of the South Carolina Indian system. They alone were supplied with arms,

¹ "Handbook of American Indians," *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30*, vol. II, p. 936 (article on Westo by Swanton); *ibid.*, p. 1003 (article on Yuchi by Speck). See also Swanton, "De Soto's Line of March" in *Mississippi Valley Historical Association Proceedings*, vol. V, p. 153; Swanton and J. R. Dixon, "Primitive American History" in *American Anthropologist* (N. S.), vol. 16, p. 383; and Speck, "Ethnology of the Yuchi Indians" in *Anthropological Publications University Museum, University of Pennsylvania*, vol. I, no. 1. In correspondence Dr. Swanton has kindly given me a fuller statement of his views than he has yet published.

and were expected to protect the province by overawing the Spanish Indians and all other potential enemies. But the alliance proved unstable. The proprietors insisted upon a monopoly of the trade with the distant Indians. Meanwhile the Westo renewed from time to time their raids upon the settlement Indians, with whom the colonists traded. Out of this situation, which created a sharp conflict between the interest of the proprietors and the interest of the private traders who controlled the provincial assembly, arose the Westo war of 1680-1681. In 1680 the settlers engaged the Savannah (the eastern Shawnee, probably recent immigrants from the west) to expel the Westo from the province. Despite the opposition of the proprietors this was accomplished: so thoroughly, indeed, that in 1683 it was reported to the proprietors that scarcely fifty Westo remained alive and those in scattered bodies.¹

From several eighteenth-century maps it has been known that at some time after their defeat the remnant of the Westo retired among the lower Creeks, first on the Ocmulgee, later on the Chattahoochee.² When did this migration occur? On this point the maps have furnished no clue. For a decade after 1683, moreover, the South Carolina records are silent with respect to the Westo. In 1693, however, two entries in the journals of the Commons House of Assembly throw a sudden flash of light upon their fortunes after their expulsion, and upon the more involved question of their identity. An analysis of this unexploited contemporary material will follow a discussion of the Swanton-Speck hypothesis: that the Westo were identical with the Yuchi.

The basis of this identification is entirely circumstantial: it rests upon an argument from location. From Woodward's relation and from the Indian references to the "Westoe bou" it is certain that the Westo were seated on the Savannah river in the late seventeenth century. It is equally well established that the Savannah river from Ebenezer creek near its mouth to fifteen or twenty miles above present Augusta, Georgia, was once the habitat of an eastern division of the Yuchi. Secondly, there is cartographical evidence that the Westo and Yuchi villages among the lower Creeks were immediately adjacent. Neither set of facts is in itself conclusive; together they have been thought to establish the probability of the identity of Westo and Yuchi.

¹ *Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society*, vol. v, pp. 166-168, 194, 378, 446, 456-462. *Grand Council Journals* (MSS. Columbia, S. C.), *passim*. Correspondence of proprietors, especially letter of September 30, 1683, to governor, deputies and parliament, in Public Record Office, *Colonial Entry Books*, vol. xxii, 16. (Transcripts, Columbia, S. C.)

² See maps of Moll (1720), Bellin (1744), and Mitchell (1755).

But the argument presupposes (*a*) that the Yuchi migration from the west occurred before 1670; and (*b*) that a considerable body of Westo remained in South Carolina after their supposed expulsion.¹ The latter surmise is directly contrary to the positive testimony of contemporaries: the Westo, apparently never a large body of Indians, were clearly "ruined" by the war. For (*a*) there is no support, save an argument from silence. If the migration of the Yuchi had occurred after the settlement of South Carolina, it may be asked, why was it not mentioned by any contemporary writer? But the argument from silence (wisely employed with caution, in view of the fragmentary character of the sources) may be used more effectively in rebuttal than in support of the contention. If the eastern Yuchi had been settled on the Savannah river in the late seventeenth century is it likely that no mention of their presence there would occur in the South Carolina records until 1707, especially in view of the fact that from shortly after the Westo war the principal route of the Indian traders lay directly through the region later known to be their habitat? References to the tribes of the Savannah river region (the Yamasee, the Palachacola, the Savannah, and, after 1704, the Apalache) abound in the accounts of the trade, but before 1707 there is no mention of Yuchi on that river under any conceivable variant of their tribal name. A single allusion to the Yuchi appears in the seventeenth-century records. In 1691 the assembly laid an embargo upon the trade with the distant tribes. The traders were given specified periods within which to bring in their goods. Included in the ban was trade with the "Attoho Kolegey"—probably the Yuchi under a disguised form of their Algonquian name (Tahogale). A trans-Appalachian tribe was meant, for these traders, like the Cherokee dealers, were allowed from March to September of the following year to close their trade, whereas the traders with the Kasihta and the Kawihta were granted only the four months then ensuing.

