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ABSTRACT

In the second half of the seventeenth century, Siouan-speaking Native communities across the southern Piedmont—like the well-known deerskin traders, the Occaneechis, and their lesser-known trading partners, the Saras—shaped colonial economies across Virginia and North Carolina. Between 1650 and 1676, theOccaneechis controlled European-Indian trade across southern Virginia: Acting as middlemen, they restricted the flow of trade objects and deerskins between Sara towns in Virginia’s Dan River Basin to their west and English towns to their east. On the periphery of Occaneechi-controlled fur trading networks, Sara communities were free to selectively engage in—and avoid—the eastern deerskin trade. Drawing on documentary sources and archaeological evidence from the Philpott (44Hr04) site in Henry County, Virginia, this thesis addresses the complex borderland processes playing out across the western Colonial Piedmont, with the goal of understanding how the Saras and other Native communities on the "Siouan frontier" engaged in, and resisted, emerging deerskin trading economies during the mid-seventeenth century. These analyses serve as a case study for investigating both the direct and indirect nature of colonial encounters at a regional scale.
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Prologue

“Clearly the boundary between trading and raiding, enmity and alliance, was a shifting and fluid one in the Virginia interior” - Hantman, Monacan Archaeology of the Virginia Interior

“Paths are the graphic effect of intentional, creative movement across the earth. They transform the ground, partition the earth, and create human space” - Weiner, The Empty Place: Poetry, Space, and Being among the Foi of Papua New Guinea

During the fall of 1700, Englishman John Lawson set out from Charleston with five other colonists and two Indian guides, intent to see the Carolina backcountry. To Lawson, the backcountry, what is now the modern-day Virginia and North Carolina Piedmont, was a literal “new world” in which every step brought “some new Object which still adds Invitation to the traveler in these parts” (Lefler 1903:202). Lawson made sense of this new world - and the plants, animals, and people within it - through analogy: Unfamiliar berries on the bank of the Roanoke were “much like our Blues, or Huckle-berries, that grows on Heaths in England” (Lefler 1903: 236-237), while rivers were “the size of the Derwent in Yorkshire or the Thames near Kingston” (Merrell 2009: 8).

But there were many elements of the Piedmont’s landscape for which Lawson had no analogy. “In our own way,” Lawson wrote, on leaving one Piedmont Native town, “there stood a great Stone about the Size of a large Oven, and hollow; this the Indians took great notice of, putting Tobacco into the concavity, and spitting after it. I ask’d them the reason of their so doing, but they made me no answer” (Lefler 1903: 192). Despite Lawson’s bewilderment, his account is valuable—not only because it offers a rare glimpse of the Saras, Occaneechis, Tutelos, Saponis, and numerous other Piedmont societies who lived beyond the gaze of colonial chroniclers for much of the seventeenth century—but because it highlights a considerable
disparity between European and Native perceptions of, or “ways of knowing,” the Piedmont’s colonial landscape (Ingold 2006; Kupperman 2000, 2007).

Ingold (2000) suggests that “knowing, like the perception of the environment in general, proceeds along paths of observation. One can no more know in places than travel in them. Rather, knowledge is regional: it is to be cultivated by moving along paths that lead around, towards or away from places, from or to places elsewhere” (2000:229). Ingold’s concept of “wayfinding” contextualizes Lawson’s confusion: Lawson did not understand the significance of the alter stone because he had never before navigated the complex system of trails that led him to it. He had had never cultivated a “regional knowledge” of the Piedmont’s meaningful spaces, nor of how Native social practices and ideologies made these spaces (and objects within them) meaningful in the first place (Ingold 2000: 219-229).

Starting with Lawson’s efforts to understand the unfamiliar spaces, places, and objects he encountered on his journey across the Piedmont, this thesis draws elements from landscape archaeology and historical anthropology to understand how fifteenth and sixteenth-century Native trading territories—and the boundaries and frontiers between them— influenced Native-European trade during the seventeenth century. Contrasting Native and European perceptions of landscapes, objects, and people revealed in historical accounts is essential to the study of human movement across and between cultural, geographic, and symbolic boundaries.

Through an analysis of archaeological and documentary evidence, I argue that the Piedmont, a region of colonial contact between Native communities and intruding Europeans, was a frontier space for the Sara and other Siouan-speaking Native communities that gave rise to hybrid forms of material culture and cultural practice in the seventeenth century (White, 1991; Appandurai 1996; Clifford 1997). Drawing ideas from Orser (1996), Wobst (1977), Hodder
(1978), Wiessner (1983), and Conkey and Hastorf (1990), I use archaeological evidence of exchange relations and historical documents about Native trail systems to trace the Saras’ social and economic connections across space and through time. Regular travel and settlement mobility created a landscape of movement within the Protohistoric Piedmont that allowed the Saras to pivot from Mississippian and Spanish networks toward new ties to the east during the colonial era.

Through these analyses, I link the Saras to their Contact Period trading partners, the Occaneechi and English to their east, and to their pre-contact trading partners in Mississippian and Spanish worlds to their west. I suggest that these trading relationships blurred and overlapped in complicated ways during the mid seventeenth century. By shifting the analysis toward the materials that played an active role shaping frontier landscapes of movement, I offer a study of borderland dynamics in areas where few ethnographic records survive. Such a frame situates Sara-affiliated archaeological sites like Philpott (44Hr04) within the broader historical context of the seventeenth-century Eastern Woodlands.

**Introduction**

*We demanded why they came in that manner to betray us, that came to them in peace, and to seeke their loves; he answered, they heard we were a people come from under the world, to take their world from them*” - John Smith, The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580-1631)

The earliest reference to Native boundaries in the Piedmont comes from Amorleck, a Manahoac scout, by way of John Smith. Hiking near the fall line (the region between the Piedmont and Coastal Plain physiographic provinces) in 1608, Smith’s band of explorers and their Algonquian interpreter Mosco captured Amorleck, a Siouan-speaking scout from beyond the falls. Amorleck told Smith, “*he and all with him were of Hasinninga, where there are three*
Kings more...that were come to Mohaskahod, which is onely a hunting Towne, and
the bounds betwixt the Kingdome of the Mannahocks, and the Nandtaughtacunds" (Smith 1580-1631; emphasis added).

Amorleck’s description of the fall line as a geopolitical boundary—a place where
information flowed freely between kingdoms—hints at the extent of the Native trail networks
that spanned Virginia’s Coastal Plain and Piedmont at the start of the seventeenth century.
Indeed, long before Smith’s party traversed the fall line, Amorleck and his Manahoac
companions had heard about the English, “a people come from under the world, to take their
world from them” (Smith 1580-1631). News of Smith’s arrival had passed quickly from person
to person along trails, the physical infrastructure of Native communications networks (Snead
2011). These Piedmont social and political networks come into focus through careful reading of
early colonial-era sources like Smith and Lawson.

When asked to describe his "owns Country,” Amorleck told John Smith that the
Monacans were the Manahoacs’ "neighbours and friends, and dwell as [we] in the hilly
Countries by small rivers, living upon rootes and fruits, but chiefly by hunting" (Smith 1580-1631, The complete works of Captain John Smith [vol. 1]). Separated by a century, Smith and
Lawson both encountered Native men who were members of culturally related communities.
Though politically independent, many Piedmont communities—including the Catawbas,
Tutellos, Saponis, Occaneechis, Monakans, and Saras—spoke “Eastern Siouan” or “Siouan-
Catawba” languages (Davis and Ward 1991; Hudson 1970; Mooney 1894; Merrell 1989).
Throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth, and early eighteenth centuries, many of these Siouan-
speaking communities settled Piedmont river drainages along the modern-day Virginia/North
Carolina state border (Mooney 1894; Davis and Ward 1991).
The geographic center of this southern Piedmont Siouan world was the Roanoke River, whose tributaries span the modern-day Virginia/North Carolina state border and collectively form the Roanoke River drainage. In this thesis, I explore the idea that the Roanoke River Drainage of the southern Piedmont was a frontier space for the Siouan-speaking Saras—a dynamic boundary land at the nexus of overlapping cultural influences (Naum 2003:111). While I address the concept of “frontier” as it applies to this paper in greater detail in the next section, here I refer to the Piedmont as both a physiographic province (a cartographic division of space) and as a region. I define “region” in the same way Casey does, as an area “concentrated by peregrinations between the places it connects” (Casey 1996:24). This definition presents paths as a central element of Native spaces. Indeed, paths were a central element of the Piedmont’s Native landscape: Paths linked disparate communities, situating each individual town or “contact point” within the broader matrix of a region.

Throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Siouan-speaking Saras negotiated social and political relationships through an elaborate network of land trails and river conduits, including trade relationships with Mississippian towns to the west and Algonquian communities to the east. By the seventeenth century, they expanded their region-wide trade networks, supplying the Siouan-speaking Occaneechis to the east with deerskins for European leather markets (Lapham 2012). Despite their prominent role in Native trading spheres across the region, the Saras are poorly understood and seldom mentioned in European histories, in part because they lived outside the gaze of colonial chroniclers for much of the seventeenth century. Many of the few details the English recorded about the Saras were relayed by their easterly trading partners, the Occaneechis. In this vein, they are similar to Sahlins’ “remote islands” of the
Pacific: While their histories “deserve a place alongside the self-contemplation of the European past,” they remain obscured by time and lack of ethnographic detail (Sahlins 1985).

Archaeological evidence from the Sara-occupied Philpott site (44Hr04) in Henry County, Virginia, speaks to the Piedmont’s position at the edge of colliding cultural spheres. Historic maps of contact period trail networks serve as “primary data” for examining past “landscapes of movement” (Snead, Erickson, and Darling 1991: 8). Non-local materials and trade objects found at Philpott and other Sara-affiliated sites serve as “secondary data”—signs of movement not directly related to the physical landscape across which people traveled—for interpreting past social and political connections across “landscapes of movement” (Snead, Erickson, and Darling 1991: 8). Traditional Mississippian motifs, like bird effigies and small anthropomorphic statues
with the “weeping eye,” appear regionally at sites occupied both before and after European contact in the late seventeenth century, and suggest strong social ties to the west. European-made trade goods, like copper beads, Gorgetts, and copper trading scraps, appear at the Lower and Upper Saratown sites. Evidence from these Middle and Late Contact period occupations suggest strong economic influences from the English to the east and the Spanish to the south.

This thesis combines these archaeological data with documentary sources to provide a more complete and dynamic view of the Saras and the rapidly changing seventeenth-century landscape on which they lived. Just as Hantman (1990) used English accounts about the Powhatans to learn about their distant enemies, the Monacans, I draw upon the well-known history of the Occaneechis to learn about the Saras and other Siouan-speaking communities living throughout the Piedmont. While earlier studies of Siouan-speakers in this region saw European trade goods as an index of acculturation and increasing English influence in the region, I suggest that they instead reflect long-standing trade relationships between interior Piedmont Siouan communities like the Saras, and eastern communities like the Occaneechi —relationships that crossed geographic and community boundaries as hybrid and dynamic exchanges.

Frontiers

"Lying on the margins or in the interstices of cultural networks, frontiers are the quintessential matrices of change. Here it is possible both to escape from the cultural conventions of one's own society and to make contact with people carrying other conventions, other ways of living, thinking, and organizing social groups" (Rodseth and Parker 2005: 8).

“All knowing is like traveling, like a journey between the parts of the matrix" (Turnbull 1991: 35)

American frontier narratives are often set against the backdrop of a “pristine,” uninhabited wilderness. Indeed, popular renderings of Virginia’s colonial past describe frontier
settlers toiling amidst the hills of the Piedmont region, an “isolated and imposing wilderness” west of the fall line (Stanford, 1990: 254). Though numerous scholars have studied frontiers in the past sixty years (Wyman and Kroeber 1957; Hartz 1964; Miller and Steffen 1977; Lamar and Thompson 1981), ‘frontier’ as a concept remains closely tied to the historical context of the nineteenth-century American West and the historiographic tradition stemming from the work of Frederic Jackson Turner (1861-1932). Bound up in Victorian notions of rugged individualism and manifest destiny (Limerick 1987, 1991; Worster 1987, 1991), Turnerian frontiers are, as Klein puts it, "of wild nature and wild people" (1996:185-186). They divide core areas from a "wilderness" in which there are few or no human inhabitants (Prescott 1987: 36; Rosler and Wedl 1992: 2; Parker 2002: 375).

Far from an uninhabited Turnerian wilderness, the seventeenth-century New World was home to numerous Native communities who had their own frontiers and borderlands (Hantman 1998; Myers 2011). In his Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannie, Jamestown secretary William Strachey outlined the geographic and political extent of “Powhatan’s Empire,” noting that “the inhabitants themselves, especially his frontier neighbor princes, call him still Powhatan” (Strachey 1615). The “frontier” Strachey mentioned highlighted the boundaries of Powhatan’s vast chiefdom. Although the word "frontier" often indexes European boundaries today, Strachey’s account suggests that seventeenth-century Native communities also negotiated frontier spaces between Native groups—spaces where new social formations, novel cultural categories, and hybrid material objects emerged through cultural contact (Barth, 1969; Green and Perlman, 1985; Lightfoot and Martinez 1995; Naum 2003). Powhatan’s “frontier” in the Tidewater—a boundary marking social, linguistic, and political differences—serves as my starting point for exploring Native frontier spaces in Virginia’s western Piedmont region.
Joining the effort to “untame” frontiers of Native North America (Rodseth and Parker 2005), I consider the southern Piedmont a region of overlapping cultural influences and economic and political networks, rather than a “no-mans land” (White 1991; Kolodny 1992; Schlegel 1992; Eaton 1993; Aron 1994; Donnan and Wilson 1994, 1999; Klein 1996; Guy and Sheridan 1998; Adelman and Aron 1999; Parker 2002). I follow Rodseth and Parker’s definition of frontier, defining it as a "shifting zone of innovation and recombination through which cultural materials from many sources have been unpredictably channeled and transformed" (2005: 4). Although Rodseth and Parker suggest that material culture moves "unpredictably" in a frontier setting, I argue that the movement of past peoples and the goods they carried with them can be understood through comparative historical research and archaeological analyses of Native tradeways.

Here, I suggest that the dynamic social and political connections between the Saras and other communities outside the Piedmont—connections that were physically inscribed upon the landscape as paths and trails—are what make the Piedmont a frontier space. Expanding out from populous centers (or cores), trails and paths crisscrossed the region, connecting Piedmont Siouan communities with Mississippian polities to the west and Algonquian groups to the east. Trails directed material goods, people, and beliefs into the Piedmont, creating a uniquely hybrid cultural space during the seventeenth century. For the Saras, such trails defined a “landscape of movement”—a “context for ‘getting there’ that evolves through action and design” (Snead, Erickson, and Darling 1991: 1). Indeed, trails and trade routes between the Saras and other communities outside the Dan River basin evolved as the Saras negotiated changing social, political, and economic relationships throughout the seventeenth century.
My approach to studying the Piedmont as a frontier created by mobile agents compliments research on borders, borderlands, boundaries, diasporas, third spaces, middle grounds, and contact zones—what Rodseth and Parker call "those 'transitional fields' in which peoples, communities, and cultural ideas tend to mingle and recombine" (Rodseth and Parker 2005:3; e.g. Barth 1969; White 1991; Eaton 1993; Bhabha 1994; Appandurai 1996; Hannerz 1996; Clifford 1997; Donnan and Wilson 1999; Aaron 2005). Borders, boundaries, and frontiers are central terms in this paper, so I distinguish between them here. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), a "boundary" - the most general term of the three - "serves to indicate the bounds or limits of anything." The term "boundary" then, includes the more specific terms "border" and "frontier." A "border," as defined in the OED, is a *legally-recognized line*, a demarcation separating one political unit from another.

In this paper, I use the term "border" as a "crystallized boundary" between two polities (Rodseth and Parker 2005: 10). In contrast, I consider a "frontier" to be a boundary space much more broadly-defined—a *region* rather than a line. Elton (1996), recognizes this difference as well, noting that frontiers differ from borders and boundaries, not only because they are regions rather than lines, but because *they include many kinds of boundaries*: In addition to political boundaries, frontiers encapsulate cultural boundaries—whether they be linguistic, ethnic, or religious. To Eton, frontiers are "zones of overlapping political, economic, and cultural boundaries" (Elton 1996: 3-9; Parker 2002).

