

**IDENTIFYING FORT SAN JUAN: A 16TH-CENTURY SPANISH OCCUPATION AT  
THE BERRY SITE, NORTH CAROLINA**

Robin A. Beck, Jr.

Northwestern University

David G. Moore

Warren Wilson College

Christopher B. Rodning

Tulane University

PLEASE DO NOT CITE IN ANY CONTEXT WITHOUT AUTHORS' PERMISSION

## ABSTRACT

In January 1567, a Spanish expedition under the command of Captain Juan Pardo arrived at the native town of Joara, located deep in the interior along the upper Catawba River in what is now western North Carolina. Here, Pardo founded a garrison, Fort San Juan, and manned it with 30 soldiers. Fort San Juan de Joara was occupied for nearly eighteen months and was the earliest European settlement in the interior of the present United States. This was the most important of several forts that Pardo built during the course of his expedition across the Carolinas and eastern Tennessee, but all were destroyed by natives in 1568. Archaeological research indicates that the Berry site (31BK22), located near Morganton, North Carolina, was the site of Joara and Fort San Juan. In this paper, we use documents from Pardo's expeditions to suggest material correlates for Fort San Juan; we then compare these specific correlates with archaeological data from the Berry site. These data include 16th-century Spanish ceramics and hardware, which we have recovered in association with a compound of several burned buildings and large features. We conclude that this compound represents the material remains of Fort San Juan.

Columbus' landfall in the Bahamas in October 1492 initiated what was perhaps the most dramatic century of cultural exchange in human history. Over two continents, the native peoples of the Americas withstood waves of explorers, colonists, and proselytizers from Spain, England, France, Portugal, the Netherlands, and other distant centers of European colonial aspiration. Of these nations, Spain was by far the most ambitious in its early efforts at exploration and conquest (Bray 1993; Deagan 2003; Thomas 1989, 1990, 1991). Archaeological research at the Berry site in North Carolina (Figure 1) sheds significant new light on this time of the first sustained contact between Europeans and the peoples of North America, as its borderland setting was the northern frontier of Spain's long reach (e.g., Hoffman 1990; Hudson 1990; Lyon 1976; Paar 1999). Here, in January 1567 at a native village named Joara, Captain Juan Pardo founded a garrison, Fort San Juan, and manned it with thirty soldiers. Although occupied for little more than 18 months, until May of 1568, this was the earliest European settlement founded in the interior of what is now the United States. Its founding also initiated one of the longest periods of sustained contact between Europeans and the native peoples of North America's interior until the seventeenth century. Our research into the long-forgotten episode of Fort San Juan's construction and subsequent fiery end promises to shed new light on the history of Spanish colonization along the Atlantic frontier, and on the ethnogenesis of this region's Historic-period native societies.

#### THE JUAN PARDO EXPEDITIONS AND FORT SAN JUAN

During the first half of the sixteenth century, a succession of Spanish explorers failed in their efforts to colonize what is now the southeastern United States [León (1521), Ayllón (1526),

Narváez (1528), Soto (1539-1544), and Luna (1559-1561)]. In 1565-1566, Pedro Menéndez de Avilés finally succeeded in founding two small settlements on the southern Atlantic Coast: San Agustín, founded September 1565 in northern Florida, and Santa Elena, founded April 1566 on present Parris Island, South Carolina; the latter was to be the principal site of Menendez' colonial aspirations (Hoffman 1990; Hudson 1990; Lyon 1976, 1984; Paar 1999). When Philip II learned of this success, he ordered reinforcements for the new colony. In July 1566, Captain Juan Pardo arrived at Santa Elena with a company of 250 soldiers and began to fortify the settlement. As the Santa Elena colony was ill-prepared to feed this large contingent of men for very long, however, Menendez ordered Pardo to prepare half of his army for an expedition into the interior lands that lay behind the Atlantic coast. Pardo's task was to explore the region, to claim the land for Spain while pacifying local Indians, and to find an overland route from Santa Elena to the silver mines in Zacatecas, northern Mexico. Pardo departed with 125 men on December 1, 1566.

In January 1567, after having traversed much of the Carolina Piedmont along the Wateree and Catawba rivers, Pardo and his soldiers arrived at Joara (Figure 2), a large native town located in the upper Catawba Valley at the base of the Appalachians (DePratter, et. al 1983:132; Hudson 1990:25). In their original reconstruction of Pardo's entrada through this region, DePratter, et al. (1983:132) located Joara at the McDowell site (31MC41) near the present town of Marion, North Carolina, 20 miles west of the Berry site. Since then, archaeological data--which we will discuss in this article--indicate that Berry, near present Morganton, is the likely location of Joara. In his book-length study of the Hernando de Soto expedition, which passed through Joara in May 1540, Charles Hudson (1997:187, 480) has agreed with our identification of this town as the Berry site. The chief of Joara, referred to in the Pardo documents as Joara Mico [Mico being native term for regional leader (Anderson 1994:96; Hudson 1990:62)], enjoyed some form of political authority

over several neighboring communities in the upper Catawba Valley (Beck and Moore 2002:201). Pardo renamed this town Cuenca, after his own native city in Spain. He built a fort at Joara, San Juan, and manned it with thirty soldiers. San Juan was to be his first and most important garrison along the proposed route across to northern Mexico (Hudson 1990:150).

