

**“On the Naming of Appalachia,” from *An Appalachian Symposium: Essays written in honor of Cratis D. Williams*, edited by J. W. Williamson (Boone, NC: Appalachian State University Press, 1977).**

The circumstances surrounding the naming of Appalachia are as hazy as a mid-summer's day in the Blue Ridge. A widespread legend has it that Hernando De Soto or the surviving members of his expedition named the mountains. Henry Gannett in *The Origin of Certain Place Names in the United States*, published in 1905, writes, “The name was given by the Spaniards under De Soto, who derived it from the name of a neighboring tribe, the Apalachi.” He also notes that one Brinton “holds its radical to be the Muscogee apala, 'great sea,' or 'great ocean,' and that apalache is a compound of this word with the Muscogee personal participle 'chi' and means 'those by the sea.’”<sup>1</sup> The North Carolina Gazetteer by William S. Powell uses almost the same words, but offers a different translation: “The name was given by Spaniards under De Soto in 1539 for the Apalachee Indians whose name meant 'people on the other side' (of a river presumably).”<sup>2</sup> The second edition of Webster's Dictionary is similar: “The mountains were called Appalachian by the Spaniards under De Soto, after the Apalachee Indians.”<sup>3</sup> Richard Drake, in a survey of the emergence of the concept of Appalachia, also accepts this account: “De Soto became lost in the maze of the southern Blue Ridge in 1540, and named the mountains for the Indians who dominated their approach.”<sup>4</sup>

In the face of this consensus it is surprising to find no evidence in the surviving accounts of the De Soto expedition to support the claim that either the conquistador or any of his companions ever intended to designate the eastern mountain chain for the Apalachee Indians, who lived in what is now northern Florida, a considerable distance from the mountains. Whether the mountains actually were termed something like “Appalachian” by one or another Indian tribe may never be clear. The best explanation of the De Soto legend may be that the early mapmakers, confused by the vague accounts of locations and distances given by the Spanish explorers, transposed the territory of the Apalachee further north.

Tracing the origin of the name requires that three distinct designations of “Appalachian” or its variants be distinguished: an Indian tribe, a village or province, and a mountain range. The first encounter of Europeans with the Apalachee tribe was recorded by the expedition of Pánfilo de Narváez, which landed in Florida in the vicinity of Tampa Bay in April 1528. The story is related by Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, who was one of four survivors of the Narváez expedition to return to Spain. Within a few days of Narváez' landing, a scouting party along the shore found pieces of cloth, items possibly of European origin, and traces of gold. “Having by signs asked the Indians whence these things came, they motioned to us that very far from there, was a province called Apalachen, where was much gold, and so the same abundance in Apalachen of everything that we at all cared for.”<sup>5</sup> Perhaps the riches of Apalachen were augmented by the Indians' eagerness to be rid of the Spaniards.

Two months later the Narváez expedition reached the village of Apalachen, probably near Lake Miccosukee in northern Florida. The Spaniards found a land rich in corn and game, but instead of treasure they received only harassment from the native residents. Less than a month after their arrival, the members of the expedition had had enough, as Cabeza de Vaca describes: “In view of the poverty of the land, the unfavorable accounts of the population and of everything else we

heard, the Indians making continual war upon us, wounding our people and horses at the places where they went to drink, shooting from the lakes with such safety to themselves that we could not retaliate ... we determined to leave that place and go in quest of the sea. . . .”<sup>6</sup> But the myth of the riches of Apalachen survived the rude reality of the place.

In 1539 the expedition of Hernando De Soto spent the winter months at the village of “Apalache,” no doubt the same place visited by Cabeza de Vaca. Having heard stories of gold in a distant country, De Soto began a march north through present-day Georgia toward the mountains in March 1540. From the accounts that survive, neither De Soto nor any members of his party designated the areas in or near the mountains as Appalachian. The Gentleman of Elvas is clear that the mountainous regions were called the provinces of Chalaque and Qualla by the native inhabitants. Similar terms appear in the accounts of Luys Hernández de Biedma and Rodrigo Ranjel, factor and secretary respectively to the De Soto expedition. Surprisingly, no such term as Apalache appears at any point on the so-called De Soto map, on which are inscribed 127 names and legends.<sup>7</sup>

Diego Gutierrez is the first mapmaker to record a variation of Appalachian. On his map of America, published in 1562, “Apalchen” appears to the north of mountains which are shown stretching from east to west inland from a rather inaccurate coastline (Fig. 1). This map may have been made before 1554, in which case the account of Cabeza de Vaca must have been the source of the term.<sup>8</sup> In any case, the region is far removed from the home of the Apalachee tribe near the Gulf of Mexico in northwestern Florida. Zaltieri's “Map of the Discovery of New France,” published in 1566, follows Gutierrez in locating the region of Apalchen roughly in the center of a truncated continent, some distance from Florida.<sup>9</sup>