Barth (1969), Cole and Wolf (1974) examined how ethnic groups living in "transitional fields" like border towns, maintained their traditional boundaries despite the flow of material culture across them. I do much the same in this thesis, suggesting that despite increasing trading between the Saras (and other Native communities in the Dan River basin) and the Spanish and
English throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Saras maintained their traditional cultural practices in the face of increasing regional interaction and economic interdependence. While the word "tradition;" often connotes stasis, I use the word as Pauketat (2005) does—to refer to long-held practices that were expanded and modified throughout the contact period.

**Natural and Cultural Worlds of the Piedmont**

“North, as well as South-America, may be divided into three regions: the flats, the highlands, and the mountains. The flats, (in Indian, Ahkynt) is the territory lying between the eastern coast, and the falls of the great rivers, that there run into the Atlantick Ocean... The highlands (in Indian, Ahkontshuck) begin at those falls, and determine at the foot of the great ridge of mountains that runs thorow the midst of this continent, northeast and southwest, called by the Spaniards Apalatai, from the Nation Apalakin; and by the Indians, Pamotinck... The Apalataean mountains, called in Indian Pamotinck, (or the origine of the Indians) are barren rocks, and therefore deserted by all living creatures” – John Lederer 1673, describing Virginia territorial divisions in his Discoveries

"We asked him how many worlds he did know, he replyed, he knew no more but that which was under the skie that covered him, which were the Powhatans, with the Monacans, and the Massawomeks, that were higher up in the mountaines. Then we asked him what was beyond the mountaines, he answered the Sunne: but of any thing els he knew nothing" - John Smith 1580-1631, relaying an encounter with Mannahoak Ammorlek near the fall line

During his first expedition through North Carolina in 1566—long before Smith’s meeting with Amorleck—Juan Pardo, commander of Hernando de Soto's Spanish armies, met with Orata Chara, a lesser Guitari chief from a town on the Yadkin River. Chara was tired of paying the excessive tributes demanded by his chief, a female warrior named Guatari Mico, one of the Mississippian "Cofitachiques" who ruled over a few dozen towns in the Yadkin River drainage. Hoping a deal with the Spanish would prove more fruitful, Chara asked Pardo's permission to shift his town's tributary relationship from the Guitari chiefdom to a chiefdom called Joara where the Spanish had recently established Fort San Juan.
It is unclear whether Orata Chara got what he wanted—the Spanish failed to record the outcome of his meeting with Juan Pardo. This 1566 anecdote may, however, provide the first European reference to the Piedmont Saras mentioned in Lederer, Lawson, Byrd, and Needham’s descriptions of communities living in Virginia/North Carolina Piedmont Physiographic Province (Hudson, 1990: 90). In 1670, Lederer found the Saras “not far from the distant mountains,” thirty miles west of Watary and three-day’s march northwest of Wisacky (Cumming, 1958: 28; Simpkins, 1985: 46)—a description that places them on the Dan River, in the vicinity archaeological sites known by the alphanumeric designations 31Sk1, 31Sk1a, 31Sk6, 31Sk16, and 31Rk6 (Simpkins, 1985: 47). Three years later, Needham again saw the Saras on the Dan River when he traveled from “Aeno” to “Sarrah” to “Yattken” with his Occaneechi guides (Alvord and Bidgood, 1912: 217). These seventeenth and eighteenth-century accounts indicate that the Siouan-speaking Saras lived in the Piedmont’s Dan River Basin, along rivers in what is now Henry County in Virginia, and Rockingham and Stokes Counties in North Carolina.

The Virginia/North Carolina Piedmont is a stretch of rolling topography bounded to the west by the Blue Ridge Mountains and to the east by the north/south-trending “fall line,” which

![Figure 2: Map of Virginia’s physiographic provinces. Figure drawn by author.](image-url)
marks the geologic transition from the Coastal Plain’s soft oceanic sediments to the Piedmont’s crystalline bedrock. Both geologic demarcation and cartographic boundary, the fall line refers to the literal “fall” of eastward-flowing river water as it passes from higher elevation in the Piedmont’s hills—“Rockes farre west in a Country inhabited by a nation they call Monacans” Smith (1607)—to lower elevation on the flat coastal plain.

Just as Lederer saw Virginia’s landscape as three distinct natural regions—the flats, the highlands, and the mountains—so too did Virginia Indians (Egloff 1985:241; Holland 1966:2-3). While these natural regions were likely “not significant cultural boundaries” for Virginia Indians during the Paleoindian and Early Woodland Periods (Hantman and Klein 1992:137), by the Late Woodland Period, the fall line boundary increasingly served as a locus of social interaction between Piedmont Siouan-speaking groups and Algonquian communities from the Coastal Plain (Hantman, 1990). By the early seventeenth century, “the ethnohistoric literature is replete with references to a cultural boundary, even animosity, between the people of the Piedmont and Coastal Plain physiographic provinces (see especially Strachey 1953:34)” (Hantman and Klein 1992:138). Indeed, coastal Virginia Indians informed John Smith that their interior neighbors the Monacans were “noughts” (good for nothing) and “very barbarous” (Barbour I:154,165; Merrell 1989: 23).
South of Monacan territory, between the coastal and mountain “worlds” Ammorlek
described to John Smith, the Piedmont’s hills drain water into the Dan River straddling the
modern-day Virginia/North Carolina state border. The Dan River basin is underlain by a series of
N-S- trending Triassic-age metamorphic belts capped by sedimentary strata (shale, mudstone,
sandstone, siltstone) (Olson 1990: 142-144). Crossing these strata, the Dan River flows east from
Virginia’s Blue Ridge region to the Roanoke River proper in south central Virginia, near present-
day Clarksville. Throughout the Middle and Late Woodland period, the Dan’s extensive
floodplains supported rich Oak forests and high deer populations (Braun 1950; Lapham 2005).
Cleared of vegetation, they provided fertile, arable land for the Dan River culture, the area’s
earliest agriculturalists (Davis 2002).
Archaeologists working in the Virginia / North Carolina Piedmont generally regard this prehistoric Dan River culture as ancestral to the historic Saras: Coe (1952), Davis (2002, 2005), Eastman (2001), Ward and Davis (1992, 1993) place ancestral Saras communities along the Dan River and its tributaries by A.D. 1000, with “little interruption” until the end of the seventeenth century (Beck 2013:126). Between 1000 and 1700, the Saras and their Dan River ancestors built palisaded villages at river confluences. They planted crops in acidic, floodplain soils—like the Riverview-Toccoa-Chewacla soil unit (Leab 1995) at Upper Saratown, and the Chewacla-Congaree-Wehadkee unit sampled from the Lower Saratown and Madison sites (Davis and Ward 1992). River ecosystems offered another source of food: Crushed gastropod shells found in middens, and fishhooks commonly found in male burials throughout the region, suggest that fish and gastropod resources were dietary staples, as well as symbolic cultural elements (Gramillion 1996). Proximity to the Saratown Mountains afforded Native communities other benefits, like access to quartz and quartzite for stone tools (Butler and Secor, 1990: 36-42, 66), while chert cobbles found in riverbeds (called “float” chert) provided some direct access to cryptocrystalline lithics (Hantman, 1987).

Scholars disagree about whether the Saras living in the Dan River basin during the mid-seventeenth century are related to the Xuala mentioned by de Soto (Wilson, 1983) or the Joara and Chara mentioned by Pardo (Merrell 1989; Simpkins 1985). Eighteenth-century maps and documents often spell Sara as Charra, Charraw and Cheraw (Cumming 1998; Evans, 1756), so Chara, Xuala, and Joara may well be different spellings of Sara (Hudson 1990; Eastman 1999). Beck (2013) and Simpkins (1985), however, suggests that if these accounts do indeed refer to the Saras, they place them far south of the Dan River Basin during the sixteenth century, perhaps as far as the modern-day border between North Carolina and South Carolina.
While such accounts may provide a glimpse into past migrations, they may also speak to the geographic extent of the Saras political and economic affiliations during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Dan River Saras may have been part of a broader Mississippian regional system (Hally, 2006), a network of socially and economically affiliated chiefly polities across the American Southeast. DePratter (1994) and Hudson (1994) suggest that during the protohistoric period (1500-1607), groups living as far north as the Dan River basin were part of the same Mississippian Cofitachequi as Orata Chara, a prominent polity mentioned in de Soto’s mid-sixteenth century accounts of his tours through North Carolina (Rudes 2004). Cofitachequi principal territory spanned north to south from the Yadkin River drainage near the junction of the Congaree and Wateree Rivers to the North Carolina state border (Depratter 1994; Hally 2006), though their power and influence likely extended as far east as the Atlantic (Hudson and Tesser 1994: 9).