In 1707 there is for the first time definite indication of an eastern settlement of the Yuchi. It was proposed in that year that a force of Indians be assembled for the protection of the province in an expected emergency, to include "100 from the Savannahs and Appalachees and Tohogoligo." The apposition of the names clearly points to neighborhood. The numbers of the eastern Yuchi must still have been small, for they were not mentioned in the elaborate account of the Indians

¹ Speck in the "*Handbook of American Indians*," vol. II, p. 1003, says: "The early writers also state that the Westo were driven out of their country in 1681 by the Savannah (Shawnee), but this must mean only a part of them."

"under the protection of this government" furnished to the Board of Trade in 1708, nor on the Nairne map of 1708 (at least in the Crisp reproduction of 1711). Moreover, Barnwell's North Carolina expedition in 1711, which was accompanied by 56 Apalaches and 87 Yamasees, included only 10 "Hog Logees" or Yuchi. From these facts, attested by contemporary records,¹ and from the known circumstances of the Indian trade it is possible to construct a more tenable hypothesis of the migration of the eastern Yuchi than that which places it anterior to the English settlement. Like the early Cherokee trade of which it was a development, the Tennessee trade must have been carried on largely with the aid of Indian burdeners. It is probable that some of these burdeners remained from time to time at or near Savannah Town, which, in the early eighteenth century, was still the entrepôt of the northern as of the southern trade, and there assisted in carrying on the mountain trade, in the same way that the Apalaches assisted in the trade with the Creeks. A migration which had such an origin would naturally take place too gradually to be certain of mention in the fragmentary colonial records.

In summary, the circumstantial evidence for the identity of the Westo and the Yuchi fails at two essential points: the Westo were certainly not settled on the Savannah after 1681; and the Yuchi were probably not established in any numbers on the South Carolina border before the first decade of the eighteenth century.

If the Westo were not Yuchi, who were they? No answer as satisfying as the one rejected can yet be given. It is possible, however, to identify one unknown with another unknown. The Westo were the Rickahockans of early Virginian history. This was a tribe which entered Virginia from back of the mountains in 1656 and was decisively defeated at the forks of the Pamunkey by Colonel Edward Hill with the aid of the Pamunkeys. After this well-known affair they retired behind the Blue Ridge, to reappear in the more or less fabulous account of Lederer (1669), as dwellers "upon a land, as they term it, of great waves; by which I suppose they mean the seashore." Lederer was probably in contact with a number of Rickahockans, but it is likely that he was mistaken in locating them on his map and in his relation "not far west-

¹ Act of September 26, 1691, in Cooper, *Statutes at Large of South Carolina*, vol. II, p. 66. *Journals of the Commons House of Assembly* (MSS. Columbia, S. C.) under date April 23, 1707. Public Record Office, *Board of Trade Papers, Proprieties*, vol. IX, p. 82 (Transcripts, Columbia, S. C.). Ed. Crisp, "Map of South Carolina" in Library of Congress. *Virginia Magazine of History*, vol. V, p. 393.

ward of the Apalataean mountains"—unless they were at the time separated in two bodies. In that case the customary identification of the "Oustack" with the Westo may still be valid.¹

