

## *French Colonial Trade in the Upper Creek Country*

Gregory A. Waselkov

The Yamasee War in 1715 brought to an end, temporarily, English domination of the trade for deer skins in the Upper Creek country. With the expulsion of English traders, Alabama and Tallapoosa Indian leaders invited the French at Mobile to build near their villages a fort, known officially as Fort Toulouse or the Alabama Post, but called by the Creeks *Franca Choka Chula*, or the "old French trading house" (Woodward 1859:39). This outpost was the focus of French trading activities in the region for the next forty-six years.

"No people," wrote George Croghan in 1749, "Carries on ye Indian Trade in So Regular a manner as the French" (Ross 1938:437). In the Upper Creek country, regulation involved a licensing system, whereby permits, called *conges*, were sold to those wishing to trade. While the fort was under construction, two Frenchmen, Dubreuil and Trefontaine, obtained permits to trade at the Alabama's and surrounding villages, including "Toquipatche two leagues distant." There they were obliged to give away their trade goods as presents to the Indians to prevent a party of Englishmen from erecting a fort of their own (Paris, ser. C13A, 5:119-120). Once the Creeks determined that French and English traders both should be permitted to trade in their villages, other Frenchmen followed. A permit was issued in 1725 to Charles de La Lande, the *garde magasin* (warehouse keeper) at the post. His was not a monopoly, how-

ever, and in 1740 Marie Roy, widow of the trader Joseph Poupart *dit* Lafleur, operated a trading warehouse in an Alabama town (Paris, ser. C13A, vol. 9; Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:4, 170). There is also a record of Michel Gaudeau, the succeeding *garde magasin*, receiving a permit to trade in 1744 (Barron 1975:324). These individuals obtained most of their trade goods on credit from merchants in New Orleans or France, and later paid their debts in deer skins (see Rowland and Sanders 1932:668–669; RSCLHQ 1923:6, 309; Usner 1985:84). Certain post commanders, such as Bernard Diron d'Arraguiette at Mobile and François Hazeur at Fort Tombeché, attempted to monopolize trade with the Choctaws (Rowland and Sanders 1929:537; RSCLHQ 1931:14, 603; Alden 1944:51; Barron 1975:288; Usner 1985:79). But this did not occur at Fort Toulouse, perhaps due to constant competition from the English.

There was another important group of Frenchmen actively engaged in trade with the Creek Indians: the post garrison. As Governor Vaudreuil explained in 1745,

. . . we send nothing but flour for the subsistence of the garrison and which most frequently is in the situation of lacking it so that the garrison must necessarily trade in order to get a living, and it is likewise important that it be in that situation in order that the Indians may find a market for their products. (Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:4, 250)

The garrison specifically reserved the right to trade for all peltries and other items brought to the post by Indians, as long as the soldiers furnished the merchandise necessary for the trade (Barron 1975:315). The mainstay of the soldiers' trade was ammunition—lead balls and gunpowder—for which there was a constant need among the Creeks, who had virtually abandoned their traditional chipped-stone technology for firearms by the early eighteenth century. The French found, furthermore, that they could supply their Indian trading partners with these goods more profitably than could the English. Fort Toulouse was resupplied by boats rowed up the Alabama River from Mobile, a more efficient means of transporting heavy and bulky items than the overland packhorse carriage employed by the English coming from Charlestown and Savannah. By the 1720s, the Fort Toulouse garrison was already trading not only for deer skins and pelts but also for provisions in exchange for “powder and balls, which are the currency of the post” (Paris, ser. C13A, vol. 12; Crane 1981:258).

## INDIAN TRADE GOODS

Until the 1740s, when the French village at Fort Toulouse began to provide for its own subsistence needs, foodstuffs were a major focus of trade between the French and the Creeks. In addition to the staple grain crop, maize, the Indians also supplied bear oil, hickory nut oil, deer oil, venison, fish, and beans (Vincennes; Paris, ser. C13A, vol 12; Usner 1985:79). The principal object of trade, however, from the French perspective, was always deer skins. Precisely how many deer skins the French at Fort Toulouse obtained from the Creeks can not be determined, but the available evidence suggests a steady increase in the deer-skin trade throughout the French colonial era. From all of French Louisiane, fifteen thousand deer skins were shipped to France in 1720, fifty thousand in 1739, and more than sixty thousand by 1760 (Vincennes; Rowland and Sanders 1932:530-537, 645; Surrey 1968:210-211, 217-218, 357; Usner 1985:86, 92 n. 40). Governor Bienville estimated in 1725 that the three hundred hunters in the four Alabama villages near Fort Toulouse furnished about three thousand deer skins every year (Rowland and Sanders 1932:536-537). Judging from the quantity of merchandise sold at the Fort Toulouse *magasin* during 1744, as many as seventy-five hundred deer skins may have been procured that year (Paris, ser. C13A, vol. 30).