Exploring this potential link between the seventeenth-century Saras and the Mississippian world south of the Dan River drainage is critical to understanding the cultural landscape English explorers encountered a century after de Soto’s march through North Carolina. Long before de Soto, Pardo, Lawson, and Lederer arrived in the interior, the Saras and other Piedmont communities were embroiled in social and political alliances to the west, alliances that shaped their engagement with European economies to the east during the seventeenth century. In the following sections, I examine historical documents for clues about the Saras’ ties to places and peoples across the Piedmont region of Virginia and North Carolina.

Building upon this synthesis, I present archaeological evidence that suggests that the Saras were positioned at the edge of colliding cultural worlds both prior to and after the arrival of Europeans to the New World. During the protohistoric and early contact periods, the Saras were
part of the Mississippian world to the west. During the middle and late contact period, they began shifting their regional networks to the east, trading deerskins with the Occaneechi and other communities of common linguistic and cultural ancestry. As the seventeenth century progressed, southern Piedmont communities were also influenced by the Iroquoian world to their North. Seneca raiders increasingly traveled south along the Great War path to capture slaves in the Southern Piedmont. Just as Mannahoak Amorleck engaged with the Native “worlds he knew” around him - the Monnakin to his west and Powhatan to his east - so too did the Saras engaged with multiple worlds from many directions.

The Occaneechi Path

“Paths are the graphic effect of intentional, creative movement across the earth. They transform the ground, partition the earth, and create human space” (Weiner, The Empty Place: Poetry, Space, and Being among the Foi of Papua New Guinea)

Lederer’s brief accounts aside, much of what we know about the Saras and other interior Piedmont communities comes filtered through accounts about their eastern trading partners, the Occaneechis. During the late seventeenth century, the Occaneechis were a prominent Native power with far-reaching economic influence. They were well known middlemen in the fur and deerskin trade that flourished between the English colonists and Piedmont Indians during the 1660s and 1670s, and maintained economic ties to both the English at Jamestown to their east and the Saras of the interior Piedmont to their west (Davis and Ward 1993; Ward 1988). Like the Saras, they spoke an eastern Siouan dialect, one of several used by Virginia Indians in the deerskin trade (Beverley 1705).

The Occaneechis first appear in historical records in 1650, when an Appomattox Indian guide told the English explorer Edward Bland about an island in Virginia’s Roanoke River where "some of the Occonacheans lived." Between 1650 and 1700, the Occaneechis’ island settlement
was a prominent marketplace in Virginia’s colonial economy. Stocked with munitions and European trade goods, Occaneechi Island was a well-known, central local where interior Native communities like the Tutellos and Saponis could meet to trade deerskins for European goods, copper beads for valuable pelts (Davis and Ward 1991; 1993).

Later accounts of the area come from Lederer, who visited and described Occaneechi Island in 1670, and from Wood, who in 1673, referred to Occaneechi Island as “the Mart of all the Indians for at least 500 miles” (Merrell 2009:91). From their island stronghold, the Occaneechi controlled the flow of goods and people along the Occaneechi Path, a prehistoric trail system that emerged as an important trade route during the seventeenth century (Myers 1928; Ward and Davis 1991). Rather than a single road, the Occaneechi Path was a series of associated trails and waterways that braided together in a regional conduit—an “ensemble[s] of place to place movements” (Ingold 2000:229)—that connected the Cherokee in the south to the Occaneechis in Virginia.

The Occaneechi Path’s name offers unique insight into its past associations and functions, what Ashmore and others would call its’ “life history” (2002:1178). Bell and Locke, for example, suggest that trails like the Occaneechi Path have “biographies based on people, events and places associated with them” (2000:86). These “biographies,” or life histories, endow the route with “cultural meaning and significance” (Bell and Locke 2000:86; cf. Darnell 2002:114; cf. Snead 2006:3). Indeed, though traveled by numerous Native groups in the seventeenth century, and later paved for European wagon roads in the eighteenth century, the Occaneechi Path retained its association with the Occaneechis throughout much of the seventeenth century.
Two ethnographic examples taken from outside the Piedmont illustrate the importance of trails like the Occaneechi Path in structuring regional social and political dynamics. Pandya (1990) suggests that the Ongees of the Bay of Bengal see their “world” not as a “reconstituted stage on which things happen, but rather an area or region created and constructed by the ongoing practice of movement” (Pandya 1990: 777). Similarly, the Walbiri of western Australia perceive their entire country "in terms of networks of places linked by paths" (Munn 1973a: 215). The Walbiri believe that the paths criss-crossing their region were originally blazed by their ancestors; by walking along such paths they are constantly retracing the steps of the dead. As Ingold suggests, “everywhere’ is not a space” for the Ongee and Walbiri, “but a region
concentrated by the place-to-place movements of humans, animals, spirits, winds, celestial bodies, and so on” (2000: 228).

Native-made maps, “graphic depictions of the balance of power among the southeastern Indians” (Waselkov 2006: 453), hint at the central role that trails like the Occaneechi Path played in the seventeenth-century Native world (2006: 453). Paths drawn between different communities on Chicksaw and Catawba maps, for example, represent kin and trade-based connections between groups (Waselkov 2006; 453). More than a means for moving goods and people from point A to point B, the Occaneechi Path was a meaningful place in its own right (Snead 2011: 478); it was a venue for negotiating social and political relationships (Loren 2008; Tanner 2005).

The following section examines archaeological evidence from interior Piedmont sites with the goal of understanding the Occaneechis’ relationship to Piedmont communities like the Saras, as well as their evolving role in the European deerskin trade over the course of the seventeenth century. Although some scholars (Davis and Ward 1993; Davis 2005) suggest that the Saras were economically tethered to the Occaneechi—and therefore received most of their European-made trade goods through Occaneechi intermediaries—I draw upon archaeological and documentary evidence from the early contact period Philpott site to suggest that between the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the Saras were predominantly trading in networks to their southwest.
Archaeological Background

Figure 5: Photograph taken of the project area in 1975, facing south. The lower terrace (the purported location of the Contact Period component) is located just beyond the tree. Gravely’s (1975) excavations took place between the tree and the building, just south of the parking lot.

In the 1980s, construction in Philpott, Virginia uncovered two Virginia Indian burials containing brass gorgets and glass beads near a previously excavated palisaded village site (44Hr04) once occupied by the Saras. Richard Graveley of the Archaeological Society of Virginia (ASV) classified the burials as “historic” and dated them to approximately 1650. Excavations just 30 miles southwest near another Sara-affiliated site—Upper Saratown (31Rk6) in North Carolina— revealed an even greater quantity of European goods and objects. In addition to brass gorgets and beads, archaeologists found English guns and metal tools such as scissors and shovels, items dating to the turn of the eighteenth century(Davis, 1990). Though
linked explicitly with the historic period, the European trade objects found at Philpott and Upper Saratown hint at the Saras’ place at the edge of multiple prehistoric and historic trading spheres.

In an effort to trace the shifting trade relations and settlement dynamics that impacted Saras’ social history prior to the peak of the European deerskin trade in 1700 (Lapham 2012), I compare contact-period remains from the Philpott site to those of other Contact Period sites throughout the Dan River Drainage (Table 1). These sites include the Hairston Site (31Sk1), Madison Site (31Rk6), Lower Saratown Site (31Rk1), Early and Late Upper Saratown Site(s) (31Sk1), and Philpott Site (44Hr4). In the pages to follow, I provide an overview of these sites, as well as the temporal “phases” in which they were occupied. Ward and Davis (1993) developed a chronological framework for the Late Prehistoric and Contact Periods in the Dan River Basin by combining radiocarbon dates obtained from midden features with ceramic, bead, and pipe seriation date ranges. I use Davis and Ward’s archaeological phases and chronological periods to describe material culture patterns at the Philpott site and across the Dan River basin (see Table 1). I also employ Eastman’s (2002:50-52) chronological classifications to organize and date sites in this study (see Appendix).