Earlier expeditions in the interior had founded seasonal encampments, such as the winter forts that Soto constructed at Apalachee Anhaica (1539) and Chicasa (1540), or had temporarily taken over native villages, such as Luna's appropriation of Nanipacana (1560), but Juan Pardo's founding of Fort San Juan was an explicit attempt to expand Santa Elena to the deep frontiers of La Florida, and to simultaneously forge strategic alliances with local native leaders. In so doing, he founded what we suggest was the earliest European colony (i.e., a settlement having intended longevity or permanence) in the interior of what is now the United States. In his written account of the first expedition, Pardo recorded that Joara was "located at the foot of a range of mountains, surrounded by rivers" (Pardo 1990:312); as noted, Soto visited this same village briefly in 1540, though documents from his expedition refer to the town as Xuala (Hudson 1997:187; Hudson, et al. 1984:67). Pardo noted that, at Joara, "I found a large number of Indians and caciques...I made a fort where Boyano, my sergeant, and certain soldiers remained with their munitions of powder, matchcord, balls, and maize to eat" (Pardo 1990:312).

Pardo left Joara and returned to Santa Elena on March 7, 1567. During the course of that summer, Sergeant Moyano [Moyano is the accepted modern spelling] went northwest across the mountains with twenty soldiers from the fort and a party of warriors from Joara to attack hostile chiefs in two different native towns (Beck 1997b). San Juan itself was manned by a small group of ten men until Pardo returned to Joara on September 24. Pardo received word at this time that Moyano was trapped at Chiaha, a native town in what is now eastern Tennessee, and he departed

at once from Joara to the aid of Moyano and his men. Pardo arrived at Chiaha in time to relieve Moyano and his outnumbered force, then tried to continue exploring the Tennessee River valley. Three days later, at the town of Satapo, he was informed of a plot to ambush the expedition, and so he wisely decided to turn back. At Chiaha, he and his men built a small fort and christened it Fort San Pedro. At a native town named Cauchi, probably on the upper Pigeon River in western North Carolina, they built another fort, San Pablo (Hudson 1990:40).

On November 6, Pardo's force returned to what his scribe Juan de la Bandera referred to as "the city of Cuenca and fort of San Juan which in the Indian tongue is called Joara, where he made a halt and remained twenty days because the people of his company were tired and poorly provided, that they might have a place to rest and to provide themselves." (Bandera 1990:277). Pardo again left thirty men at the fort before departing Joara. Along his return to Santa Elena, he constructed small forts at three other native villages, bringing the total number of forts to six. It is clear from their accounts that Pardo and his scribe Bandera considered Fort San Juan to be the most important of the settlements in the interior. First, this fort was manned with thirty soldiers, the largest contingent assigned to one of Pardo's frontier garrisons. Also, Bandera indicates that Pardo provided Fort San Juan with both a greater quantity of military and construction materials, and with a more extensive array of goods, than any of the other interior forts. Finally, Pardo left Alberto Escudero de Villamar in charge of Fort San Juan, and ordered that Villamar was to have nominal authority over the officers left in charge of the other forts (Hudson 1990:150).

By May 1568, news reached Santa Elena that Indians had attacked all of Pardo's interior forts, and that all had fallen. Only one Spanish soldier, Juan Martín de Badajoz, appears to have escaped the destruction. Although it is not known whether all of these forts were attacked at the same time, it is clear that none remained by June 1568 (Hudson 1990:176). Several factors may

have had a role in the Indians' decision to destroy the forts, but two stand out: Spanish demands for food and the soldiers' improprieties with native women. Bandera recorded, for example, that "the captain commanded him [the corporal placed in charge of Fort Santiago] in the name of His Majesty...that no one should dare bring any woman into the fort at night and that he should not depart from the command under pain of being severely punished" (1990:285). In any event, 130 soldiers and all six of the forts were lost, and with them Spain's only attempt to colonize the deep interior of northern La Florida. Indeed, no other Europeans are known to have penetrated this far into the southern Appalachians until the second half of the seventeenth century.

#### THE MATERIAL CORRELATES OF FORT SAN JUAN

The Pardo accounts offer several clues as to what kinds of material correlates we might find in association with the archaeological remains of Fort San Juan. There were two categories of architecture that the company used at Joara: defensive fortifications and the houses where the soldiers lived. None of the documents specifically described Fort San Juan. However, Bandera did describe the fortifications at Fort Santiago, which Pardo built at the native village of Guatari, located about 150 km east of Joara along the Yadkin River (Bandera was not present on the first expedition, when Fort San Juan was built). Pardo founded Fort Santiago after his departure from Joara in November 1567. Afraid that he and his men would be recalled to Santa Elena, Bandera noted that Captain Pardo spent five days at Guatari hurriedly building two "*bastardos*" (Bandera 1990:238), which Hudson identifies as "bastions...of logs and earth" (1990:151). When no such summons came, Pardo's soldiers--along with the people of Guatari and neighboring towns--spent

seventeen more days building four tall "*cavalleros*" (Bandera 1990:239) of thick wood and earth, and a palisade of high poles and earth. Fort Santiago clearly required large amounts of earth and wood, including bastions and a tall palisade; given that Fort San Juan was to be the principal fort in the interior, we would expect Pardo to have invested no less effort in its construction.