Deer skins were classified according to the manner of preparation by the Indians. "Dressed" skins, which the Creeks used for their own clothes and seldom traded, were stretched, scraped on both sides, treated with deer brains, and finally smoked (Swan 1855:692; Swanton 1946:445-446). At the other extreme were "heavy" skins (also referred to as "in the hair" or "raw"), which had only been scraped on the flesh side. The heaviest of these heavy skins, weighing at least two *livres* each, were preferred by French tanners, who could produce a Moroccan grain leather from them (Vincennes). Skins that had been scraped of both hair and flesh were called "half-dressed" (or "parchment" or "green" or, most confusingly, "dressed") and weighed about one and a half *livres* each or less. At Niort, the center of French leather making near the port of La Rochelle, these skins were made into parchment and widely used for binding books (Usner 1985:85; Clark 1981:167; RSCLHQ 1931: 14, 574).

## FRENCH TRADE GOODS

The variety of European-made artifacts traded or given as presents to the Indians of French Louisiane has been compiled for the years 1701-63, as shown

in Table 2.1 (see glossary in the Appendix for an explanation of terminology). This summary suggests some chronological trends that should be detectable in the archaeological record. For instance, silver first appears in the 1740s in the form of earrings, two decades before the large-scale introduction of sheet-silver gorgets and cast silver medals. Signet rings, which probably include the types now known as Jesuit rings, have an early distribution, from 1701 to 1743. Smoking pipes occur only once in the records, in 1702, which corresponds with the archaeological evidence revealing predominantly English-made pipes at early eighteenth-century Indian sites in French Louisiane. Perhaps less can be made of the infrequent mention of liquor, which must have been a significant trade item (judging from the numerous French-made bottles found), despite regular attempts to limit its distribution.

Although a wide variety of goods was thought to be important for presents, a smaller range of artifacts comprised the usual trade inventory. During the years 1756, 1760, and 1761, the years for which the most complete records still exist, the Fort Toulouse garrison principally received gunpowder, lead balls, and trade shirts every month, along with lesser quantities of vermilion, knives, gunflints, and other items (Paris, ser. D2C, vols. 51–52). Because the soldiers had to trade this merchandise to provide for their subsistence, the garrison was probably the major source of French goods for the Creek Indians. The next greatest source must have been the annual ceremony distributing presents, generally to influential headmen. These gifts usually included a coat, shirt, hat, ax, knives, some paint, a gun, gunflints, gunpowder, and lead balls (see Jacobs 1950:69, 1967:10; McDowell 1970:245; Higginbotham 1977:76–77). By the 1740s, brandy had become an essential element in French presents (Adair 1930:277; McDowell 1970:66). In addition to these gifts, the French also maintained a blacksmith at Fort Toulouse to repair muskets for the Creeks without charge (Jacobs 1967:9–10, 63–64).

Profits for French traders fluctuated according to the demand for deer skins in Europe, but official exchange values in Louisiane remained relatively stable. A deer skin valued at twenty *sous* in 1716 sold in France for double that amount; in 1750 the price in Louisiane rose to twenty-five to thirty *sous* each, whereas the value in France dropped to thirty-five to thirty-six *sous* (Giraud 1974:296; RSCLHQ 1935:18, 455, 1938:21, 899). Prices of European goods traded at Fort Toulouse were fixed by government decree at 50 percent above the cost in France for goods obtained from the royal warehouse (Surrey 1968:252; Paris, ser. C13A, vol. 18). Prices for the Choctaw trade were much lower, because the French attempted to exclude English competition (Rowland and Sanders 1932:303, 596; Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:4,

Table 2.1

Objects Traded or Given as Presents to the Indians in French Louisiane, 1701-63

	1701	02	03	13	17	18	19	21	22	26	27	33	34	43	49	56	59	60	63
Arrows (Iron)	X																		
Awls	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	X
Axes	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X						X		X	X
Tomahawks						X	X			X							X	X	X
" " (pipes)																		X	
Bags																		X	
Barrels																		X	X
Beads (Glass)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
Bells	X	X			X	X				X	X								
Belts																		X	X
Blankets		X	X				X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Buckles (Shoe)															X		X	X	X
Buttons															X		X		
Cloth																		X	
(Camelot)																		X	
(Dourgne)															X			X	
(Étoffe/Drap)	X		X		X					X									
(Écarlate)			X		X													X	X
(Indienne)																		X	X
(Limbourg)				X	X	X	X	X				X		X		X	X	X	X
(Mazamet)				X	X	X							X					X	
(Molton)															X			X	
(Platille)															X				
(Sempiterne)																		X	
(Toile)															X			X	X
Clothing																			
(Breechclouts)											X							X	X
(Breeches)																		X	X
(Coats)	X	X	X	X			X			X					X			X	X
(Cravats)																		X	
(Handerchiefs)																		X	X
(Hats)				X	X	X	X	X		X								X	X
(Leggings)										X								X	X
(Moccasins)																		X	X
(Plumes)						X												X	X
(Ribbons)												X			X			X	X
(Shirts)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X	X
(Shoes)										X								X	X
(Skirts)																		X	X
(Stockings)								X										X	X

Table 2.1 (Continued)