I focus specifically on the Philpott Site (44Hr4) because of the size of its’ Late Prehistoric village, the thickness of its’ archaeological deposits, and the high density of artifacts across its’ lower and upper terraces, which together suggest an important settlement in the region (Davis 1998). I am particularly interested in understanding the Contact Period component at Philpott: Was this component culturally affiliated with the prehistoric occupation of the site? How long was the settlement actively occupied during the seventeenth century? With whom were the Philpott Saras trading? What can Philpott reveal about the Saras’ past? Using these questions as a guide, I draw upon material evidence from Philpott’s historic component—two
Contact Period burials (labeled A and B) on the site’s lower terrace—to argue that the settlement was an important node within a broad network of Sara-affiliated communities in the Dan River drainage.

**Sites in this Study**

Table 1: Site Chronology for sites included in mortuary analysis (Figure made by author, based on Eastman 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronological Period</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Sites Included in Mortuary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Contact (LC)</td>
<td>AD 1670-1710</td>
<td>Upper Saratown (31Sk1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Contact (MC)</td>
<td>AD 1650-1670</td>
<td>Upper Saratown (31Sk1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Contact (EC)</td>
<td>AD 1607-1650</td>
<td>Lower Saratown (31Rk1), Hairston (31Sk1), Madison (31Rk6), Philpott (44Hr4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Philpott (44Hr4)*

Located at the confluence of the Smith River and Town Creek in Henry County, Virginia, the Philpott site was occupied multiple times and includes two components dated to the Early Saratown and Middle Saratown Phases. The Early Saratown component contains thousands of lithic, ceramic, and shell artifacts; however, contexts are poorly mapped. 357 artifacts made of marine shell were recovered from the Philpott site. All but two of these objects came from burial contexts. Located on the lower terrace of near the bank of Town Creek, the Middle Saratown component of the Philpott site is poorly understood and defined solely by the presence of two burials containing European trade goods. These items include smoking pipes, European trade Aside from items included in burials A and B, Philpott’s Middle Saratown component is suggested by the presence of a large number of Oldtown Series Pottery.
Early Upper Saratown or "Hairston" (31Sk1)

Located in the same field as Upper Saratown, the Early Upper Saratown site was dated to the Protohistoric Period (1500-1607). Covering approximately 2.5 acres, Hairston is a multi-component site representing three separate occupations. A 30.5 m long trench excavated at the site revealed forty large, high-density pit features, six human burials, and a possible palisade (Wilason, 1983: 379). Artifacts recovered from these features were primarily Native-made. One circular copper gorget was recovered; however, Eastman (1999: 18) suggests that it was likely
Native copper rather than European copper alloy. The Hairston site was listed as “likely” affiliated with the Catawba in NAGPRA inventories (Davis 1999:42). Ceramics account for the majority of artifacts recovered from features at the Hairston site: While Uwharrie and Dan River ceramics were recovered from a few features, most features contained Protohistoric and Contact Period Oldtown series pottery.

Madison (31Rk6)

Named for the 130 burials excavated at the site, the Madison "Cemetery" site is located on the Dan between the Upper Saratown and Lower Saratown sites. While most burials at this site contain Late Contact Period materials and likely date between 1670-1710 AD, three burials at the site likely date to the Early Contact Period (Eastman 2002). Data from these three burials are included in analyses of Early Contact Period burials from the Dan River Basin.

Upper Saratown (31Sk1a)

Affiliated with the Catawba, the Upper Saratown site is located in Stokes County, North Carolina. The Late Contact Period Upper Saratown site dates is positioned on the Dan River’s western floodplain, just north of the river’s confluence with Town Fork Creek. RLA conducted excavations on a 1,524m² area of the site between 1972 and 1981, revealing 225 pit features and 111 human burials. Wilson (1983: 474) identified portions of (at least) four palisade walls and 13 circular structures. High quantities of European trade objects, suggest that it was occupied between 1670 and 1710 when the sites occupants were likely heavily involved in the European Deerskin trade to the east.

Lower Saratown (31Rk1)

Located just below the mouth of the Smith River on the Dan (1.2 km east of Eden in Rockingham Country), the Lower Saratown site is a multi-component site with occupations
dating to the Early and Middle Saratown Phases (1450 - 1620; 1620 - 1670). Using historic accounts, Coe (1938) and Lewis (1951) suggested that the Early Saratown component of the Lower Saratown site represented the same village mentioned by Byrd in his 1733 account. Byrd's account and maps place an abandoned Sara village on the Dan River near Town Creek; however, no historic artifacts were recovered during the 1938 excavations (Gamer 1980), casting doubt on this designation. Excavations conducted at the site in 1988 revealed the remains of a second village component containing one human burial, 47 pit features, and a segment of palisade wall (Ward and Davis 1993: 182). This component, occupied during the Early Contact Period (1607-1650) likely represents the remains of the Lower Saratown mentioned in Byrd's account (Eastman 1994: 22). Data from Lower Saratown’s “Burial 1” are included in analyses of Early Contact Period burials from the Dan River Basin.

**Dan River Basin Chronological Phases**

Table 2: Site Chronology (Figure made by author, based on Ward and Davis 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronological Period</th>
<th>Period Date Range</th>
<th>Sites Included in Mortuary Analysis</th>
<th>Phase Date Range</th>
<th>Ceramic Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Contact (LC)</td>
<td>AD 1670 - 1710</td>
<td>Late Saratown Phase</td>
<td>AD 1670 - 1710</td>
<td>Oldtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Contact (MC)</td>
<td>AD 1650 - 1670</td>
<td>Middle Saratown Phase</td>
<td>AD 1620 - 1670</td>
<td>Oldtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Contact (EC)</td>
<td>AD 1607 - 1650</td>
<td>Middle Saratown Phase</td>
<td>AD 1620 - 1670</td>
<td>Oldtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protoliterate</td>
<td>AD 1500 - 1607</td>
<td>Early Saratown Phase</td>
<td>AD 1450 - 1620</td>
<td>Oldtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Prehistoric</td>
<td>AD 1000 - 1500</td>
<td>Dan River Phase</td>
<td>AD 1000 - 1450</td>
<td>Dan River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dan River Phase (AD 1000-1450)*

The Dan River Phase encompasses the Late Prehistoric Chronological Period (AD 1000-1500). The Dan River Phase is associated with occupations dated before the arrival of Europeans to the Americas. This phase is marked by the predominance of thick-walled rock tempered Dan River Series pottery associated with the Dan River culture (Davis 1998). While it is unclear whether the Dan River Culture is related to the Saras recorded living in the Dan River drainage by
Lederer and Lawson at the start of the eighteenth century, the presence of Dan River pottery at contact period sites across the Dan River drainage suggests that at least some Sara communities continued to produce and use Dan River wares through the seventeenth century. Typically around one half acre in size, Early Dan River phase sites are most often located along stream terraces in alluvial bottomlands throughout the Dan River basin (Simpkins 1992). Early Dan River phase sites (ca. AD 1000-1300) appear to lack internal arrangement: most are marked by clusters of round and square buildings. Sand and rock-tempered Dan River series pottery is nearly ubiquitous at these sites, while contemporaneous shell-tempered Uwharrie and Grayson series pottery are found more rarely (Davis and Ward 1991). By the start of the Middle Dan River phase (ca. AD 1300-1350), however, settlements become larger (occupying 1 to 2 acres of land) and more formally organized (Eastman 1994:26). Late Dan River villages (ca. AD 1350-1450) are typically palisaded and comprised of 15-20 structures surrounding a central plaza (Davis and Ward 1991: 48). Davis and Ward (1991), Simpkins (1992), and Ward and Davis (1993) suggest that changes in site organization and size during this period reflect increasing populations throughout the region, perhaps in association with intensifying Maize agriculture. Construction of palisaded villages intensified during the late Dan River phase, as increasing labor-investment in agricultural lands fueled inter-community hostilities (Eastman 1994: 228).