During his first expedition, Pardo instructed the chiefs of several native towns, including Joara, to build houses for the soldiers who would be stationed in their towns along the proposed road to Zacatecas. When Pardo arrived at Joara during his second expedition, Bandera noted he "found built a new house of wood with a large elevated room full of maize, which the cacique of the village, who is called Joada [sic] Mico had built by the command of the captain" (1990:265). At several of the towns where Pardo ordered houses built, Bandera noted that the structures were large, likely in relation to the Indians' own houses (Hudson 1990:141). These houses were built for Pardo's expedition at a number of different native towns, and we might therefore expect such buildings to reflect different native construction techniques, as the social territory that Pardo and his company traversed was marked by distinct practices of house-building. Bandera (1990:263), for example, specifically described the circular floor plan and mat-covered interior of the house built for Pardo at Guatari. This is not surprising, as Guatari was situated along the western edge of the Piedmont Siouan tradition, distinguished by circular houses (e.g., Ward and Davis 1999). Pisgah peoples in the Appalachian Summit area west of Guatari favored square houses (Dickens 1976), and as we will show, data from the Berry site suggest that the Burke people of Joara also favored square houses (Moore and Beck 2002; Moore, Beck, and Rodning 2004). We expect the houses built for Pardo's soldiers to reflect native construction techniques, but it seems likely that the Spaniards contributed their labor, experience, and ideas, as well.

Bandera also listed the supplies that Pardo left at each of the interior forts; these lists may provide one of the best sources of information regarding the material correlates of Fort San Juan. Most of the artifact classes on Bandera's lists are materials that never entered into Spanish-native exchange networks, so their presence on archaeological sites deep in the interior may be taken as strong evidence of extended Spanish presence rather than short-term contact or exchange (Worth 1994). During his two expeditions, Pardo issued the following military and construction supplies for Fort San Juan, the largest quantity left at any of the forts (Hudson 1990:148-150):

235 lbs of arquebus powder	42 chisels
201 lbs of matchcord	6 shovels
235 lbs of lead	4 mattocks
4 crossbows and 240 crossbow bolts	4 picks
2 socketed axes	4 iron wedges
34 lbs of nails*	

\*of all Pardo's forts, only Fort San Juan was supplied with nails

In addition to the supplies that he specifically left at the fort, Pardo carried 878 pounds of biscuit and 72 liters of wine for provisions (Hudson 1990:126-127); while the biscuit was likely carried in linen sacks unlikely to be recovered in archaeological contexts, the wine was almost certainly transported in the ceramic vessels known as Olive Jars--the typical containers colonial Spaniards used for transport and storage. We may thus expect the archaeological remains of Fort San Juan to include artifact classes that did not enter into documented Spanish-native exchange networks and that are very uncommon--or altogether absent--on contemporaneous interior sites, especially lead shot, nails, and sixteenth-century Spanish ceramics (Worth 1994). Pardo gave gifts to many of the chiefs that he met on his expeditions, including iron knives and chisels, cloth, buttons, and glass beads (Hudson 1990:135-140); we should expect to recover such items at Joara.

In sum, we suggest the following architectural and artifactual correlates of Spanish Fort San Juan. It is probable that the construction of the fort included a palisade and possible earthen

embankments. The nature of structures inside the fort is uncertain, though the accounts suggest that the presence of houses larger than those typically used by natives might reflect Spanish use or occupation. Unfortunately, the archaeological remains of these fort features may be difficult to discriminate from similar native structures. The presence of certain types of Spanish artifacts may prove a better correlate of Spanish occupation. Quantities of lead shot, wrought nails, and Spanish ceramics--items that did not enter the Spanish-native trade networks--could substantiate the direct and extended presence of Spaniards and the location of Pardo's forts. We turn now to examine the Berry site with respect to these expected correlates of Spanish occupation.

#### THE BERRY SITE, JOARA, AND FORT SAN JUAN

Archaeological and documentary evidence (e.g., Beck 1997b; Moore 2002; Worth 1994) indicate that the Berry site (31BK22) is the location of Joara and Fort San Juan. Berry is located along Upper Creek, a tributary of the upper Catawba River, in what is now Burke County, North Carolina (Figure 1); the site covers 4.5 ha and is located at the eastern margin of a 75 ha alluvial floodplain at the junction of Upper and Irish creeks. Systematic surface collections indicate that Berry was one of the largest late prehistoric sites in the upper Catawba Valley (Beck and Moore 2002:200; Moore 2002:61). Berry was briefly noted in Cyrus Thomas' *Catalogue of Prehistoric Works East of the Rocky Mountains* as a "Mound on the west Bank of Upper Creek 8 miles north of Morganton (about 15 feet high and unexplored)" (1891:151). Both the earthen mound and the surrounding site were regularly plowed, and in 1964 the mound was bulldozed to provide fill for a low-lying area to the west of the site--probably the original borrow pit--that was often prone to

flooding. Today, the remaining mound measures about 70 m in diameter and rises to a height of about 1.5 m above the surrounding field.