	1701	-02	-03	-13	-17	-18	-19	-21	-22	-26	-27	-33	-34	-43	-49	-56	-59	-60	-63		
(Suits of Clothes)																			X	X	
(Vests/ Waistcoats)																				X	X
Combs				X	X			X		X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X
Crosses																				X	
Earrings															X						
False Stones																					X
Gorget																					X
Gunflints	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X
Gunpowder		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Guns	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gun Worms	X	X	X	X		X		X			X				X				X	X	X
Hoes			X			X		X	X		X										X
Jet																					X
Kettles (Brass)	X	X	X	X		X		?	X						X				X	X	X
" " (Iron)								?			X										
Knives (Clasp)	X		X	X	X	X		X	X		X				X	X	?	X	X	X	X
" " (Sheath)	X	X	X		X	X	X								X		?	X	X	X	X
Lead					X			X									X		X	X	X
" " (Balls)		X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
" " (Shot)	X	X	X									X	X								
Liquor										X									X		X
Medals (Silver)																					X
Mirrors	X				X	X					X				X	X			X	X	X
Nails											X										X
Needles	X		X								X	X			X				X	X	X
Pipes (Smoking)			X																		
Powder Horns								X													X
Rings						X															X
" " (Signet)	X			X	X				X						X						
Salt									X						X				X	X	X
Scissors	X			X	X					X					X	X			X	X	X
Strike-a-lights					X	X					X				X				X	X	
Swords	X		X	X		X									X						
Thread											X	X							X	X	X
Tobacco			X																X	X	X
Trunks																					X
Vermilion	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X				X	X	X		X	X	X
Wire (Brass)				X							X	X			X				X	X	X
" " (Iron)				X				X			X								X		X

Table 2.1 (Continued)

*References:* Bossu 1962:135–136; Gérin-Lajoie 1979:289–300; Dart 1920; de Villiers du Terrage 1904:169–170; Hamilton 1910:532–534; Higginbotham 1977:76–77, 119–120; McDowell 1970:66, 245; Miquelon 1978:64; Rowland 1911:28–29; Rowland and Sanders 1927:41–45, 1929:143–160, 1932:260–261, 302–304, 327–328, 779–780; Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:4, 208–209, 5:227–241; Usner 1981:134.

*Manuscript Sources:* Archives Nationales, Paris, ser. C13A, 3:287–310, 5:137–138, 7:300–301, 18:62–68, 33:230v, 41:327–338v; *Mississippi Provincial Archives, French Dominion*, 8:112, 32:299–302; Huntington Library, Loudon Collection, LO 508.

75–76, 215; cf. Surrey 1968:100). Among the Creeks, French traders had to depend primarily on profits from brandy, which the English did not offer in trade, and on providing higher quality goods whenever possible (Rowland and Sanders 1932:698; Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:5, 171).

#### COMPETITION AND COLLUSION WITH ENGLISH TRADERS

The French often admitted that they could not match the English in the variety or volume of goods. They argued, however, that their goods were generally of higher quality. French-made limbourg cloth was repeatedly singled out as being “superior,” specifically in being heavier and more durable than English stroud (Rowland and Sanders 1927:369–370, 1929:613, 1932:596–597, 652, 668–669, 698–699; Mereness 1961:250; Jacobs 1950:69). Unfortunately for the French, the Indians’ conception of quality did not always coincide with their own. The heavy brass kettles sent to the Alabama Post, for instance, were not thought highly desirable by the Creeks, who preferred the lighter—and, to the French, less durable and inferior—English styles. Heavy swords and buccaneer muskets likewise won little favor among the Indians, who cherished ease of mobility (Rowland and Sanders 1927:349). But other types of French goods were generally conceded by all to be of a higher quality than their English counterparts. For example, Antoine Bonnefoy seemed to find agreement among the Cherokees in 1742 when he claimed “that a pound of our powder had twice as much effect as a pound of the English” (Mereness 1916:250; see also Paris, ser. C13A, vol. 18).

Occasionally efforts were made to improve the quality of inadequate merchandise or to find styles that were more acceptable to the Creeks. When poor quality muskets were distributed in 1743, the Indians were assured that the “best quality would be sent the next year along with other goods for the Ala-

bamas," and the muskets were indeed delivered in 1744 (Barron 1975:323–324, 360–361). In a lengthy letter to the French court dated 1743, Governor Vaudreuil transmitted a memoir by Commandant Hazeur at Fort Toulouse explaining the Creeks' apparent preference for English merchandise. He sent a sample of English ribbons, which he thought French manufacturers ought to imitate, and further stated that

we have not been in a position to be informed up to the present of the price of these ribbons or about the other articles of merchandise in the English factories. It would not even be easy to obtain this information, because that would appear suspicious to the English traders because of the affected indifference in which our traders are obliged to live with those of that nation, who neglect nothing in order to set the Indians against us by means of the ease that they have of contenting them by supplying them with all the things they need, even with several trifles that appeal to their tastes such as ribbons, braid, earrings, mirrors, buckles, belts, shoes, and stockings for men and women, coats of fine materials, fine hats, fine and often decorated shirts, in a word with everything that can flatter their imagination. More than this their arms, such as pistols and muskets, are much better and more adorned, and the traders give them credit very often and at a better price by more than half than our traders, since they sell for two skins that for which ours demand five for the reason that furs are dearer and more sought after in England than in France, a buckskin being worth five livres in England, while it is worth only two here. Supposing even that our goods were of better quality, the fact that there was a difference in the price would be enough to give the preference to the English, in addition to the fact that the latter make alliances with them by marrying their daughters and drinking and eating with them very familiarly. . . . It will be objected that it is surprising that these Indians do not restrict themselves to commerce with the English and that they do not abandon the French entirely. That would doubtless happen if the Indians were not obliged to resort to us for powder and lead, which they obtain with great difficulty from the English, in addition to the liquor, which is brought to them from here in abundance. . . . (Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:4, 208–209)

Although French and English traders usually competed for the deer skins offered in trade by the Creeks, there were numerous opportunities for Europeans and Indians alike to circumvent colonial trade regulations. On at least two occasions, Choctaw hunters exchanged their deer skins with Upper Creeks near Fort Toulouse, receiving "old Cloaths" and other secondhand items indirectly from the English, a practice that must have been quite common, though seldom recorded (Barron 1975:217; McDowell 1970:423; see Ray 1978).