Honors for designating the mountain range Appalachian must go to Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues, an artist who traveled with the French Huguenot expedition of René de Laudonniere to Florida in 1564. The expedition constructed Ft. Caroline at the mouth of the St. John's River (named the River of May by Jean Ribaut) on the east coast of Florida. Stories of precious metals from the mountains led to several attempts to forge alliances with Indian tribes that would give the French access to the mountains. Le Moyne never actually travelled north to the mountains, but he did paint a scene of Indians collecting gold from the streams running from the “Apalatchy Mountains.” (Fig. 2). The description with the engraving of the scene notes:

“A great way from the place where our fort was built, are great mountains, called in the Indian language Apalatchy; in which, as the map shows, arise three great rivers, in the sands of which are found much gold, silver, and brass, mixed together. Accordingly, the natives dig ditches in these streams, into which the sand brought down by the current falls by gravity. Then they collect it out, and carry it away to a place by itself, and after a time collect again what continues to fall in. Then they convey it in canoes down the great river which we named the River of May, and which empties into the sea. The Spaniards have been able to use for their advantage the wealth thus obtained.”<sup>10</sup>

This is the strongest evidence we have that the mountains were termed Appalachian in some Indian language. How reliable is this derivation? Le Moyne and the other French explorers under Ribaut and Laudonniere were no doubt familiar with the narratives of the Narvaez and De Soto

expeditions and their stories of the wealthy province of Apalache. The only maps available at the time placed Apalache or Apalchen in the vicinity of the mountains. The Huguenots could have been expected to ask Indians about gold in the mountains of Apalache. For their part, the Indians would have indicated the mountains as the source of such gold and copper as they may have acquired. Did the French put the name Apalatchi into the mouths of the Indians or was it a native term? With the evidence at hand, it is impossible to say. What is certain is that Le Moyne's map, "The Province of Florida in America" (Fig. 3), is the first to clearly name the mountains as Appalachian. Inscriptions on the map read "Montes Apalatchi, in quibus aurum argentum & aes invenitur" ("in which gold, silver and copper are found"), and in the lake fed by the waterfall, "In hoc lacu Indigenae argenti grana inveniunt" ("In this lake the natives find grains of silver"). A village of Apalatchi is also identified.

In 1586 Richard Hakluyt took a statement from a Spaniard, Pedro Morales, taken prisoner by Sir Frances Drake in Florida. Morales noted that "Three score leagues up to the Northwest from Saint Helena are the mountains of the golde and Chrystall Mines, named Apalatchi." Hakluyt added, "He saith also that he hath seene a rich Diamond which was brought from the mountaines that lye up in the cuntry Westward from S. Helena. These hills seeme wholly to be the mountaines of Apalatchi, whereof the Savages advertised Laudonniere. . . ." <sup>11</sup>

Le Moyne managed to escape the massacre of the Huguenots by the Spanish under Menéndez de Avilés and return to France in 1565. His map, which is customarily dated 1565, was not actually published until after his death when the map and paintings of the new world were purchased by Theodore de Bry, who brought out an illustrated edition on the French expeditions in 1591. Thus, perhaps fortunately, Le Moyne's version of the Appalachians was not available to Gerard Mercator in preparing his world map of 1569 (Fig. 4), which "is the first map to show the Appalachians as a continuous mountain range stretching parallel to the coast in a southwest-northeasterly direction. . . . Mercator's delineation of the southern mountain region by a roughly inverted Y is in general not improved until the early part of the eighteenth century." <sup>12</sup> There is no indication that Mercator named these mountains Appalachian, however. Apalchen on his map appears to designate the region between the forks of the Y of the mountains, drained by the "River Sola" (probably the Savannah River).

Once published, Le Moyne's map had considerable influence. In 1597 Corneille Wytfliet published a map of "Florida and Apalche" (Fig. 5) which terms as Apalche the territory between Virginia and Florida (north of the Rivers Secco and Sola, or Savannah River). <sup>13</sup> Jodocus Hondius published an edition of Mercator's atlas in 1606 with a revised map of the southeast that shows Le Moyne's waterfall and lake, his inscriptions about precious metals, and the "Apalatchy Montes auriferi," or "golden Appalachian Mountains." William Cumming comments on the impact of Le Moyne's map: "The map contains many striking details, frequently erroneous, which were incorporated in other maps for over a hundred and fifty years. It was Le Moyne's misfortune to have many of his errors incorporated and even exaggerated in Mercator's map of 1606, upon which for half a century much of the subsequent cartography of the region was based." <sup>14</sup>

During the eighteenth century, the term Allegheny emerged as the principal rival to Appalachian. By convention the southern half of the eastern mountain chain was known as the Appalachians

and the northern half the Alleghenies.<sup>15</sup> The overall designation alternated between the two. Ambivalence about the appropriate term for the entire region is apparent in Washington Irving's proposal for a more accurate name for the country than "United States of America." In a letter to the editor of the *The Knickerbocker* in 1839 signed "Geoffrey Crayon," Irving suggested, perhaps tongue in cheek.