During the sixteenth century, the Berry site (i.e., Joara) sat at the northeastern edge of the Mississippian cultural world and at the northwestern edge of the Spanish colonial frontier. Berry was the political and ritual center of a Mississippian chiefdom, one of many similar polities that dotted the cultural landscape of the eastern United States from A.D. 1000-1600 (Anderson 1994; Beck 2003; Blitz 1999; Hally 1996; Knight 1990; Muller 1997; Smith 1978). Systematic survey north and south of Berry (Beck 1997a) yielded evidence of at least 25 other sites, some of which cover as much as 2.5 ha, and ceramic analysis suggests that many are probably contemporaneous with the Berry site; together, we believe that these sites form the core of the Berry site's regional polity, or chiefdom (Beck and Moore 2002). Moore (2002) has defined this period of occupation along the upper Catawba River as the Burke phase (A.D. 1400-1600), and he identifies its highly distinctive pottery as a regional variant of the Lamar cultural tradition (Hally 1994; Williams and Shapiro 1990). Burke ceramics are soapstone tempered and marked by a preponderance of plain and complicated stamped jars (Figure 3, top) and incised cazuela bowls (Figure 3, bottom). This set of ceramic features is largely restricted to the upper Catawba and nearby Yadkin valleys, and its distribution is a unifying element of Catawba Valley Mississippian in this area.

Our work at Berry, under the auspices of the Upper Catawba Valley Archaeology Project, has included systematic surface collection and gradiometer survey over the entire 5 ha site (Beck 1997a; Hargrove and Beck 2001; Schroedl and Moore 2002). Excavations, which total over 900 m<sup>2</sup> to date, have focused on the 0.5 ha area (Figure 4) immediately north and south of the mound, where we have recovered a relatively large assemblage of Spanish ceramics and hardware. What is more, our excavations in this northern part of the site have revealed a compound of five burned

buildings. In the following sections, we examine data from Berry with regard to the documented material correlates of Fort San Juan: Spanish material culture, and architectural remains.

#### Correlate 1: Sixteenth-Century Spanish Ceramics and Hardware

Not surprisingly, the vast majority of cultural materials recovered in this compound area are of native manufacture, including a predominance of Burke ceramics. As Deagan has recently stated, “easily identifiable European objects [and] artifacts may not be abundant or even present in Native American sites occupied early in the contact period” (2004:603). In the particular case of Fort San Juan, Pardo’s expedition had no horses--and there is no mention of porters--such that expedition members likely carried most of their provisions on their own backs. Nonetheless, we have recovered a relatively large assemblage of sixteenth-century Spanish artifacts from the area of the compound, both from feature and plowzone contexts. Features 23, 25, 38, and 48, as well as Structure 1, have yielded Spanish items (see Figure 4 and Table 1); as yet, we have excavated no other major features in the compound area. Of the 89 items that we have identified as related to Spanish occupation, 37 have been recovered from these *in situ* deposits. Non-Spanish historic materials have been recovered from the plowzone, but the vast majority of these are small pieces of iron scrap. This group of material also includes several cut and wire nails, a few fragments of whiteware and porcelain, modern bullets, plastic, modern hardware, etc. None of this modern or more recent material has appeared in undisturbed (i.e., feature) contexts.

Spanish ceramics from this area of the site include 13 sherds from at least four Olive Jars (Figure 5). Olive Jars are the most ubiquitous ceramics recovered from Spanish colonial sites in the Americas, and their use spanned a period from the 1490's to the nineteenth century (Deagan 1987:28). These amphora-derived vessels were typically used for transporting and storing olive

oil (hence the name) and wine, but were also used for transporting olives, lard, condiments, and vegetables like beans and chick peas (Goggin 1960:256). As we have noted, Pardo's provisions included 72 liters of wine, and this was almost certainly transported in Olive Jars. Olive Jars are widely distributed throughout the Caribbean, Mexico, and Central America, and are occasionally found in the American Southwest. While common along the Atlantic coast, they are rarely found in the interior Southeast (excluding Florida).

Unfortunately, none of the Olive Jar sherds recovered at the Berry site are, in themselves, temporally diagnostic; lacking neck or handle fragments it is generally not possible to distinguish early-, middle-, and late-style jars (Deagan 1987:28-34; Goggin 1960). However, several sherds from Berry are quite diagnostic, including a sherd of Caparra Blue majolica (Figure 6). Caparra Blue is a common-grade, tin-enameled earthenware (Lister and Lister 1982:61-62). In the New World, Caparra Blue has a chronological range of 1492 to about 1600 (Deagan 1987:63), and is known to occur in but a single form: the albarello, or drug jar (Lister and Lister 1982:61). These small, carinated vessels are characterized by a slightly indrawn body, a short neck, a wide mouth, and a foot ring around the base. While never common, Caparra Blue majolica has been found on many Caribbean sites; on sites in Mexico and Central America, and at Nueva Cadiz, Venezuela; and from the southeastern United States at Santa Elena and sixteenth-century St. Augustine (e.g., Deagan 1987:63; Goggin 1968:135). Ewen and Hann (1998) also report that Caparra Blue was found at the Governor Martin site, location of Hernando De Soto's 1539 winter encampment near present-day Tallahassee, Florida. There, Caparra Blue was recovered alongside early-style Olive Jars, Columbia Plain majolica, and other sixteenth-century, common-grade ceramic types typical of those used on military expeditions.