There is also substantial evidence that the French garrison at the Alabama Post traded routinely with the English for cloth, gunflints, English ceramics, white-clay smoking pipes, and other objects (Adair 1930:343; Jacobs 1967:23–24; McDowell 1970:366; Waselkov 1989). Even at Mobile and New Orleans, ships' captains from New York and New England obtained deer skins in exchange for English trading goods, "especially the British Woolen Manufactures, which the French dispose of to the Creeks and Choctaws" (Candler 1904:415–416; Bossu 1962:135; Surrey 1968:352–353, 449).

## FRENCH TRADE WITH THE UPPER CREEKS

One might conclude from this historical review that musket balls could provide some of the firmest evidence for French-Creek trade in specific archaeological contexts. A detailed trace-element analysis is certainly needed, but as yet none has been attempted. The available evidence is limited to a few well-studied artifact categories (e.g., metal gun parts, gunflints, glass bottles, metal buttons, and glass beads) from a few sites in the lower Coosa and Tallapoosa river valleys.

Excavations at the site of Fort Toulouse II (the second French fort on the location, occupied from 1751 to 1763), have yielded some findings that bear on this discussion. Faunal remains suggest that Indian hunters may have supplied the post with a considerable amount of meat. From fort contexts nearly 21 percent of the total available meat came from white-tailed deer, whereas venison comprised nearly 33 percent of the meat represented by bone refuse in a nearby French household refuse pit (Waselkov 1984:30–31, 96). This contrasts markedly, however, with analyses of faunal remains from French contexts at Fort Ouiatenon and Fort Michilimackinac, where nondomesticates supplied 65 percent and 45 percent, respectively, of the meat (Martin 1991; Scott 1985:191).

Clearer data concerning trade at Fort Toulouse can be seen in the relative quantities of European and Creek ceramics, with the latter greatly outnumbering the former in refuse from the fort and village areas (Waselkov, Wood, and Herbert 198:27; Waselkov 1984:25–27, 97). At least three-quarters of the Creek ceramics are from large Chattahoochee Brushed jars that are thought to have been used primarily for storage. This assemblage seems to reflect the large-scale adoption of native-made storage jars by the French, as European-made storage vessels, such as Spanish olive jars and French redwares, are uncommon in the excavated samples. European-made vessels were heavy, bulky,

and inexpensive items that would have been costly and unprofitable to transport by boat from Mobile. Native-made ceramic vessels were readily available from neighboring Creek villages and would have been functionally, though probably not technically, equivalent. Recent ceramic studies indicate that several forms of colono vessels (ceramics made by Creek potters using traditional methods but copying French and Spanish forms) are an important segment of the ceramic assemblage at Fort Toulouse II (Brooms and Parker 1980:109; Waselkov 1984:27, 97; Ned Jenkins, pers. com. 1987). Some colono forms include copies of Spanish olive jars, French redware bowls, and faience plates. (For historical references to colono-Indian vessels used by French colonists, see Belting 1948:44; Dart 1922:469; Le Page Du Pratz 1974:342.)

There is now considerable evidence from the fort area as well as from the household refuse pit in the nearby French village that small ornaments were produced by the post's garrison and its civilian inhabitants for trade. This "cottage industry" included the manufacture of small tinkling cones and other pendants from scrap sheet brass and sheet silver, as indicated by the numerous discarded cuttings that have been recovered (Waselkov, Wood, and Herbert 1982:140; Pratt 1984:81; Waselkov 1984:24). In addition, straight pins that had been formed into suspension loops for use with earbobs and other sorts of pendants were found (Pratt 1984:90; Waselkov 1984:98). This evidence suggests that the French villagers were active participants in trade.

Turning to archaeological data from Indian village sites, one is faced with a very small number of French artifacts described in published reports. Most of the reported finds of French artifacts from Creek sites are of gun parts, knives, and buttons (see DeJarnette and Hansen 1960:52; Heldman and Ray 1975; Knight 1985:130). Some information was gathered during an analysis of the large collections at the Alabama Department of Archives and History, excavated by the Alabama Anthropological Society between 1909 and 1945 (Waselkov and Sheldon 1987). Still more is gradually being analyzed as part of a long-term archaeological study of Creek culture change, which has so far focused on the village sites of Hoithlewaulee (Waselkov 1985) and Fusihatchee (in progress). This work eventually should lead to some understanding of the role of Indian preferences in trade good selection. At Cherokee sites, for example, beads are predominantly black and white, contrasting dramatically with the prevalence of blue, white, and (to a lesser degree) red beads at Creek sites (cf. Harmon 1986:101; Waselkov 1985:47; see Surrey 1968:356-357 for a discussion of cloth colors appropriate to the Indian trade). Such a difference probably had more symbolic than economic significance.