"We have it in our power to furnish ourselves with such a national appellation from one of the grand and eternal features of our country; from that noble chain of mountains which formed its backbone, and ran through the "old confederacy," when it first declared our national independence: I allude to the Appalachian or Allegheny mountains. We might do this without any very inconvenient change in our present titles. We might still use the phrase "The United States," substituting Appalachia, or Alleghenia, (I should prefer the latter,) in place of America. The title of Appalachian, or Alleghenian, would still announce us as Americans, but would specify us as citizens of the Great Republic. Even our old national cypher of U.S.A. might remain unaltered, designating the United States of Alleghenia."<sup>16</sup>

This is probably the first appearance in print of the term Appalachia;<sup>17</sup> the Latinized suffixia was in vogue at the time in forming names of states or countries.

Irving wasn't the only one to show a preference for Allegheny over Appalachian. The 1860 census, for example, in a study of mortality rates in "the great natural divisions," terms the area "From Pennsylvania through Virginia, Eastern Tennessee, &c., to Northern Alabama" as "The Allegheny Region."<sup>18</sup> An article published by geographer Arnold Henry Guyot in 1861 is credited with establishing scientific and popular usage for the entire mountain range. Evidently, Guyot also had difficulty deciding which term is more appropriate: "He apparently hesitated between the names. His map, prepared in advance, used Allegheny, but his final title was On the Appalachian Mountain System."<sup>19</sup> Guyot naturally notes the east to west division of the Appalachian system into parallel chains of mountains separated from the plateaus by the Great Appalachian Valley, and he also proposed dividing the system from north to south into three areas: the northern division, from the Adirondacks to the Gaspé Peninsula in Canada; the middle or central division from New York south of the Mohawk to the New River; and the southern division from the New River to the extremity of the system. He also places the central and southern division together in a southern section. Guyot's authority was followed by John Wesley Powell in his *Physiographic Regions of the United States*,<sup>20</sup> which designates the eastern mountains from New York to Alabama as the Appalachian Ranges. Powell introduces a new twist, however, by terming the entire upland area to the west of the Appalachian mountain ranges the Allegheny Plateaus. He also uses the New River as a dividing line between what he calls the northern and southern Appalachian ranges.

At this point our survey shifts emphasis from geographic nomenclature, now firmly established, to Appalachia as a cultural region and a social and economic problem area. Until the Civil War, "the Appalachians" was simply a term for a physiographic section of mountains. There was little to distinguish the way of life there from life generally on the American frontier. The "discovery" of Appalachia as a distinctive cultural region was led by the writers of the "local color" movement who began in the mid-1870's to use the mountaineer as a subject of fiction and travel sketches published in popular national magazines. Carvel Collins records that between 1875 and

1900 “more than two hundred novels and stories were published which described the hill people as quaint and isolated, living peculiar lives in the shadow of awe-inspiring peaks.”<sup>21</sup> Three underlying social and historical forces contributed to the discovery of the traditional subculture of the Southern Appalachians in the period following the Civil War: the mountaineer's loyalty to the Union, the end of the frontier, and the rapid expansion of industrial capitalism. The first served to distinguish the mountaineer from other Southern whites, and the second and third made him appear an anachronism in comparison to the mythical mainstream American.

Educators and social reformers sought to define this Southern Appalachian cultural region as a social problem area deserving the attention of church home mission boards and private philanthropic foundations. The first person to give a precise geographic definition to the Southern Appalachians as a cultural region was William G. Frost, President of Berea College from 1892 to 1920. Together with his former student, C.W. Hayes, then working for the Geological Survey, Frost identified 194 counties he called “the Mountain Region of the South” in 1894. He announced this discovery of “a new pioneer region in the mountains of the Central South” in 1895, and went on to elaborate his view in several articles in national magazines (Fig. 6). The most influential of these is “Our Contemporary Ancestors in the Southern Mountains” in the *Atlantic Monthly* for March 1899, in which Frost describes the region as “The mountainous back yards of nine states . . . one of God's grand divisions, and in default of any other name we shall call it Appalachian America.”<sup>22</sup> Frost's lead was followed by a number of writers including Samuel Tyndale Wilson, Horace Kephart (who gets credit for reintroducing the term Appalachia), and James Watt Raine.<sup>23</sup>

The landmark study and definition of the region was made by John C. Campbell in *The Southern Highlander and His Homeland* published in 1921.<sup>24</sup> Campbell includes sections of the same nine states from Maryland to Alabama identified by Frost, but expands the number of counties included to 254. He identifies three parallel divisions: the Blue Ridge Belt and the Allegheny-Cumberland Belt, with the Greater Appalachian Valley in between. Campbell's initiative in organizing the Conference of Southern Mountain Workers in 1913 and his ties with the Russell Sage Foundation provided the organizational and financial base for a small but persistent social movement to secure an adequate private and public response to the problems of the Southern Appalachians. It was largely the Conference (later the Council of the Southern Mountains), Berea College, and their magazine *Mountain Life & Work*, launched in 1925, that sustained the relative handful of educators, ministers, and community workers who kept alive through thick and thin the idea of Appalachia as a distinctive cultural and social problem region.<sup>25</sup>

