Examining the Non-Mississippian Southeast: A Comparison of the Intrasite Archaeological Potential of Piedmont Village Tradition Settlements, AD 1200-1700

Introduction

In general, ordinary complex societies and hunter-gatherer societies have been the focus of archaeological research. In this study, the Upper Yadkin Valley was chosen because of the focus of household archaeology. However, in cases where great preservation and temporal control exist for middle-range settlement systems, the approach has been to interact with social and economic factors. In this instance, the research objectives were to: identify patterns of structures and pit features at PVT hermit architecture settlements in the Yadkin riverfront area, 1200-1500 AD, to explore the above topics. We then apply these patterns to the Yadkin riverfront region, where a large amount of information is available in the form of test plots. We also sought to answer the potential of household archaeology for PVT. PVT is the archaeological record of the historic inhabitants of the North Carolina and Virginia Piedmont (Wall and Helsel 1989). The PVT settlement sites provide potential for the investigation of households and pit features and the social role of food amongst PVT communities. Warfare and raiding offer the best explanation. All valleys and ecofacts suggest year-round occupations. Subterranean storage is present at each site, with at least one pit feature that can be assigned a function. Household pits may have been for the consumption of the other. Using Waselkov’s (1997) and Scarry and Scarry’s (2007) work with Mississippian settlements, allowing us to conduct research on their property and for their interest in our work. Sedentism has undiscovered pits not near the excavated houses. For the Yadkin, valley, we use household and communal storage and food processing patterns. What means for the types of patterns and conflict of the region.

Results

We compiled data from the Den, Taa, and Haw Sites to examine trends in household formation, settlement stability, and food processing and storage patterns. We did not include data from the Den Sites because complete house features have been identified. Below are two examples:

1. Eno sites: a. Exterior = within or overlapping with structure walls
   b. Assigned structures and pits within 10 feet
   c. Interior = within or overlapping with structure walls
   d. Shallow basin = basin, and refuse pit = storage pit

The table below shows our criteria for comparing pit features. Upper Saratown 2 (FS) was closest. The later Dan River sites have more interior/assigned burials than earlier and Haw sites, considering they have less area excavated (Figs. 6-9). However, in cases where good preservation and temporal control exist for middle-range settlement systems, the approach has been to interact with social and economic factors. In this instance, the research objectives were to: identify patterns of structures and pit features at PVT hermit architecture settlements in the Yadkin riverfront area, 1200-1500 AD, to explore the above topics. We then apply these patterns to the Yadkin riverfront region, where a large amount of information is available in the form of test plots. We also sought to answer the potential of household archaeology for PVT. PVT is the archaeological record of the historic inhabitants of the North Carolina and Virginia Piedmont (Wall and Helsel 1989). The PVT settlement sites provide potential for the investigation of households and pit features and the social role of food amongst PVT communities. Warfare and raiding offer the best explanation. All valleys and ecofacts suggest year-round occupations. Subterranean storage is present at each site, with at least one pit feature that can be assigned a function. Household pits may have been for the consumption of the other. Using Waselkov’s (1997) and Scarry and Scarry’s (2007) work with Mississippian settlements, allowing us to conduct research on their property and for their interest in our work. Sedentism has undiscovered pits not near the excavated houses. For the Yadkin, valley, we use household and communal storage and food processing patterns. What means for the types of patterns and conflict of the region.

Discussion and Conclusions

What does this research tell us?

This research tells us that the Yadkin Valley sites provide potential for the investigation of households and pit features and what they tell us about social and economic organization, but much more work is needed to address the issues at hand. This research offers a single story of the Yadkin and its residents, stackets and patterns that may help to shed light on this particular. Other sites with similar preservation should be examined to add to the comparison.
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