This research has identified the rise of political and economic factions among the Creeks after the establishment of Fort Toulouse. After 1720 an increasing number of Creeks were buried with either French *or* English goods, suggesting symbolic representation of factional affiliation. More important, a number of individuals were buried in military coats or wearing presentation medals obtained from one colony or the other (Waselkov 1988). The coexistence of these two factions, one supporting political and economic ties with the English and the other with the French, is an important clue to the nature of Creek neutrality during the colonial period.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This chapter is based, in part, upon research supported by the National Science Foundation, under grants BNS-8305437, BNS-8507469, and BNS-8718934. I am most grateful to Patricia Galloway and Linda Waselkov for suggested interpretations of some French trade terms, although any remaining errors are my own.

## APPENDIX

### *Glossary of Louisiana French Trade Terminology*

*Aiguille*: Needle; includes *aiguille à coudre* (sewing needle).

*Aleine*: Awl; also spelled *alène*, *aleigne*, *alanne*, *alleine*, and *alaine*.

*Azur*: Blue pigment?

*Bague*: Ring; includes *bague à cachet* (signet ring or "finger ring with seal," probably equivalent to a Jesuit ring), *bague de laiton* (brass ring), *bague de traite de cuivre jaune* (brass trade ring), and *bague d'oreille* (earring).

*Balle*: Lead musket ball.

*Barril*: Barrel.

*Bas*: Stockings, hose.

*Batefeu*: Strike-a-light steel.

*Boucle de soulier*: Shoe buckle.

*Braguette*: Breechclout or "flap" (McDermott 1941:34).

*Camelot*: Cheap cloth of wool and goat's hair (Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:5, 240 n. 9) originally made in England of camel or goat hair and silk or wool (Cole 1964:2, 574).

- Capot*: Blanket coat or military greatcoat, usually red or blue (Dorrance 1935:64).
- Casaquin*: Short coat.
- Casse-tête*: Tomahawk; includes *casse-tête à calumet* (pipe tomahawk) and *casse-tête à pique* (spiked tomahawk).
- Ceinture*: Belt; includes *ceinture de traite* (trade belt).
- Chapeau*: Felt hat, often trimmed with imitation silver or gold braid; includes *chapeau de traite* (trade hat) and *chapeau bordé ou fin* (decorated or fine hat).
- Chaudière*: Kettle or cauldron; includes *chaudière de cuivre* (copper kettle) and *chaudière de cuivre jaune* (brass kettle).
- Chemise*: Man's shirt, usually white; includes *chemise de traite* (trade shirt, usually of linen [*toile de St. Jean*], specified in 1749 as being "as long in front as in back" [Usner 1981:134]), and *chemise garnie* (decorated shirt).
- Ciseaux*: Scissors; a shipment of Indian trade scissors came from St.-Étienne in 1743 (Miquelon 1978:64); includes *sizeaux garnis de jaune* (scissors decorated with brass).
- Clou à planche*: Nail.
- Coffre*: Trunk or chest; includes *coffre de traite* (trade trunk).
- Cordage*: Rope.
- Corne à poudre*: Powderhorn.
- Corset*: Waistcoat or vest, often quilted.
- Couteau*: Knife; includes *couteau boucheron* (sheath knife, sometimes translated as "woodcutter's knife," [Dorrance 1935:63; McDermott 1941:36]), *couteau à manche de bois* (knife with a wooden, often boxwood, handle), and *couteau siamois* ("Siamese" knife, a clasp type with wooden handle).
- Couverture*: Blanket; includes *couverture de bazas* (a coarse woolen blanket, perhaps of baize [Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:5, 240 n. 3] and perhaps equivalent to the "dog's hair" blankets given to slaves [Rowland and Sanders 1932:714]); *couverture à berceau* (baby's blanket); *couverture blanche* (white blanket, usually used in reference to fine woolen blankets from Rouen [Gérin-Lajoie 1979:296, 298]); *couverture fin* (fine blanket); and *couverture de 2 pointes, 2 pointes 1/2, 3 pointes* (2 and 2½ and 3 point blankets), referring to blanket weight and size and the corresponding number of marks woven into the blanket, originally indicating the purchase price in beaver skins (Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:5, 240 n. 2).
- Croix*: Cross.
- Culottes*: Breeches of écarlate, écarlatine, or limbourg.
- Dourgne*: Red and violet cloth (*Montauban cordellaterie*, a low quality cloth made with odd lots of wool [Thomson 1982:464]).
- Drap*: Coarse woolen cloth.
- Eau de vie*: Brandy; sometimes used more inclusively as "a name for all spirituous liquors" (Rowland and Sanders 1927:415 n. 1).
- Écarlatine*: Red woolen fabric originally made in England (there called *stroud* or *stroudwater*, and in France called *écarlatine d'Angleterre*, though its importation and sale were prohibited in France [Giraud 1974:201; Gérin-Lajoie 1979:292]).