Campbell always preferred the designation “Southern Highlands” for the region. Discussing his reasons for this choice, Campbell wrote, “Southern Appalachians is a term sometimes used, but inasmuch as this term is limited by geographers [evidently a reference to Guyot and Powell] to that part of the Appalachian mountain system lying south of the New River Divide in southern Virginia, some other name for the whole territory under consideration is necessary. The designation Southern Mountains has also been used. But because so often descriptions of depressed social conditions, which are true only of limited areas, have been given without qualification as existing throughout the Southern mountains, this term has come to carry with it the implication that such conditions prevail generally throughout the region.” After a lyrical passage describing the beauty of the mountain country and its romantic folk tradition, Campbell

concludes “there is but one name that will do it justice—the Southern Highlands.”<sup>26</sup> A more convincing explanation of Campbell's evoking the image of highland Scotland may be found in his effort to overcome the myth of the degenerate race of “mountain whites” that appeared in some stories of the local color writers after 1889, and in the historical works of John Fiske and others.<sup>27</sup> Campbell contrasts to this genetic argument an environmental explanation centered on isolation, “while establishing the mountaineer in the morally favorable ground of middle-class Romanticism,” as Henry Shapiro comments.<sup>28</sup> But as these issues lost their salience, Campbell's argument against the common usage of Southern Appalachians had little impact despite the classic character of his study.

The federal government made its first acknowledgement of Appalachia as a social problem by its comprehensive survey, *Economic and Social Problems and Conditions of the Southern Appalachians*, published in 1935. The U.S. Department of Agriculture was encouraged to support the study by a cluster of organizations including the Conference of Southern Mountain Workers, the Home Missions Council, the Council of Women for Home Missions, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and Community Church Workers. The first of a series of conferences that led to the study was held at the Russell Sage Foundation in 1929. The USDA study contains a section by F.J. Marschner which divides Southern Appalachia into three major divisions: the eastern or Blue Ridge, the central or Appalachian Valleys and Ridges, and the western or Appalachian Plateaus. He then divides these divisions into 16 physiographic subregions (Fig. 7). Marschner's delineation contains 236 counties in nine states; the rest of the USDA study limits itself to 205 counties in six states (Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia).<sup>29</sup>

This modest recognition as a social problem area did not lead in the 1930's to any federal government efforts aimed at the Southern Appalachian region as such. The major New Deal regional development program, the Tennessee Valley Authority, included a portion of the Southern Appalachians, but its origins were in the dispute over the Muscle Shoals dam begun during the First World War. It was conceived as an example of river basin development by a public authority and had little relation to the work of the people promoting Southern Appalachia as a social problem area. Nor did the Appalachian advocates persuade one major regionalist, Howard W. Odum, whose influential *Southern Regions of the United States* does not include Appalachia among its divisions.<sup>30</sup>

The various efforts to develop a national system of regional classification that were undertaken in the late 1930's did not adopt the broad definition of Southern Appalachia used in the two classic studies of the area. In the Works Progress Administration study *Rural Regions of the United States*, A.R. Mangus falls back on the traditional usage of an Allegheny Region including parts of Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia, and an Appalachian Region including parts of Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Georgia. Another multi-county delineation, the State Social Subregions, was established for the 1940 census; it was modified to the State Economic Area system in the 1950 census which has continued in use to the present.<sup>31</sup>

The low ebb in the movement to identify Appalachia as a social problem in the public consciousness appears to have been reached in the late 1940's and early 1950's. In 1949 the

Russell Sage Foundation ended its support of the Council of Southern Mountain Workers and *Mountain Life & Work*; the magazine was discontinued until revived with the help of Berea College faculty in 1950. Council activities and funding increased gradually following the hiring of Perley Ayer as executive director in 1951. A symposium, *Regionalism in America*, that ignores Appalachia was published in 1951.<sup>32</sup> Not until 1957 were two organizational efforts set in motion that would lead to a commitment by the federal government to alleviate Appalachian problems. In that year W.D. Weatherford, a YMCA leader who had been recruited to the Board of Trustees of Berea College in 1916 by William Frost, approached the Ford Foundation with an idea for a comprehensive survey of the Southern Appalachians that would update the 1935 USDA study. Southern Appalachian Studies, Inc., received \$250,000 for the research which was published as *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey* in 1962.<sup>33</sup> The survey covers 190 counties in seven states from West Virginia through Alabama (excluding Maryland and South Carolina). The delineation is based on the State Economic Area system from the 1950 census, and includes only those SEA's composed entirely of Appalachian counties. After publication of the study, the Ford Foundation gave a \$250,000 grant to the Council of the Southern Mountains to expand its community development work in the region.