*Early Saratown Phase (AD 1450-1620)*

The Early Saratown Phase encompasses the Protohistoric Chronological Period (1500-1607 AD). Like Late Dan River Phase sites, Early Saratown (or Protohistoric) villages are comprised of multiple buildings surrounding a central plaza. Early Saratown phase sites, however, are larger in size (covering approximately 2-3 acres in area), and are marked by highly-dense midden
features, stratified pits, and exotic marine shell objects in burials (Eastman, 1994:26). Early Saratown sites also contain Oldtown Series pottery, which largely replaces Dan River Pottery during the Protohistoric period. Shell gorgets found at these Protohistoric sites resemble those found throughout the Southern Appalachians and Southwest Virginia. Likewise, Oldtown pottery includes new vessel forms and decorative treatments that resemble pottery from the Lamar pottery region of the interior southeast (Simpkins, 1992). While Eastman (1994) suggests that these site patterns reflect increasing community size, growing social complexity, and intensifying agriculture practice throughout the Protohistoric, Simpkins (1992) argues that they evidence social and economic ties to the west.

_Middle Saratown Phase (1620-1670)_

The Middle Saratown Phase encompasses the Early and Middle Contact Chronological Periods (1607-150; 1650-1670 AD). The Middle Saratown Phase marks the period when the Saras began to receive English trade goods through a series of down-the-line exchanges via Indian intermediaries (Davis and Ward 1991). Davis and Ward (1993) note that the “hallmark” of the Middle Saratown phase (1620-1670) is the presence of small European-made items, like copper and glass beads, in burials. The Middle Saratown Phase also marks a period of increased violence for communities living in the Dan River Basin. Increasing construction of palisaded villages during this time period reflect growing hostilities from outside the region (Ward and Davis 1991, 1993). Indeed, Iroquois raids were a constant threat for the Saras and their neighbors across the Piedmont. Historical accounts document threats from the north: Lederer and Lawson were often on the lookout for Seneca raiders said to be passing through the region on slave raids.
Late Saratown Phase (1670-1710)

The Late Saratown Phase encompasses the Late Contact Chronological Period (1670-1710 AD). The Late Saratown Phase marks a period in which the Saras were beginning to trade directly with English traders and were actively participating in the European Deerskin trade towards the east (Davis and Ward 1991; Lapham 2012). This period is marked by increasing mobility and resettlement of many Piedmont communities eastward, as Native people responded to increasing pressure from Iroquois raiding parties, European disease, and growing desire to engage directly in European deerskin trading markets to the east.

Material Culture Analysis

Material culture-based studies of mortuary practice provide important information for understanding past populations and their social structures (Beck 1995; Binford 1971; Blakey et al 1997; Braun 1979; Brown 1971; Carr 1995; Eastman 1994, 1997; Eastman and Rodning 2000). Recognizing the temporal sensitivity of mortuary objects like ceramics and pipes, I focus on these specific object categories when situating Philpott within the chronological arch of the seventeenth century Dan River Basin. I also use radiocarbon dates obtained at a few sites to establish occupation ages. Though less accurate for dating sites occupied after 1600, radiocarbon dating also provides a relatively reliable occupation date range for a few sites in the Dan River Basin when used alongside dates derived through artifact seriation—a process for ordering groups of data based on a dimension of variance (Marquardt 1978; Spaulding 1978).

Ceramics

Vessel form, surface decoration, and temper are often used to date sites and build site occupation chronologies in the Dan River drainage (Eastman 1994:46; Davis and Ward 1993;
Davis 1998). Three main ceramic series are common throughout the region: the Uwharrie Series, the Dan River Series, and the Oldtown Series. All three of these pottery series were represented in Philpott ceramic sample, which is composed of over 60,000 sherds recovered through excavation and surface survey at the Philpott site. Of the total sherds collected, only ~3000 sherds (~5% of the assemblage) were analyzed. Of this sample, Davis (1998) targeted decorated sherds and mendable vessel forms. For a detailed discussion of pottery decoration motifs at the Philpott site, see Davis (1998: 43-46).

_Uwharrie Series Pottery:_ Uwharrie series pottery is a late prehistoric pottery type found in late prehistoric features at the Upper Saratown site, the Hairston site, and the Philpott site. Uwharrie sherds are typically thick, between 6mm and 10 mm, and are tempered with angular quartz particles, coarse sub-angular quartz sand (Davis and Ward, 1993; Davis, 1998). Most vessels have rims decorated with fingernail indentations and scraped interiors. While some Uwharrie series pottery is common at sites across the Dan River basin, it is not a dominant ceramic type at the sites I examine in this study, so I do not include any Uwharrie Series sites in my chronology or analysis.

_Dan River Series Pottery:_ Dan River series pottery is another type of late prehistoric pottery common throughout the western Piedmont of southern Virginia and northern North Carolina (Egloff et al. 1994). The series is found throughout (and named for) the Dan River Basin at sites like Upper Saratown, Hairston, and Philpott and is the dominant pottery type at sites in the region that were occupied between 1400 through the Protohistoric period (Coe and Lewis 1952). Over 97% of the pottery sherds and reconstructed vessels at Philpott are from the Dan River Series. Most of these vessels are net-impressed, which means that their exterior surfaces are decorated with impressions from a knotted or looped net. Net impressed Dan River
pottery is the most common ceramic series at the Philpott site, as well as at other sites throughout the region.

*Oldtown Series Pottery:* The Oldtown series was produced in the Dan River drainage from the fifteenth through the beginning of the eighteenth century. Oldtown pottery emerged as Dan River Potters began incorporating new design elements into the vessels they were producing. Over time, they slowly changed their clay “recipe” to include a finer temper made from sand grains and muscovite (Davis 1998). This new “recipe” allowed potters to create vessels with thinner walls and smoother surface treatments. Oldtown pottery found at sites across the Dan River drainage reflects these changing production strategies. A collection of very thin Oldtown pottery sherds from the Lower Terrace of the Dan River site, where burials A and B are located, likely date to the early seventeenth century. These potsherds are likely contemporaneous with burials A and B (Davis, 1997:44).

Frequency seriation of pottery types from sites across the region reveals an important trend in pottery production. Although most communities transitioned from Uwharrie, to Dan River, to Oldtown Pottery through the passage of generations, all Contact Period features sampled from sites in the Dan River basin contain at least 8% Dan River pottery. These numbers suggest that Dan River communities continued to use (and perhaps produce) Dan River pottery through the contact period, a continued pottery tradition that may reflect the historic Saras’ prehistoric ties to the Dan River culture (Davis 2002).
Figure 7: Frequency seriation of selected pottery types in nine pit feature assemblages from across the Dan River Basin. Seriation was conducted on sherds excavated from Feature 9 of Philpott’s Dan River Phase occupation. These seriation data were compared to data from other feature contexts in the Dan River Drainage.

Clay Smoking Pipes

Two complete pipes were found at the Philpott site: one was recovered from Burial 16 (located in the Dan River phase village area), the other was recovered from Burial B (located on the lower terrace, associated with the seventeenth century occupation of the site) (Davis 1998:49). The pipe found in Burial 16 has a round stem that tapers from the bowl to the bit. It has a slightly bulbous bowl that is embellished with a square rim flange. Its form is consistent with pipes produced in the Dan River drainage during the late Dan River phase (AD 1350-1450) (Figure 8). This pipe form is contemporaneous with tubular and cylindrical pipe bowl forms found at other Dan River sites (Davis 1998:49). The pipe found in Burial B has a tapering stem with a plain bit and a heel with a small projection. The bowl is long (41 mm) and conical-shaped, with a smooth exterior surface decorated with a series of incised Vs (Figure 8). This surface treatment resembles the liner decorations found on pipe forms excavated at the Jenerette,
Mitchum, and Fredricks site in the Eno and Haw River drainages and at Upper Saratown on the Dan River (Davis and Ward 1993:205). Pipes with linear, rouletted decorations are sometimes referred to as “Tidewater” pipes, though they are found at seventeenth century sites along the Atlantic Seaboard (Kent 1984: 147-148). Portions of 32 other cylindrical, bulbous, and tubular pipe bowls were also recovered from the site. One tubular pipe bowl is shaped to look like a human face with a modeled nose and eyes, with nostrils and mouth indicated by punctuations. The eyes are encircled by an incised line with two other incised lines radiating from beneath the eyes, creating a decoration similar to “weeping eye” motifs common throughout the Southeast (Davis 1998: 49).