The Berry assemblage also includes six small sherds of what appears to be Mexican Red Painted ware (Figure 7), all from a single vessel of indeterminate form. This ware was defined by Hale Smith (1949), based on its similarities to Aztec Red ceramics, and Deagan (2002:43-44) has dated the ware to A.D. 1550-1750. Mexican Red Painted was produced in Mexico and other production centers in the Americas. It is an unglazed coarse earthenware with smoothed surfaces painted or burnished red, and molded or relief decoration is sometimes present; a molded design is apparent on one of the sherds from the Berry site. The temporal distributions of Mexican Red Painted ware (A.D. 1550-1750) and Caparra Blue majolica (A.D. 1492-1600) overlap during the period from A.D. 1550-1600, suggesting that the assemblage of Spanish artifacts from the Berry site may be dated to a relatively narrow fifty-year interval consistent with Juan Pardo's founding of Fort San Juan in January 1567.

The assemblage of sixteenth-century Spanish ceramics recovered from the Berry site is distinct from other collections of Spanish material recorded from sites in the interior Southeast, as most collections consist primarily of glass beads and other non-utilitarian trade goods (Smith 1987). Sites in the interior (excluding Florida) have yielded only three sixteenth-century Spanish sherds: a fragment of Columbia Plain majolica from the Pine Log Creek site in central Alabama (Little and Curren 1989:183), a sherd of unidentified majolica from the McMahan site in central Tennessee (Smith 1987:50), and one fragment of orange micaceous earthenware from the Lyon's Bluff site in northern Mississippi (Peacock and Hogue 2005:53). Significantly, two of these (all but the specimen from Lyon's Bluff) had been altered by native people into non-utilitarian forms such as ear spools or gaming disks. That none of the Spanish ceramics recovered from the Berry site exhibit such alterations suggests that these were simply discarded as utilitarian debris. Also,

as Worth (1994) notes, the presence of multiple sherds from several different Olive Jars suggests that these were broken at the site, having arrived intact as part of a Spanish occupation.

In addition to the Spanish ceramics, this section of the Berry site has yielded examples of other artifact classes that we would expect to find at the location of Fort San Juan, including lead shot, quartered lead shot, and lead sprue (Figure 8), all in the same caliber range as the shot and quartered shot from Santa Elena (South, et al. 1988:75-87). Wrought iron nails from this part of the site (Figure 9) can be classed as the *Barrote* type, based on their length and weight, and were used for finishing work such as flooring, matting, and other projects requiring little strength (South, et al. 1988:39-40). We have also identified brass aglets or lacing tips (Figure 10) similar to those from Santa Elena (South, et al. 1988:135), as well as numerous fragments of brass scrap and several brass cones.<sup>1</sup> This scrap may reflect aboriginal use or alteration, but it also may be a by-product of Spanish alteration or recycling. Of 31 brass items, 14 are from undisturbed feature contexts. Several glass beads have also been found in feature, structure, and plowzone contexts, but none of these are temporally diagnostic. In 1986, Moore (2002:237-239) discovered an iron knife in the burial of a fully extended adult male, located just to the south of the remnant mound. A burial bundle that consisted of a turtle shell container, a clay elbow pipe, projectile points, and stone abraders accompanied this individual. Similar bundles were recovered in sixteenth-century burials at the King site in northwest Georgia (Hally 1994:243) and at Toqua in eastern Tennessee (Polhemus 1987:478-430). Pardo presented eight knives to Joara Mico as gifts for his “subjects” (Bandera 1990:265), and this knife from the Berry site may have been one of those gifts.

---

<sup>1</sup> While we use the term *brass* in reference to this material, we recognize that it may also be *copper* of European origin; the important point is that this material is almost certainly not of native origin, though some of it may have been used or altered by native peoples.

## Correlate 2: Architectural Remains

In 1997, gradiometer and auger testing revealed the presence of four burned buildings, as well as several large features, in the 0.5 ha area north of the remnant mound (Beck and Hargrove 2002); subsequent gradiometer survey of the remaining 4 ha of the site yielded no clear evidence of burned buildings (Schroedl and Moore 2002), suggesting that burned architecture is restricted to that part of the site where most of the Spanish materials have been recovered. Since 2001, we have exposed more than 900 m<sup>2</sup> in this area, defining a ‘compound’ of five burned buildings that form an oval pattern around what was probably a courtyard area. Large pit features--from which we have recovered brass lacing tips, glass beads, small iron fragments, and scrap brass, as well as faunal remains and native-made Burke ceramics--occupy the spaces between buildings (Best and Rodning 2002). Lines of posts located adjacent to Structures 1 and 3 suggest that a palisade may have enclosed the compound, which we believe constitutes the remains of Fort San Juan. All of the structures were built in semi-subterranean basins that cut into the subsoil, and as they burned, their collapsing remains filled their respective basin pits. All of the buildings are approximately square: Structures 1-4 each measure about 64 m<sup>2</sup> (8 m on a side), and Structure 5 measures about 40 m<sup>2</sup> (6.5 m on a side).

There is a complex stratigraphic relationship between Structure 4 and the mound, as may be inferred from Figure 4. Most of this building appears to lie beneath the north perimeter of the mound, and if the building is part of the Spanish compound (as we currently expect), then at least one stage of mound construction post-dates the burning of the garrison. Data from Moore’s 1986 fieldwork offer intriguing support for this possibility. Two sherds of Olive Jar (Figure 5: second row, first and second sherds from left) and one fragment of lead sprue (Figure 8: upper left) were recovered from a partially intact humus zone overlaying moundfill along the south margin of the

mound. At the time this humus zone was forming, the mound appears to have been less than 1 m high (Moore 2002: Figure 23). This suggests that most of the mound's mass was added *after* the humus zone formed--and thus after the Olive Jar and lead sprue were deposited--since the mound eventually reached a height of 4-5 m (Thomas 1891:151). While it is possible that these Spanish artifacts were intrusive into the humus zone [which had been plowed in areas, probably by horse- or mule-drawn plow (Moore 2002:218)], it is equally possible that the mound reached its greatest height only after the fort's destruction, and that Structure 4 was built alongside, or perhaps into, a much lower earthwork than the mound described by Cyrus Thomas in 1891. Future stratigraphic analysis and excavations in this area of the site will help to resolve the chronological relationship between Structure 4 and the mound.