Also in 1957 eastern Kentucky was hit by the most devastating flood in memory. In response to the disaster, Governor Bert Combs appointed the Eastern Kentucky Regional Planning Commission; John D. Whisman, whose ideas have played an important part in subsequent Appalachian development programs, served as its executive director. On January 1, 1960, the Commission issued a report, *Program 60: A Decade of Action for Progress in Eastern Kentucky*, which called for a broad range of development programs for the area, and also suggested that an Appalachian States Development Authority be established.<sup>34</sup> In response, the Conference of Appalachian Governors was organized at a meeting in Maryland in May 1960 at the invitation of Governor Millard Tawes, and received a study, "The Appalachian Region," prepared by the Maryland Department of Economic Development on an eleven-state area from New York to Alabama (excluding Ohio). At the same time, national attention was drawn to the conditions of the Appalachian coalfields by the presidential primary in West Virginia on May 10.<sup>35</sup> John F. Kennedy's debt to the region for his primary victory over Hubert Humphrey led to a meeting with the Appalachian governors in May 1961. Another meeting in 1963 led to the appointment on April 9 of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission, with Whisman as Executive Secretary, which presented its report to Lyndon B. Johnson in 1964. The report refers to 340 counties in ten states from Pennsylvania to Alabama (excluding South Carolina, and with reservations about Ohio whose governor declined to sign the report).<sup>36</sup>

On March 9, 1965, President Johnson signed the Appalachian Regional Development Act and made the social and economic development problems of the area an official concern of national public policy. The Act established the Appalachian Regional Commission, with responsibilities for portions of twelve states; in August the Commission invited New York to participate in the program under provisions of the Act. New York accepted, and a total of 373 counties were then covered by the ARC. The 1967 amendments to the ARDA joined 20 counties of Mississippi to Appalachia, and also added one county from Tennessee, two from Alabama, and one from New York, for the current total of 397 counties in thirteen states.<sup>37</sup> Political criteria for inclusion in Appalachia have superseded historical, cultural, social, or economic factors. Whisman continues

his major role in the development of the Commission, serving first as the Governor's Representative for Kentucky and then as the States' Regional Representative since July 1966.

The 1967 *Annual Report* of the ARC outlines the "Four Appalachias," defined by the varying economic bases of the subregions. Northern Appalachia is seen in transition from a coal-steel-railroad economy to new types of manufacturing and service industries. Central Appalachia is focused on the coalfields of eastern Kentucky, southern West Virginia, southwest Virginia, and northern Tennessee. Southern Appalachia is rapidly converting from an agricultural economy to an urban and industrialized one. The Appalachian Highlands includes the Alleghenies, Blue Ridge and Smoky Mountains from New York to Georgia, a thinly populated region with potential for recreation and tourism. In 1974 the ARC merged the Highlands into the other three subregions.<sup>38</sup>

In terms of social problems, the economy of Central Appalachia remains in persistent difficulty. Some 35 percent of the population lives in poverty by federal standards, two-and-a-half times the national average; per capita income is only 60 percent of the national average.<sup>39</sup> This alone should insure that Appalachia remain on the public agenda for some time to come. Yet as even the Central Appalachian region draws closer to national "norms" of poverty, Appalachian problems are likely to be seen more as national than regional in character. Solutions may be found only in answers to the national problems of providing full employment, adequate income maintenance, health care and decent housing for all, environment protection, public control of natural resources, and democratization of such public corporations as the TVA. Thus it is possible that interest in defining Appalachia as a distinctive social problem area will decline; certainly the focus will be narrowed from the current thirteen-state ARC definition.

The naming and redefining of Appalachia appears to have no end. I have traced the designations of the region from physiographic nomenclature to cultural area, to social and economic problem, and finally to an exercise in political logrolling. Clearly there is no ultimate definition, only delineations that serve particular social, political, organizational, or academic interests. Overall, the social movement to obtain recognition for Appalachia as a problem area must be accorded a remarkable success for a movement which never developed a mass following within the region itself.<sup>40</sup> "Appalachian," after all, has never become a symbol of self-identification for the vast majority of the region's people, for whom the community, county, state, and nation remain more important units of political identity.<sup>41</sup> Despite the apparent decline in those features of the traditional mountain subculture supposedly characteristic of the region,<sup>42</sup> interest in aspects of Appalachian culture is on the increase, as evidenced by the popularity of books on the region's folk arts, Appalachian Studies programs, and this Appalachian Symposium. As long as the people of the region value their distinctive heritage, Appalachia by one definition or another, under one name or another, will continue to make an important contribution to American life.

## NOTES

I wish to acknowledge, with great appreciation, the assistance provided by Dr.

Richard Boulind, Curator of Maps, Manuscripts, and Prints of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University. He suggested numerous references and checked a number of early maps for me. Responsibility for any errors or omissions in this account is, of course, my own.

---

<sup>1</sup>2nd ed., U.S. Geological Survey Bulletin No. 258 (Washington: GPO, 1905), 27. Gannett's source is evidently ethnographer Daniel G. Brinton. A description of the Apalachee tribe is given in John R. Swanton, *Indians of the Southeastern United States*, Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin No. 137 (Washington: GPO, 1946), 89-91 ; see also Brinton, *The Floridian Peninsula* (1859; rpt. New York: Paladin Press, 1969), Ch. 2, 92-110.

<sup>2</sup>(Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1968), 11.

<sup>3</sup>*Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language*, 2nd ed. (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam, 1953), 128. The 3rd edition (1971) is prudently silent on the question of who named the Appalachians and is content to note a probable derivation from Apalachee.