![Figure 8: Complete pipes recovered from Philpott: a) Burial 16, Dan River Series; b) Burial B, Middle Contact (Davis 1998).]
Glass, Copper, and Columella Beads

Important in building chronologies, mortuary objects also serve as a critical gauge for social and economic connections between communities. Many mortuary objects—like copper, glass, and marine shell beads and pendants—were used in life as trade objects, so focusing on these particular artifacts provides critical insight about a community’s economic ties. To understand regional trade connections and economic patterns across the Dan River basin, I compare mortuary data from Philpott’s Early Contact Period component to mortuary data from
the five other sites in this study (Table 1). These data provide a clearer picture of how piedmont social and economic systems changed over the course of the seventeenth century.

209 glass beads from Burials A and B were classified using Kidd and Kidd’s (1970) classification system. Analyzed as a whole, the assemblage indicates that the site most likely dates to the first half of the seventeenth century, sometime during the Middle Saratown phase (Figure 10). Larger (4–6 mm diameter) round and oval beads were also present. Seed beads were typically embroidered onto clothing as decoration while larger round and oval beads were more commonly worn as necklaces. These beads are similar to beads from early seventeenth-
century Siouan sites in the region including Lower Saratown (31Rk1), Trigg (44My3), Hurt Power Plant (44Py144), Madison (31Rk6), and Hairston (31Sk1).

In addition to glass beads, Burial B also contained 12 tubular beads made of copper alloy (Figure 10). All of these were rolled from cut strips of sheet metal. Nine tubular beads are 4–5 mm in diameter and are 84 mm (n=2), 45–50 mm (n=2), and 35–40 mm (n=4) long. Twisted, “two-ply” cordage is preserved in some of these (Davis, 1998:78). Three larger beads have diameters of 6 mm and lengths of 20 mm (n=2) and 9 mm (n=1). Copper alloy artifacts, including one centrally-perforated disc gorget, one tinkling cone, and three masses of rolled copper beads (similar to those from Burial B) were also discovered in Burial A.
Trade Objects

“Metaphor is largely at use among these Peoples; unless you accustom yourself to it, you will understand nothing” - French fur trader, Paul le Jeune describing his Iroquois guides in 1636 (Miller and Hamill, 1986: 311).

Decades before Lederer wrote about the Saras’ “rich commodities and Minerals,” John Smith wrote of the Powhatan; “their manner of trading is for copper, beades and such like trash for which they give such commodities as they have, as skins, fowle, fish, flesh, and their country come. But their victuall is their chiefest riches” (Smith, 1607). To Smith and other Europeans looking for “commodities” to sell overseas, the Indians’ “chiefest riches” were natural resources like lumber, minerals, deerskins, and tobacco (Lapham 2012). As Le Jeune’s account about the Iroquois suggests, however, Native people saw these trade objects differently: For the Saras and other Native communities across the Southeast, beads, shell, copper and other “trash” were valuable symbols of social status, political power, and religious authority (Gleach 1997:57; Hamell 1983:25; Hantman 1990: 685; Lapham 2012: 8; Potter 1989: 153, 1993:218; Rountree 1989: 71-73; Waselkov 1989: 122). Rather than any “intrinsic” western economic value, copper gorgets and glass beads were valuable because of their histories of association, their ties to power (Wallis 2011). Often exchanged as ceremonial gifts, trade objects were physical reminders of social bonds and political agreements (Mauss 1925).

Gift exchanges were an essential component of foreign relations for local political leaders, or chiefs, who relied upon prestige items crafted from potent, non-local materials (like copper and shell (Hofstra 1998)) to confirm their elite status and solidify connections to other communities (Snyder 2010). Negotiating with Chief Powhatan for corn in the fall of 1608, Smith found the Werowance would trade him more food for a “few bunches of blew Beades” than for the “12 great Coppers” and hatchets he thought Powhatan would favor. According to Smith,
Powhatan “much desired” the beads, and “seeing so few, he offered me a basket of two pecks.” Here, Smith’s qualifier “so few” hints at the importance of scarcity in Native trading systems: Powhatan saw a small quantity of beads made from a substance no other Chief had and wanted them to signal his prestige and importance to others.

Often described as “status symbols,” objects valued for their uniqueness or rarity, prestige goods like Powhatan’s blue beads may have also been valuable because of their “other-worldly” physical properties—properties that seemed to reflect or emanate light (Sahlins 1976; Hofstra 1998: 324-325). For Northeastern Woodland Indians like the Huron, Wyendont, and Seneca, for example, light represented life and knowledge (Kupperman 2005:115-17). Objects possessing qualities of light—like brightness in color, metallic shininess, pearly luster, or crystalline transparency—were seen as symbolically charged and powerful items (Miller and Hammel 1986). White shell necklaces and reflective copper gorgets not only revealed one’s social ties to a larger community (Loren, 2008), but also one’s knowledge and wisdom, as light was thought to reflect “cognitive aspects of life” (Hofstra, 1998: 324-325).

Like the northern Iroquois, the Saras and their Piedmont neighbors were discerning traders: they did not want objects merely because they were “exotic” or “rare”—they wanted symbolically potent tools and adornment items made from materials whose color and form resonated within their cosmologies and value systems. Between 1660 and 1673, however, the Occaneechi largely blocked the Saras and their neighbors, the Tutellos and Saponis, from trading with the English, prevented them from acquiring many types of prestige items. The Occaneechi maintained economic and political dominance in the region through territoriality, a “strategy to affect, influence, or control resources and people by controlling geographic area” (Reinhart and Hodges 1992:18). To control their trading “territory,” the Occaneechi restricted other Native
communities like the Tutellos, Saponis, and Saras from access to their trading paths and from acquiring certain valuable trade goods like guns and tools.

Figure 12: Map showing the location of Piedmont Siouan communities in the mid-seventeenth century. These locations are based on historical accounts (Figure drawn by author, adapted from Davis 2005).
ca. 1670

Figure 13: Map illustrates the Piedmont’s cultural landscape in the years leading up to Bacon’s Rebellion. Through much of the 1670s, the Tutelos, Saponis, and Saras remained in the riverine encampments they had occupied for much of the seventeenth century. Figure drawn by author, adapted from Davis 2005.
The Occaneechi were at their peak of power during the 1670s, when William Byrd II’s father, William Byrd I, wrote to a colleague in London about the “tight competition” between Indian middlemen and colonial traders over trade routes (Eastman 1994: 38; Tinling 1977). To protect their economic advantage as sole middlemen between English traders and many interior Piedmont communities, the Occaneechis refused to let other traders access their path (Ward and Davis 1993). When Cherokees requested Occaneechi permission to trade directly with the English in 1672, “it so angered the Occaneechi that they murdered their visitors” (Cummings,
Likewise, when explorer James Needham (1674) tried to establish direct trade relations with interior Siouan groups without first consulting Occaneechi tribal leaders, they refused to allow him back into their territory nor to return home using their path (Alvord and Bidgood 1912: 217).

To circumvent the Occaneechi, and gain more direct access to European traders and their wares, many interior communities, including the Tutellos and Saponis eventually relocated their settlements eastward towards the Occaneechi path. Citing Lawson’s observation that most deerskin exchanges took place along the Occaneechi trading path at the start of the eighteenth century, Davis (2005: 142) suggests that “participation in the deerskin trade” prompted the Tutello and Saponi to “reposition themselves along the trading path” after 1670.

By contrast, the Saras remained in the Dan River Basin for much of the seventeenth century (Figures 14-17). While the Occanechis, Tutellos, and Saponis eventually moved south along the path in the years after Bacon’s Rebellion, the Saras chose not to relocate their settlement towards the Occaneechi path and instead kept their distance from Occaneechi-controlled English copper supplies. The Saras’ immobility is particularly striking in a time when so many Piedmont communities were relocating eastward to be closer to English trading towns near the Occaneechi path, and hints that the Saras, unlike the Tutellos and Saponis, may have been receiving European-made trade goods from someone other than the Occaneechis.

Regional Analysis

Turning to the Piedmont’s extensive archaeological record—specifically, to the quantity and diversity of copper, glass, and marine shell trade goods found in Early, Middle, and Late Contact Period contexts—offers important clues about the Saras trade connections in the seventeenth century that may explain why they chose to remain in the Dan River Basin for much
of the seventeenth century. Mortuary data on 105 burials from the six sites in this study—including the Philpott Site, Upper Saratown Site, Lower Saratown Site, and Hairston Site—represent occupations spanning the Early Contact Period (1607-1650), the Middle Contact Period (1650-1670), and the Late Contact Period (1670-1700).