To date, we have entirely exposed Structure 3--and large portions of Structures 1, 2, and 5--to the base of plowzone; we have only opened one 2 x 2 m unit to expose the top of Structure 4 (see Figure 4). All of the buildings exhibit clear evidence of destruction by fire (i.e., bright red soils, large sections of carbonized wood and cane, carbonized upright posts), and none show any evidence of post-burning construction activities (notwithstanding the possibility that Structure 4 was buried underneath later episodes of mound construction). We have conducted sub-plowzone excavations into one of the five buildings, Structure 1, to determine the nature and depth of intact deposits within the structure.

Fieldwork during 2001 and 2002 exposed most of the top of Structure 1 to the base of the plowzone, revealing doorway trenches in its west corner. In 2003, we exposed a 6 x 2 m (12 m<sup>2</sup>) section across the entry area from north to south, in three contiguous 2 x 2 m units approximately 1 m inside (east of) the doorway trenches. At the base of plowzone, we divided the 2 x 2 m units into 1 x 1 m squares. First, we removed a sterile, homogenous brown soil along the perimeter of

the building, just outside the burned posts and fired soils of the wall. This deposit, Zone 1, was a fill that sealed the gap between the completed building wall and the edge of the semisubterranean basin cut. Zone 2 is the soil deposited between the base of the plowzone and the uppermost layer of carbonized wood, cane thatch, and other organics *inside* the structure. Zone 3 is soil between the uppermost layer of burned organics and the structure floor. Zone 4 is the very thin lens of the structure floor, and Zone 5 is the sterile subsoil below the floor. Zones 1 and 2 were additionally sub-divided into arbitrary levels. We only excavated a single 1 x 1 m unit, located just inside the doorway trenches, through the Zone 4 floor to the Zone 5 subsoil.

These excavations, though relatively limited in extent, have yielded abundant information about the building's construction and use history (Figure 12), such as carbonized wood posts and timbers from its walls and roof, possible cane matting from the walls and floor, and architectural furniture such as a wooden bench along the wall. Two lines of data suggest that Europeans may have helped to build the structure, and may subsequently have spent time inside it. First, though the general style of Structure 1 is consistent with native techniques and technologies, some of its timbers appear to have been cut by metal tools, one having been prepared with a probable square cut notch (Figure 13). While the plan and organization of Structure 1 is therefore consistent with native practices of house construction, the probable metal cut wood suggests that Europeans may have worked together with native craftsmen to build this structure. What is more, excavations in the southwestern corner of Structure 1, above the floor surface (Zone 3, Level 2) and next to the wall bench, yielded two small pieces of twisted iron wire (recovered during waterscreening) that Stanley South and Chester DePratter have identified as fragments of chain mail (2003, personal communication). Individual links of mail routinely separated from armor--archaeologists found many such fragments, for example, at the aforementioned Governor Martin site (Ewen and Hann

1998:xx)--and the fragments from Structure 1 at Berry (Figure 14) may have been lost upon the seat of the bench or else ended up under the bench on the floor of the building. The recovery of chain mail and the presence of what are probably metal cut timbers strongly support our view of this building as a quarters for members of the Pardo expedition.

The sequence of depositional events across Structure 1 indicate that its collapsed remains slumped shortly after the building burned to the ground, and that they were subsequently covered by a layer of homogenous fill that leveled the surface over the building. This deposit was clearly intentional, given the presence of a smashed Burke phase vessel within its matrix, and may have served the functional purpose of leveling the slumped portions of the structure. However, it may also have served to bury the structure's remains--and to have removed all traces of the associated events from view--through an act of ritual purification. It bears repeating in this regard that there is no evidence of later construction activity over this or any of the other buildings.

## CONCLUSIONS

Archaeological and documentary evidence presented in this article suggest that the Berry site, situated in the upper Catawba Valley of western North Carolina, is the location of Joara and the 1567-1568 garrison of Fort San Juan, the earliest European settlement in the interior of what is now the United States. Spanish artifacts recovered from the northern 0.5 ha section of the site constitute an occupation--rather than trade--assemblage, and consist primarily of ceramics, brass, and hardware. Ongoing excavations in this same part of the site have revealed a close compound of five burned buildings possibly surrounded by a palisade, with numerous large features spaced

around the buildings. Moreover, gradiometer surveys conducted over the remaining 4 ha of the site suggest that these are its only burned buildings. Excavations inside Structure 1 have yielded fragments of chain mail and timbers that may have been cut with metal tools; European materials recovered in the features include brass aglets or lacing tips, brass scrap, iron fragments, and glass beads. Based upon the expected archaeological correlates of Fort San Juan that we derived from the various accounts of the Juan Pardo expeditions, we suggest that this compound represents the material remains of Fort San Juan, and that these structures are the houses that quartered Pardo's soldiers. That all of the buildings were burned may serve as a chilling testament to how relations between the Spaniards and the people of Joara ended tumultuously in 1568.