<sup>4</sup>"Appalachian America: The Emergence of a Concept, 1895-1964," *Mountain Life & Work*, 40 (Spring 1965), 6.

<sup>5</sup>"The Narrative of Alvar Nunez Cabeza de Vaca," ed. Frederick W. Hodge, in *Spanish Explorers in the Southern United States, 1528-1543*, a volume in the series *Original Narratives of Early American History*, ed. J. Franklin Jameson (New York: Scribners, 1907), Ch. 4, 21-2.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, 31. Their reception in Apalachen is covered in Chs. 6 and 7, 28-33. The identification of the region with wealth is captured in the title of the fictionalized version of Cabeza de Vaca's explorations by Frank G. Slaughter, *Apalachee Gold* (1954; rpt. New York: Pocket Books, 1974).

<sup>7</sup>"The Narrative of the Expedition of Hernando de Soto, by the Gentleman of Elvas," ed. Theodore H. Lewis, in *Spanish Explorers*, Chs. 12-15, 160-81. See also "Relation of the Conquest of Florida by Luys Hernández de Biedma," trans. from the original document by Buckingham Smith; and "A Narrative of De Soto's Expedition Based on the Diary of Rodrigo Ranjel," by Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdes, trans. Edward Gaylord Bourne, in *Narratives of the Career of Hernando de Soto*, Vol. II (1904; rpt. New York: Allerton, 1922). On the so-called De Soto map, probably by Alonso de Santa Cruz and commonly dated ca. 1544, see William P. Cumming, *The Southeast in Early Maps* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1958), 10-12, 113-15, and Plate 5. Swanton in *Indians of the Southeastern United States* presents an interesting reconstruction and map of the De Soto expedition's route, 39-59.

---

<sup>8</sup> See 115 and Plate 6 in Cumming, *The Southeast in Early Maps*. The earliest published accounts mentioning the Apalache tribe and the village of Apalchen are the *Relacion* of Cabeza de Vaca (Zamora, 1542), Ranjel's diary in Oviedo's *Historia General y Natural de las Indias* (Salamanca, 1547), and the *Relacam* of the Gentleman of Elvas (Evora, 1557). The history of the De Soto expedition by Garcilaso de la Vega, *La Florida del Inca* (Lisbon, 1605) could not have influenced the sixteenth-century mapmakers. The authoritative source for dating these early documents is Joseph Sabin, *A Dictionary of Books Relating to America, from Its Discovery to the Present Time*, 29 vols. (New York: 1868-1936; rpt. Amsterdam: N. Israel, 1961-62).

<sup>9</sup> The map of Zaltieri, also known as Zalterius of Bologna, is No. 21 in Emerson D. Fite and Archibald Freeman, *A Book of Old Maps Delineating American History* (New York: Dover, 1969), 72-4.

<sup>10</sup>This translation is by G. B. Watts, as quoted in W.P. Cumming, R.A. Skelton, and D.B. Quinn, *The Discovery of North America* (New York: American Heritage Press, 1971), 187. Le Moyne's map is reproduced in color on 175. The map is No. 20 in Fite and Freeman, *A Book of Old Maps*, 68-70. See also Cumming, *The Southeast in Early Maps*, 124-5 and Plate 15. The narrative of Le Moyne and the engravings by De Bry based on the lost paintings of Le Moyne are contained in *The New World: The First Pictures of America*, ed. Stefan Lorant, rev. ed. (1946; rpt. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1965). I have used the translation by Watts rather than that provided by Lorant on 117; Lorant's reads more smoothly in English, but is less detailed and literal and omits the reference to Apalatcy deriving from an Indian language.

<sup>11</sup>"The Relation of Pedro Morales," No. 138 in *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584-1590*, ed. David Beers Quinn, 2 vols. (London: Hakluyt Society, 1955), 761-3.

<sup>12</sup> Cumming, *The Southeast in Early Maps*, 2. See Gerard Mercator's *Map of the World (1569)*, Publicaties Van Het Maritiem Museum "Prins Hendrick" No.6 (Rotterdam: 's-Gravenhage, 1961), sheet 5.

<sup>13</sup>Cumming, *The Southeast in Early Maps*, 17, 127, and Plate 17.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 124. For the Mercator-Hondius map, see 129-131 and Plate 20.

<sup>15</sup> For examples of eighteenth century maps, see William Faden, "The British Colonies in North America" (1777) and J. Carver, "A New Map of North America" (1778) in Fite and Freeman, *A Book of Old Maps*, Nos. 59 and 70, 232-4 and 274-7.

<sup>16</sup> *The Knickerbocker*, August 1839, 161; reprinted in the various editions of Irving's *Collected Works* under the title "National Nomenclature." On names for the nation, see George R. Stewart, *Names on the Land* (New York: Random House, 1945), Ch. 19,

---

169-74; and H. L. Mencken, "Names for Americans," *American Speech*, 22 (December 1947), 241-56.

<sup>17</sup> It is the first appearance cited in *A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles*, ed. Mitford M. Mathews (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1951), 37.