- Écarlate*: Fine scarlet wool, top-quality imitation stroud (Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:5, 240 n. 8).
- Étoffe*: Stuff, a worsted woolen cloth used in 1702 for breechcloths (Gérin-Lajoie 1979:292).
- Fers de flèches à viroles*: Ferruled iron arrowheads.
- Fil*: Thread or wire; includes *fil à voile* (sail thread), *fil de Rennes* (sewing thread), *fil de laiton* (brass wire), and *fil de fer* (iron wire).
- Flatin*: Clasp knife; named after Denis Flatin, a cutler of St.-Étienne, "who, according to French contemporary records, invented the folding knife" (Gérin-Lajoie 1979:292); they often had horn or antler handles; specified in 1759 to come with *tête de chien* (dog's head), probably referring to a trademark (Rowland, Sanders, and Galloway 1984:5, 240 n. 6).
- Fusil*: Musket; includes *fusil fin* (fine-grade musket), *fusil commun* (standard-grade musket), *fusil de chasse* (hunting musket), *Tulle fusil* (musket made at Tulle), *fusil de traite* (trade musket), and *fusil 1/2 fin* (medium-quality musket).
- Galon*: Gold or silver lace braid in a tape or ribbon, for trimming coats and hats (Montgomery 1984:245).
- Grelot*: Horse bell, round.
- Grenat faux*: False gem.
- Guildive*: Rum (McDermott 1941:85).
- Habit*: Suit of clothes, of écarlate, écarlatine, or limbourg.
- Hache*: Ax; includes *demi hache* (small axe), *hache moyenne* (medium-sized axe), *hache de traite* (trade ax), and *hache de maître* (service ax).
- Haussecol*: Gorget; also spelled *hausse-col* or *housse-cou*.
- Indienne*: Block-printed cotton chintz, a type of calico cloth.
- Jambette*: Clasp knife; used interchangeably with *flatin*.
- Jayette*: Jet, probably in bead form for rosaries.
- Jupe*: Skirt.
- Ligne blanche*: White cord (?).
- Limbourg*: Lightweight woolen cloth, often red or blue.
- Mazamet*: Twilled woolen serge, usually red or blue, sometimes brown, specified in 1713 as having "a nap on one side" (Rowland and Sanders 1929:156).
- Miroir*: Mirror, with *fer blanc* (tin-plated) mirrored surface, sometimes in leather frames; includes *moyen miroir* (medium-sized mirror).
- Mitasses*: Pair of leggings (Read 1963:97).
- Molton*: Thick flannel duffel (also called *Molletone*); compare with English-made melton, a heavy woolen cloth with a smooth surface and a short nap, used for overcoats.
- Mouchoir de Cholet*: Handkerchief.
- Peigne*: Comb, frequently of boxwood, four or five inches long, issued annually to colonial troops.
- Pendant d'oreille*: Earring, particularly with a bob or dangle.
- Perle fausse*: False pearl; perhaps a blown bead type.

- Pierre à fusil*: Gunflint.
- Pioche*: Hoe; includes *pioche de traite* (trade hoe), and *pioche de maître* (large hoe).
- Platille*: Very fine, well-bleached linen (Montgomery 1984:325).
- Plomb*: Lead; including *plomb à oye* (goose shot).
- Plume*: Large feather or plume, used in the hair or on a hat; also *plumet*.
- Poudre*: Gunpowder.
- Rassade*: Glass bead; specifically, a round bead; tubular beads (imitation wampum) were called *canons* (Rowland and Sanders 1927:45 n. 3).
- Ruban*: Ribbon; includes *ruban de laine rouge* (red woolen ribbon), *ruban de padou* (silk ribbon, red and blue), and *ruban de soierie, soire, or soie*.
- Sac*: Sack; includes *sac de toile* (linen sack).
- Sel*: Salt; doled out by the *jointe* (double handful) in 1759 (Hamilton 1910:532–534).
- Sempiternne*: Twilled woolen stuff, resembling serge (Montgomery 1984:344, pl. D-49), colored blue, red, and plum.
- Souliers*: Shoes; includes *souliers de troupes* (soldier's shoes) and *souliers de pais* (moccasins).
- Tabac*: Tobacco.
- Taffia*: Rum.
- Tire-bourre*: Musket wormscrew or wad extractor.
- Toile de St. Jean*: Linen for lining suits and coats.
- Vermillon*: Vermilion pigment (mercuric sulfide), packaged in one-*livre* sacks, *bouestes* (boxes) of unspecified size, and barrels of fifty and one hundred *livres*; includes *vermillon meslé* (vermilion, mixed or blended, probably with red lead), and *vermillon pur* (pure vermilion).
- Veste*: Vest or waistcoat, of *écarlate*, *écarlatine*, or *limbourg*.

## REFERENCES CITED

- Huntington Library, San Marino, California  
 Loudon Collection, LO 508: Vaudreuil to Maurepas, September 1749.
- Mississippi Provincial Archives, French Dominion, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson, Mississippi  
 Vol. 8: 112, Memoir, 1717  
 Vol. 32: 299–302, Comparative Statement of Presents, November 1763
- Archives Nationales, Archives des Colonies, Paris (Paris)  
 Series C13A: 3:287–310, Duclos to Pontchartrain, 12 October 1713; 5:119–120, de Trefontaine to Lepinay, 8 October 1717; 5:137–138, Memoir, June 1718; 7:300–301, Presents, 6 No-