The arrival of the sixteenth-century expeditions under Hernando De Soto and Juan Pardo undoubtedly altered the historical trajectories of Mississippian chiefdoms in the Catawba Valley. At the same time, the contents of Structure 1 and the other burned buildings promise to shed light on how Spanish soldiers maintained their European identities in a faraway place, while they were simultaneously incorporating features of native lifeways into their daily practices. The Berry site allows us to directly examine these aspects of contact as we inquire into the nature of the Spanish presence at the site. By illuminating the changing relationships between Spanish soldiers and the native peoples of Joara, continued research at Berry will offer unique insights into the beginnings of European colonialism in this borderland region. Moving beyond Berry, Spanish documentary sources provide a beginning point for learning more about the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century social landscape of the area. Ultimately, we hope to better understand how the process of contact contributed to the apparent depopulation of the entire upper Catawba Valley by the early decades seventeenth century, and to the ethnogenesis of the Historic-period native peoples of the Carolina Piedmont, especially the Catawba Indians (Moore 2002).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for continued research at the Berry Site comes from the National Geographic Society, Warren Wilson College, Western Piedmont Community College, Western Piedmont Foundation, a National Park Service Certified Local Government grant to the City of Morganton administered by the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, and Friends of the Upper Catawba Archaeology Project. We appreciate their support and generosity. Finally, we would like to thank the Berry family for their strong stewardship of the Berry site and their interest in this project. Our work would not be possible without their friendship and support.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, David G.

- 1994 *The Savannah River Chiefdoms: Political Change in the Late Prehistoric Southeast*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Bandera, Juan de la

- 1990 The Bandera Relations. Translated by P. Hoffman. In *The Juan Pardo Expeditions: Exploration of the Carolinas and Tennessee, 1566-1568*, by Charles M. Hudson, pp. 205-321. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D. C.

Beck, Robin A., Jr.

- 1997a The Burke Phase: Late Prehistoric Settlements in the Upper Catawba River Valley, North Carolina. Unpublished MA thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.
- 1997b From Joara to Chiaha: Spanish Exploration of the Appalachian Summit Area, 1540-1568. *Southeastern Archaeology* 16(2):162-169.
- 2003 Consolidation and Hierarchy: Chiefdom Variability in the Mississippian Southeast. *American Antiquity* 68(4):641-661.

Beck, Robin A., Jr., and David G. Moore

- 2002 The Burke Phase: Mississippian Chiefdoms in the Upper Catawba Valley, North Carolina. *Southeastern Archaeology* 21(2):192-205.

Best, Megan S., and Christopher B. Rodning

- 2003 Mississippian Chiefdoms and the Spanish Frontier: An Overview of Recent Excavations at the Berry Site in Western North Carolina. Paper presented at the 60th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Blitz, John H.

- 1999 Mississippian Chiefdoms and the Fission-Fusion Process. *American Antiquity* 64:577-592.

Bray, Warwick (editor)

- 1993 The Meeting of Two Worlds: Europe and the Americas 1492-1650. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 81. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Deagan, Kathleen

- 1987 *Artifacts of the Spanish Colonies of Florida and the Caribbean 1500-1800. Vol.1: Ceramics, Glassware, and Beads.* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- 2004 Reconsidering Taíno Social Dynamics after Conquest: Gender and Class in Culture contact Studies. *American Antiquity* 69(4):597-626.

DePratter, Chester B., Charles M. Hudson, and Marvin T. Smith

- 1983 The Route of Juan Pardo's Explorations in the Interior Southeast, 1566-1568. *Florida Historical Quarterly* 62:125-158.

Dickens, Roy S.

- 1976 *Cherokee Prehistory: The Pisgah Phase in the Appalachian Summit Region.* University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Ewen, Charles R., and John Hann

- 1998 *Hernando de Soto Among the Apalachee: The Archaeology of the First Winter Encampment*. University Press of Florida, Tallahassee.

Goggin, John

- 1960 *The Spanish Olive Jar: An Introductory Study*. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology*, No. 62. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- 1968 *Spanish Majolica in the New World*. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology*, No. 72. Yale University Press, New Hartford.

Hally, David J.

- 1975 *Archaeological Investigation of the King Site, Floyd County, Georgia*. submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities, Grant No. 20561-74-441.
- 1994 *An Overview of Lamar Culture*. In *Ocmulgee Archaeology, 1936-1986*, edited by David J. Hally, pp. 144-174. The University of Georgia Press, Athens.
- 1996 "Platform-Mound Construction and the Instability of Mississippian Chiefdoms." In *Political Structure and Change in the Prehistoric Southeastern United States*, edited by John F. Scarry, pp. 92-127. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Hargrove, Thomas, and Robin A. Beck, Jr.

- 2001 "Magnetometer and Auger Testing at the Berry Site, Burke County, North Carolina." Paper presented at the 58th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Hoffman, Paul

- 1990 *A New Andalusia and a Way to the Orient: The American Southeast During the Sixteenth Century*. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge.

Hudson, Charles M.

1990 *The Juan Pardo Expeditions: Explorations of the Carolinas and Tennessee, 1566-1568*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D. C.