<sup>18</sup> Joseph C.G. Kennedy, Superintendent of Census, *Population of the United States in 1860: The Eighth Census* (Washington: GPO, 1864), xiii-xliii.

<sup>19</sup> Stewart, *Names on the Land*, 334. The original article is Arnold Guyot, "On the Appalachian Mountain System," *American Journal of Science and Arts*, 2nd Series, 31 (March 1861), 157-87. For background on Guyot, see Myron H. Avery and Kenneth S. Boardman, "Arnold Guyot's Notes on the Geography of the Mountain District of Western North Carolina," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, 15 (July 1938), 251-4.

<sup>20</sup> National Geographic Monographs, Vol. I, No. 3, May 1895 (New York: American Book Company).

<sup>21</sup> Carvel Emerson Collins, "Nineteenth Century Fiction of the Southern Appalachians," *Bulletin of Bibliography*, 17 (Sept.-Dec. 1942 and Jan.-April 1943), 186-90, 215-18. The early literature on Appalachia is discussed in two dissertations: Cratis Dearl Williams, "The Southern Mountaineer in Fact and Fiction" (New York University, 1961), serialized in an abridged version edited by Martha H. Pipes in Vol. 3 of the quarterly *Appalachian* Wilson, *The Southern Mountaineers* (New York: Board of Home Missions, 1906; rev. 1914); Kephart, *Our Southern Highlanders: A Narrative of Adventure in the Southern Appalachians and a Study of Life Among the Mountaineers* (New York: Outing, 1913; rpt. Macmillan, 1921, rev. 1922, reissued 1926); Raine, *The Land of the Saddle-bags: A Study of the Mountain People of Appalachia* (New York: Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1924).

Peculiar People: The Discovery of Appalachia, 1870-1920" (Rutgers, 1966), a brilliant interpretation to which I am indebted in my discussion of Appalachia as a social problem. The Southern Appalachians is grouped with the broader "Upland South" in Wilbur Zelinsky, *The Cultural Geography of the United States* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), 118-19, 122-4.

<sup>22</sup> 311; see also William Goodell Frost, *For the Mountains: An Autobiography* (New York: Revell, 1937), 97; and Drake, "Appalachian America," 6. Berea College has used a modified version of Frost's and Campbell's delineations of the region to define its area of concern; the 1917 Berea College catalog defines the southern mountain region as 265 counties in eight states (not including western Maryland). See Elizabeth S. Peck, *Berea's First Century: 1855-1955* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1955), 79. A 1974 pamphlet of the Office of Admissions lists 230 counties in these eight states as "The Field of Berea." In 1976 Berea College's list was revised and expanded to include 256 counties.

---

<sup>23</sup> Wilson, *The Southern Mountaineers* (New York: Board of Home Missions, 1906; rev. 1914); Kephart, *Our Southern Highlanders: A Narrative of Adventure in the Southern Appalachians and a Study of Life Among the Mountaineers* (New York: Outing, 1913; rpt. Macmillan, 1921, rev. 1922, reissued 1926); Raine, *The Land of the Saddle-bags: A Study of the Mountain People of Appalachia* (New York: Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1924).

<sup>24</sup>(New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1921; rpt. Lexington: Univ, Press of Kentucky, 1969).

<sup>25</sup>An historical sketch of the Council of the Southern Mountains up through 1973 is given in David E. Whisnant, "Controversy in God's Grand Division: The CSM," *Appalachian Journal*, 2 (Autumn 1974), 7-45. Rebuttals in the form of extended letters to the editor by Loyal Jones, Thomas Parrish, and A.H. Perrin, along with a reply by Whisnant, appear under the title "Problems in Revisionism: More Controversy in God's Grand Division." *Appalachian Journal*, 2 (Spring 1975), 171-91. On the theory of a social problem as a social movement, see the following: Herbert Blumer, "Social Problems as Collective Behavior," *Social Problems*, 18 (Winter 1971), 298-306; John I. Kitsuse and Malcolm Spector, "Toward a Sociology of Social Problems: Social Conditions, Value-Judgements, and Social Problems," *Social Problems*, 20 (Spring 1973), 407-19; Malcolm Spector and John I. Kitsuse, "Social Problems: A ReFormulation," *Social Problems*, 21 (Fall 1973), 145-59; and Armand L. Mauss, *Social Problems as Social Movements* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1975), Chs. 1 and 2, 3-71. Also relevant to the study of the Appalachian social problem movement is John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, *The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization* (Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1973).

<sup>26</sup>*Southern Highlander*, 12.

<sup>27</sup>Collins, "Nineteenth Century Fiction," 186; John Fiske, *Old Virginia and Her Neighbours* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1897), II, 177-89. See Campbell's "Appendix B: A Misapplied Theory of Mountain Origin," in *The Southern Highlander* on Fiske.

<sup>28</sup>Shapiro, "A Strange Land and Peculiar People," 96.