- vember 1722; 9:370f-373, Pauger to the Directors, 23 March 1725; 12:161-171v, Letters, September 1729; 18:62-68, Bienville and Salmon to the Minister, 5 April 1734; 30:369-369v, Cost of Munitions, 19 October 1745; 33:230v, List of Trade Goods, c. 1749; 41:327-338v, Statement of Requests, 1759  
 Series D2C: Vols. 51-52, Compagnies Louisiane, 1710-63  
 Archives du Ministère de Guerre, Vincennes (Vincennes).  
 Series A1 2592: Memoir, June 1720
- Adair, James  
 1930 *The History of the American Indians*. Samuel C. Williams, ed. Johnson City, Tenn.: Watauga Press. (Original document 1775.)
- Alden, John R.  
 1944 *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Barron, Bill  
 1975 *The Vaudreuil Papers*. New Orleans: Polyanthos.
- Belting, Natalia M.  
 1948 *Kaskaskia Under the French Regime*. Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences 29(3).
- Bossu, Jean-Bernard  
 1962 *Travels in the Interior of North America, 1751-1762*. Seymour Feiler, ed. and transl. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Brooms, Bascom McDonald, and James W. Parker  
 1980 *Fort Toulouse Phase III Completion Report*. Report to the Alabama Historical Commission, Montgomery.
- Candler, Allen G., ed.  
 1904 *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia*, vol. 2. Atlanta: Franklin Printing.
- Clark, John G.  
 1981 *La Rochelle and the Atlantic Economy During the Eighteenth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cole, Charles W.  
 1964 *Colbert and a Century of French Mercantilism*. 2 vols. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books.
- Crane, Verner W.  
 1981 *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732*. New York: Norton.

- Dart, Henry P., ed.  
 1920 Cabildo Archives, III. *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 3(3):322-360.  
 1922 A Gentleman of Pointe Coupee, 1743. *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 5(4):462-477.
- DeJarnette, David L., and Asael T. Hansen  
 1960 The Archaeology of the Childersburg Site, Alabama. Florida State University, Notes in Anthropology 6.
- Dorrance, Ward A.  
 1935 The Survival of French in the Old District of Sainte Genevieve. University of Missouri, Studies 10(2).
- Gérin-Lajoie, Marie, transl.  
 1979 Appendix B: Supplies for the Louisiana Colony and Trade Goods for the Indians during the Years 1701-1703 and 1733-1734. In *Tunica Treasure*, pp. 289-301. Harvard University, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology and Ethnology 71. Cambridge.
- Giraud, Marcel  
 1974 *A History of French Louisiana*. The Reign of Louis XIV, 1698-1715, Vol. 1. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Hamilton, Peter J.  
 1910 *Colonial Mobile*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Harmon, Michael A.  
 1986 Eighteenth Century Lower Cherokee Adaptation and Use of European Material Culture. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Volumes in Historical Archaeology 2.
- Heldman, Donald P., and R. Craig Ray  
 1975 A Late Historic Burial in Montgomery County, Alabama. *Journal of Alabama Archaeology* 21(1):79-97.
- Higginbotham, Jay  
 1977 *Old Mobile: Fort Louis de la Louisiane, 1702-1711*. Museum of the City of Mobile. Mobile, Alabama.
- Jacobs, Wilbur R.  
 1950 *Wilderness Politics and Indian Gifts: The Northern Colonial Frontier, 1748-1763*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.  
 1967 *The Appalachian Indian Frontier: The Edmond Atkin Report and Plan of 1755*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.



- Knight, Vernon J., Jr.  
 1985           Tukabatchee: Archaeological Investigations at an Historic  
 Creek Town, Elmore County, Alabama, 1984. University of  
 Alabama, Office of Archaeological Research, Report of Investi-  
 gations 45.
- Le Page Du Pratz, Antoine S.  
 1774           *The History of Louisiana*. London: T. Becket.
- Martin, Terrance J.  
 1991           An Archaeological Perspective on Animal Exploitation Patterns  
 at French Colonial Sites in the Midwest. In *French Colonial Ar-  
 chaeology*. John A. Walthall, ed. pp. 189-200. Champaign:  
 University of Illinois Press.
- McDermott, John F.  
 1941           *A Glossary of Mississippi Valley French, 1673-1850*. Washington  
 University Studies, Language and Literature, n.s., 12. St.  
 Louis.
- McDowell, William L., ed.  
 1970           *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1754-1765*. Columbia:  
 University of South Carolina Press.
- Mereness, Newton D., ed.  
 1916           *Travels in the American Colonies*. New York: Antiquarian Press.
- Miquelon, Dale  
 1978           *Dugard of Rouen: French Trade to Canada and the West Indies,  
 1729-1770*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Montgomery, Florence M.  
 1984           *Textiles in America, 1650-1870*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Pratt, Robert W.  
 1984           Analysis of a Late French Feature Located Near Fort Toulouse.  
 In *Fort Toulouse Studies*. Gregory A. Waselkov, ed. pp. 53-94.  
 Auburn University Archaeological Monograph 9.
- Ray, Arthur J.  
 1978           History and Archaeology of the Northern Fur Trade. *American  
 Antiquity* 43(1):26-34.
- Read, William A.  
 1963           *Louisiana-French*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University  
 Press.

- Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana (RSCLHQ)  
 1923-38      Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana (abstracts). *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 6:309, 14:603, 18:455, 21:899.
- Ross, Frank E.  
 1938      The Fur Trade of the Ohio Valley. *Indiana Magazine of History* 34(4):417-442.
- Rowland, Dunbar, ed.  
 1911      *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1766, English Dominion*.  
 Nashville: Brandon Printing.
- Rowland, Dunbar, and Albert G. Sanders, eds.  
 1927-32      *Mississippi Provincial Archives, French Dominion*, Vols. 1-3. Jackson: Mississippi Department of Archives and History.
- Rowland, Dunbar, Albert G. Sanders, and Patricia K. Galloway, eds.  
 1984      *Mississippi Provincial Archives, French Dominion*, Vols. 4-5. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Scott, Elizabeth M.  
 1985      *French Subsistence at Fort Michilimackinac, 1715-1781*. Mackinac Island State Park Commission, Archaeological Completion Report Series 9.
- Surrey, N. M. Miller  
 1968      *The Commerce of Louisiana During the French Regime, 1699-1763*. New York: AMS Press. (1st ed. 1916.)
- Swann, Maj. Caleb  
 1855      State of Arts and Manufactures, with the Creek Indians, in 1791. In *Information Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States*, Vol. 5. Henry B. Schoolcraft, ed. pp. 691-693. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Swanton, John R.  
 1946      The Indians of the Southeastern United States. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin no. 137. Washington, D.C.
- Thomson, J. K. J.  
 1982      *Clermont-de-Lodève, 1633-1789: Fluctuations in the Prosperity of a Languedocian Cloth-Making Town*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Usner, Daniel H., Jr.  
 1981      Frontier Exchange in the Lower Mississippi Valley: Race Relations and Economic Life in Colonial Louisiana, 1699-1783. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, Duke University.

- 1985            The Deerskin Trade in French Louisiana. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Meeting of the French Colonial Historical Society, 1984*. Philip P. Boucher, ed. pp. 75-93. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- Villiers du Terrage, Baron Marc  
 1904            *Les Dernières Années de la Louisiane Française*. Paris: Guilmoto.
- Waselkov, Gregory A.  
 1984            *Fort Toulouse Studies*. Auburn University Archaeological Monograph 9.  
 1985            *Culture Change on the Creek Indian Frontier*. Final Report to the National Science Foundation, grant BNS-8305437.  
 1988            Historic Creek Indian Responses to European Trade and the Rise of Political Factions. Paper presented at the 53d annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Phoenix, 30 April 1988.  
 1989            Introduction: Recent Archaeological and Historical Research at Fort Toulouse. In *Fort Toulouse: The French Outpost at the Alabamas on the Coosa*, pp. vii-xlii. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Waselkov, Gregory A., and Craig T. Sheldon, Jr.  
 1987            *Cataloguing and Documenting the Historic Creek Archaeological Collections of the Alabama Department of Archives and History*. Final Report to the National Science Foundation, grant BNS-8507469.
- Waselkov, Gregory A., Brian M. Wood, and Joseph M. Herbert  
 1982            *Colonization and Conquest: The 1980 Archaeological Excavations at Fort Toulouse and Fort Jackson, Alabama*. Auburn University Archaeological Monograph 4.
- Woodward, Thomas S.  
 1859            *Woodward's Reminiscences of the Creek, or Muscogee Indians, Contained in Letters to Friends in Georgia and Alabama*. Montgomery, Ala.: Barrett and Wimbish.



CALUMET  
FLEUR-DE-LYS



ARCHAEOLOGY  
OF INDIAN AND  
FRENCH CONTACT  
IN THE  
MIDCONTINENT

EDITED BY  
JOHN A. WALTHALL AND  
THOMAS E. EMERSON

© 1992 by the Smithsonian Institution  
All rights reserved

Editor: Karin Kaufman  
Production Editor: Duke Johns  
Designer: Kathleen Sims

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Calumet and fleur-de-lys : archaeology of Indian and French contact in the midcontinent / edited by John A. Walthall and Thomas E. Emerson.

p. cm.

Papers from Conference on French Colonial Archaeology in the Illinois Country, April 1988.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-56098-158-X (alk. paper)

1. Indians of North America—Illinois—Antiquities—Congresses. 2. French—Illinois—Antiquities—Congresses. 3. Indians of North America—Mississippi River Valley—Antiquities—Congresses. 4. French—Mississippi River Valley—Antiquities—Congresses. 5. Indians of North America—Great Lakes Region—Antiquities—Congresses. 6. French—Great Lakes Region—Antiquities—Congresses. 7. Illinois—Antiquities—Congresses. 8. Mississippi River Valley—Antiquities—Congresses. 9. Great Lakes Region—Antiquities—Congresses. I. Walthall, John A. II. Emerson, Thomas E., 1945- . III. Conference on French Colonial Archaeology in the Illinois Country (1988 : Springfield, Ill.)

E78.I3C34 1992

977.3'01—dc20

91-37953

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data is available

Manufactured in the United States of America

99 98 97 96 95 94 93 92 5 4 3 2 1

© The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials Z39.48-1984

For permission to reproduce illustrations appearing in this book, please correspond directly with the owners of the works, as listed in the individual captions. The Smithsonian Institution Press does not retain reproduction rights for these illustrations individually, or maintain a file of addresses for photo sources.