1997 *Knights of Spain, Warriors of the Sun: Hernando de Soto and the South's Ancient Chiefdoms*. University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Hudson, Charles M., Marvin T. Smith, and Chester B. DePratter

1984 The Hernando de Soto Expedition: From Apalachee to Chiaha. *Southeastern Archaeology* 3:65-77.

Knight, Vernon J., Jr.

1990 Social Organization and the Evolution of Hierarchy in Southeastern Chiefdoms. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 46:1-23.

Lister, Florence C., and Robert H. Lister

1982 Sixteenth Century Maiolica Pottery in the Valley of Mexico. *Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona, No. 39*. The University of Arizona Press, Tuscon.

Little, Keith J., and Caleb Curren

1989 Conquest Archaeology of Alabama. In *Columbian Consequences, Volume 2: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands East*, edited by David H. Thomas, 169-195. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Lyon, Eugene

1976 *The Enterprise of Florida: Pedro Menéndez de Avilés and the Spanish Conquest of 1565-1568*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

1984 *Santa Elena: A Brief History of the Colony, 1566-1587*. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Mitchem, Jeffrey

- 1989 Initial Spanish-Indian Contact in West Peninsular Florida: The Archaeological Evidence. In *Columbian Consequences, Volume 2: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands East*, edited by David H. Thomas, pp. 49-59. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Moore, David G.

- 2002 *Catawba Valley Mississippian: Ceramics, Chronology, and Catawba Indians*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Moore, David G., Robin A. Beck, Jr., and Christopher B. Rodning

- 2004 Joara and Fort San Juan: Culture Contact at the Edge of the World. *Antiquity* Vol. 78, No. 299: March 2004 Project Gallery (<http://antiquity.ac.uk/ProjGall/moore/>).

Muller, Jon

- 1997 *Mississippian Political Economy*. Plenum Press, New York.

Paar, Karen

- 1999 Witness to Empire and the Tightening of Military Control: Santa Elena's Second Spanish Occupation, 1577-1587. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of History, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Pardo, Juan

- 1990 Relation. Translated by Paul Hoffman. In *The Juan Pardo Expeditions: Explorations of the Carolinas and Tennessee, 1566-1568*, authored by Charles Hudson, pp. 310-316. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Peacock, Evan, and S. Homes Hogue

2005 A New Series of Absolute Dates from Lyon's Bluff (22OK520), East-Central Mississippi. *Southeastern Archaeology* 24(1):28-45.

Polhemus, Richard R.

1987 *The Toqua Site: A Late Mississippian, Dallas Phase Town*. Report of Investigations No. 41. Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Schroedl, Gerald F., and Palmyra Moore

2002 "Geophysical Survey at the Berry Site, Burke County, North Carolina." Paper presented at the 59th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Biloxi, Mississippi.

Smith, Bruce D.

1978 Variation in Mississippian Settlement Patterns. In *Mississippian Settlement Patterns*, edited by Bruce D. Smith, pp. 479-503. Academic Press, New York.

Smith, Hale G.

1949 Two Archaeological Sites in Brevard County, Florida. Gainesville. Florida Anthropological Society Publications, No. 1. University of Florida Press, Tallahassee.

Smith, Marvin T.

1987 *Archaeology of Aboriginal Culture Change in the Interior Southeast: Depopulation During the Early Historic Period*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

South, Stanley, Russell Skowronek, and Richard Johnson

- 1988 *Spanish Artifacts from Santa Elena*. Anthropological Studies 7. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, The University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Thomas, Cyrus

- 1891 *Catalogue of Prehistoric Works East of the Rocky Mountains*. Bulletin No. 12, Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Thomas, David H. (editor)

- 1989 *Columbian Consequences, Vol. 1: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands West*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- 1990 *Columbian Consequences, Vol. 2: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands East*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- 1991 *Columbian Consequences, Vol. 3: The Spanish Borderlands in Pan-American Perspective*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Ward, H. Trawick, and R. P. Stephen Davis, Jr.

- 1999 *Time Before History: The Archaeology of North Carolina*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Williams, J. Mark, and Gary Shapiro

- 1990 *Lamar Archaeology: Mississippian Chiefdoms in the Deep South*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Worth, John R.

1994 "Exploration and Trade in the Deep Frontier of Spanish Florida: Possible Sources for Sixteenth-Century Spanish Artifacts in Western North Carolina." Paper presented at the 51st Annual Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Lexington, Kentucky.

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Berry site location

Figure 2: Native towns visited by Juan Pardo in the Carolinas and Tennessee, 1567-1568

Figure 3: Burke ceramics from the Berry site

Figure 4: Plan view, Berry site excavations

Figure 5: Olive Jar fragments, Berry site

Figure 6: Caparra Blue Majolica (A.D. 1492-1600), Berry site

Figure 7: Mexican Red Painted ware (A.D. 1550-1750), Berry site

Figure 8: Lead shot and quartered shot, Berry site

Figure 9: Barrote-type nail, Berry site

Figure 10: Brass aglets from Berry site

Figure 11: Plan view of Structure 3, looking north, following plowzone removal  
(structure measures 8.5 m by 8.5 m)

Figure 12: Excavation trench across Structure 1, looking north, revealing intact  
architectural remains (excavation trench measures 2 m by 6 m)

Figure 13: Structure 1, roofing timber with square-cut notch, possibly cut with metal  
tools (notch measures 12 cm long by 5 cm deep)

Figure 14: Chain mail fragments, Structure 1, Berry site