<sup>29</sup>United States Department of Agriculture Miscellaneous Publication No. 205 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1935), 7-15. Elizabeth R. Hooker of the Institute of Social and Religious Research published an important study of the religious institutions of the region drawing on preliminary data from the USDA survey: *Religion in the Highlands: Native Churches and Missionary Enterprises in the Southern Appalachian Area* (New York: Home Missions Council, 1933). The USDA study also influenced the inclusion of the "Southern Appalachian Coal Plateaus" region in the Study of Population Redistribution supported by the Rockefeller Foundation: Carter Goodrich et al., *Migration and Economic Opportunity* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1936),

---

54-123. Also from this period see J. Wesley Hatcher, "Appalachian America," in *Culture in the South*, ed. W.T. Couch (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1934), 374-402.

<sup>30</sup>(Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1936). Nor does Appalachia appear in Howard W. Odum and Harry Estill Moore, *American Regionalism: A Cultural-Historical Approach to National Integration* (New York: Holt, 1938). On the background of TVA, see Preston J. Hubbard, *Origins of the TVA: The Muscle Shoals Controversy, 1920-1932* (Nashville: Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 1961).

<sup>31</sup>Mangus, *Rural Regions of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1940). On the State Social Subregions of the 1940 census, see Donald J. Bogue, Henry S. Shyrock, Jr., and Siegfried A. Hoermann, *Subregional Migration in the United States, 1935-40*, Vol. I, Streams of Migration, Scripps Foundation Studies in Population Distribution No.5 (Oxford, Ohio: Miami Univ., 1957), 26-8. On the State Economic Areas, see Donald J. Bogue and Calvin L. Beale, *Economic Areas of the United States* (New York: Free Press, 1961). My thanks to James S. Brown for these references.

<sup>32</sup>Ed. Merrill Jensen (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1951).

<sup>33</sup>Ed. Thomas R. Ford (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1962). Another publication resulting from the survey is W. D. Weatherford and Earl D.C. Brewer, *Life and Religion in Southern Appalachia* (New York: Friendship Press, 1962). On Weatherford's role in obtaining the Ford Foundation grant, see Wilma Dykeman, *Prophet of Plenty: The First Ninety Years of W. D. Weatherford* (Knoxville: Univ. of Tennessee Press, 1966), 206-18.

<sup>34</sup>See also the follow-up study, Program 60 Report: Action for Progress in Eastern Kentucky in the First Quarter of the 1960 Decade, Eastern Kentucky Regional Planning Commission, 30 June 1962.

<sup>35</sup>See Harry W. Ernst, *The Primary That Made a President: West Virginia 1960*, Eagleton institute Cases in Practical Politics No. 26 (McGraw-Hill, 1962).

<sup>36</sup>Appalachia: A Report by the President's Appalachian Regional Commission 1964 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1964).

<sup>37</sup>Appalachian Regional Commission, *Annual Report 1965*, 3; "Mississippi Joins Appalachia," *Appalachia*, I (October 1967), 4-5.

<sup>38</sup>The first mention of four subregions is in the first issue of *Appalachia*, I (September 1967), 3-5. For an expanded version see ARC, *Annual Report 1967*, 7-9; see also the article by the Commission Executive Director, Ralph R. Widner, "The Four Appalachias," *Appalachian Review*, 2 (Winter 1968), 13-19. The scheme is modified in

---

"The New Appalachian Subregions and Their Development Strategies," *Appalachia*, 8 (August-September 1974), 1016.

<sup>39</sup>ARC, *1974 Annual Report*, 24-6. One task awaiting radical critics of Appalachian poverty and underdevelopment is the defining of that portion of Appalachia or Central Appalachia that should be considered an internal colony or, alternatively, a peripheral region within an advanced capitalist economy.

<sup>40</sup>This success should not obscure the change in character that has overtaken the movement as some of its goals have been institutionalized in the ARC. The concerns of Frost, the Campbells, and other early advocates of Appalachia as a distinctive social problem region were rooted in a cultural idealism common to American regionalists of the first part of the century. The approach of the ARC is based in an entirely different tradition of technocratic planning. On "the new regionalism," see John Friedmann, "Poor Regions and Poor Nations: Perspectives on the Problem of Appalachia," *Southern Economic Journal*, 32 (April 1966), 465-7. Currently, the movement seems to be fragmented, with the cultural idealists, technocratic planners, and radical critics going separate ways.

<sup>41</sup>The idea of "Appalachia" appears to have been grasped opportunistically by most politicians. Some conservatives see the concept as a new strategy of expanding the welfare state and are opposed to all it entails. An amusing expression of this reaction is the following letter to the editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* from Hatler Johnson of Paintsville, Kentucky, printed in the 18 April 1973 issue under the heading "Finds 'Appalachia' Offensive": "During the last eight years the croaking chorus of 'Appalachia' has swamped the people of the region down in the dismal spiritual mire of mind and soul pollution that sickens their sense of innate self-reliance and morale. The utterance of the million-times repeated word sends out waves of pollution more deadly than strontium 90. The Congress should pass a law that would ban the use of the word from the lexicon, and anyone violating that ban should be liable to a \$10,000 fine and five years in the penitentiary."

<sup>42</sup>See Thomas R. Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," Ch. 2 in *The Southern Appalachian Region*.