The proof of the identity of Westo and Rickahockans is as follows: On January 13, 1693, the governor and deputies notified the Commons House of Assembly "that they were informed that some Northern Indians intend next Somer to settle among the Cowataws and Cussetaws" (on the Ocmulgee). The reply of the Commons House next day identified the "Northern Indians" in question. They advised "that all possible means be used to prevent the Settlem^t of any Northern Nation of Indians amongst our Friends more Especially ye Rickohogo's or Westos a people which formerly when well used made an attempt to Dstroy us. . . ." The "Hickauhaugau" of Woodward's relation was, then, simply a variant of "Rickohogo" or Rickahockan. After their defeat in 1681 the Westo had naturally retired northward, in the direction from which they had originally come, until, for some reason unknown, they were led to join their former enemies, the lower Creeks, in the last decade of the seventeenth century. Of the competence of the testimony there can be no question. Captain James Moore, one of the committee which carried the message to the governor, had served on a mission to the Westo in 1680, and was, moreover, one of the principal Indian traders of South Carolina.

Thus far all is verifiable. From this point the inquiry enters the realm of conjecture. Who were the Rickahockans, now identified with the Westo? Mooney's supposition that they were Cherokee is untenable: Westo and Cherokee were known enemies. The surmise that they were the remnants of the Erie (Riquehronnons) is intriguing, but has not found favor with ethnologists.² If neither Cherokee nor Erie there is yet a possibility that they were an offshoot of the Iroquoian group. For the Commons House address of 1693 adds this commentary: "And the Mawhawkes are a numerous, warlike nation of Indians, and strictly aleyd to the Westos. . . ." Much depends upon the interpretation of the expression "strictly aleyd," with regard to which it is dangerous to dogmatize. It is at least conceivable, however, that further researches

¹ Alvord and Bidgood, *First Explorations of the Trans-Allegheny Region*, pp. 155-156 and notes. Neill, E. D., *Virginia Carolorum*, pp. 245-246. Burk, *History of Virginia*, vol. II, p. 107.

² Hanna, *Wilderness Trail*, vol. I, p. 13 and references. Alvord and Bidgood, *loc. cit.*

may confirm the tentative hypothesis that the Westo represent the southernmost migration of the Iroquoian stock.¹

VERNER W. CRANE.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE TRIBES OF SIERRA LEONE

THERE are two statements in Professor Starr's review of my books (*American Anthropologist*, vol. 19, p. 286) to which I must take exception, as they appear to be pure perversion of my own statements. My reviewer states (1) that I do not aim at uniformity of spelling in the linguistic portion of the work. It is true that this statement is found in the preface to Part III (stories), and a more cautious mind than my reviewer's might have reflected that it might possibly be intended to refer to the portion of the work to which it is prefixed, and not to the other portion, in particular the dictionary which precedes it.

In point of fact the dictionary is carefully reduced to a uniform system and the defect in it is that words possibly distinguished by tones or by small vowel differences are spelt the same, owing to the fact that some of my material was obtained in England from Ms. and not *viva voce*; it is clear that this is not quite the same thing as Professor Starr has in mind. Uniformity in the spelling of the stories I did not aim at, for the simple reason that dialects exist. Professor Starr apparently thinks that it is desirable to slur over dialectical differences; I do not know whether he has ever attempted to justify this position, which does not commend itself to the majority of those who work at African languages, and does not appear to have any reasonable basis. (2) The second statement is that I have no knowledge of any of the languages that I record. I am at a loss to know where Professor Starr finds this information, if it is not an inference from the preface to my dictionary, in which I refer to the numerous homonyms that further research may distinguish. I have stated above the reason for the uncertainty as to the real position; but I may remark that, even were it otherwise, few linguists have the refinement of ear necessary to establish the minute differences and that this lack does not in any way depend on ignorance of the language.

In point of fact before I left Sierra Leone I had sufficient knowledge of Timne to follow a case in a court of law, and when I came to deal with Schlenker's Mss. in England I was able to read his untranslated stories

¹ Unfortunately there is an almost complete dearth of linguistic data. Besides the name of their town the only other Westo word recoverable is the name of one of their chief men, Ariano. *Grand Council Journals*, April 12, 1680.