Table 3: Total “Non-Glass Artifacts” (NGA) in Early Contact Period Burials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Contact</th>
<th>Sites / Burials</th>
<th>Total Non-Glass Artifacts (NGA)</th>
<th>% NGA Copper</th>
<th>% NGA Columnella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31Rk1</td>
<td>Bu.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Rk6</td>
<td>Bu.112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bu.65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bu.90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Skl</td>
<td>Bu.2 (G)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bu.5 (G)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td>54.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Skl1A</td>
<td>Bu.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bu.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bu.64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bu.69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.15%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48.65%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44Hr4</td>
<td>Bu.A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bu.B*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48.78%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>44.72%</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Total “Non-Glass Artifacts” (NGA) in Middle Contact Period Burials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites / Burials</th>
<th>Total Non-Glass Artifacts (NGA)</th>
<th>% NGA Copper</th>
<th>% NGA Columella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bu.102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.107</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.109</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>35.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.45a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.45b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46.27%</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** 347 34.58% 11.53%

**Grand Total:** 347 34.58% 11.53%
Table 5: Total “Non-Glass Artifacts” (NGA) in Late Contact Period Burials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late Contact Sites / Burials</th>
<th>Total Non-Glass Artifacts (NGA)</th>
<th>% NGA Copper</th>
<th>% NGA Columella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A Bu.1</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>37.09%</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.106</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39.19%</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.53</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17.29%</td>
<td>63.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.83%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48.65%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1765</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.05%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.22%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1765</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.05%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.22%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most contact period sites in the Virginia interior bear a similar material culture pattern; a more-or-less linear increase in the percentage of burials containing trade goods through time (Davis 2005; Lapham 2012). This pattern is generally thought to reflect increasing intensity of trade interactions between interior Piedmont Native communities and the English over the course of the seventeenth century—from least intense indirect exchange during the Early Contact Period to most intense direct exchange during the height of the Virginia Deerskin Trade in the Late Contact Period (Lapham 2012).
Based on this information, I hypothesized that my analyses of burials from Early, Middle, and Late Contact Period sites would reveal an increase in the percentage of burials containing trade goods through time. Using the percentage of burials containing traded items as a gauge for trading intensity, I expected to see the lowest percentages of European glass and copper artifacts in burials dating to the Early Contact period—a time when indirect trade between the English and interior communities (like the Tutellos, Saponis, and Saras) was in its earliest stages.

Analysis of mortuary items recovered from Early, Middle, and Late Contact Period burials at Sara-affiliated sites, however, suggests a more complicated picture. Rather than a linear increase in European trade goods found in burials—which might reflect increasing trade between the Saras and Native middlemen, like the Occaneechis—the percentage of burials containing conch columella, glass, and copper beads and pendants in Early, Middle, and Late Contact Period contexts both support and complicate prevailing archaeological expectations about the spatiotemporal distribution of European-made trade goods across Piedmont archaeological sites (Davis 2005).

Table 6: Percentage of burials containing glass beads, copper artifacts, and columella artifacts / time period. Chronological categories are based on Eastman’s (2002) study of the social traditions surrounding gender and the Virginia deerskin trade. Although she classifies several sites (including Lower Saratown and Philpott) as “Middle Contact” (2002:48), Eastman labels burials from Lower Saratown and Philpott as “Early Contact” in her master spreadsheet (2002:50-52).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>% Burials Containing Glass Beads</th>
<th>% Burials Containing Copper Artifacts</th>
<th>% Burials Containing Columella Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Contact</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Contact</td>
<td>80.95%</td>
<td>26.19%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Contact</td>
<td>96.55%</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 15: Bar graph illustrating the percentage of graves containing copper or brass adornment items (including tubular beads, pendants, gorgets, and bells). Over 70% of early contact period burials contained copper, while just 26% contained copper in the middle contact period.

Figure 16: Bar graph illustrating the percentage of graves containing glass beads. While glass beads are by far the most common trade item found in burials from all periods of the seventeenth century, there is still a noticeable decrease in the percentage of burials containing glass beads during the middle contact period. These data might suggest that although some trade persisted during the middle contact period, it was largely restricted to small items like beads. While not performed here, an analysis of each bead assemblages’ diversity might also reveal that the middle contact period contained the least number of different bead designs and types.
Figure 17: Bar graph illustrating the percentage of graves containing conch columella beads and pendants. Most commonly used during the Late Woodland period, columella beads remained popular in mortuary settings throughout the contact period. Following the trend observed in copper and glass beads, the percentage of burials containing columella beads decreases.

One data trend followed expected regional material culture patterns, showing a measurable increase in the percentage of burials containing diagnostic mortuary artifacts from the Middle Contact Period to the Late Contact Period. This trend supports Davis’ (2005) and Davis and Ward’s (1989) interpretation that the Saras were blocked from participating in, and receiving goods from, the Occaneechi’s English deerskin trading operations throughout much of the Middle Contact Period—and therefore only began to receive a higher number of trade items at the start of the Late Contact Period, when the Occaneechis were ousted from their seat as middlemen during Bacon’s Rebellion.

Another data trend, however, contradicted expected material culture patterns. Burials dating to the Early Contact Period — a time when the Occaneechis and Saras weren’t yet fully involved in trading with the English, and the time period for which I expected the percentage of burials containing English trade goods to be lowest—contained copper more often than burials dating to the Middle Contact Period.
Davis (2005) suggests that during the first decades of the seventeenth century, especially during the height of Occaneechis power (between 1660 and 1677), the Saras and other interior communities were largely blocked from trading for European wares, and received only a few, small trade goods from the east. Yet it is clear upon examining the volume of trade associated with early contact period burials that the Saras received a relatively high number of trade goods in the years before the Occaneechis gained power in the region.

Many archaeologists working in Virginia interpret the presence of glass and copper objects at Piedmont sites as evidence of a connection to the English at Jamestown by way of Native middlemen like the Occaneechis. These data, however, suggest that the Saras may have acquired European copper and glass from a source other than the Occaneechis’ English supply.

Stevenson’s (2014) elemental characterization study of copper objects from sites west of the fall line also suggests that the Saras and other interior communities were acquiring their copper from sources other than the English during the Early and possibly Middle Contact Period. According to Stevenson, of the copper mortuary items analyzed in interior sites, including the Trigg site in Montgomery County and the Abbyville Site in Patrick County, only 10% were composed of the same alloyed copper variety found at, and traded from, Jamestown (2014:13).

But if the Occaneechi weren’t supplying the Saras with copper, who was? Sixteenth-century Spanish expeditions through the North Carolina Piedmont, as well as recent discovery of a sixteenth century Spanish fort in North Carolina’s Appalachian foothills—less than 200 miles from the Philpott site—raise the possibility that some copper artifacts found at sites across the Dan River Basin may have been of Spanish rather than English origin.
Discussion

“

In an age that paints the American frontier in shades of gray, it is tempting to dismiss those who saw things in black and white as fools and cranks, if not imperialists and racists” (James Merrell, Unsettling the Early American Frontier, 1998:18-19).

Archaeological and ethnographic evidence suggest that communities living in the Dan River drainage basin during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries negotiated economic and political lives at the edge of colliding eastern and western economic and cultural influences. Preliminary analysis of artifacts found at the Philpott (44Hr4) in Henry County, VA, and the Upper Saratown (31Rk6) in Stokesville, North Carolina, suggest that protohistoric Dan River basin communities primarily traded with polities to their southwest prior to the arrival of Europeans in the New World. Importantly, as data presented in this thesis suggest, many communities living in the Dan River Basin continued to utilize these trading connections throughout the first half of the seventeenth century.

Evidence from late contact period sites suggests that by the last decades of the seventeenth century, Dan River communities like the Saras had largely shifted their economic networks to the east. In the following discussion, I suggest that participation in the deerskin trade—what Lapham (2012) describes as a “new Native economy” that emphasized 1) hunting for commercial hide production and 2) increased competition for European commodities—catalyzed the Saras’ social and political transformation over the course of the seventeenth century. Here, I heed Merrell’s (1998) call to “resist the temptation” to dismiss European chroniclers, drawing again from historical documents to explore the extent to which the Saras remained connected to both eastern and western trading spheres in hopes of “making sense of frontier spaces across colonial North America” (Merrell 1998:18).
An account by Lederer provides an important clue about the Saras’ ties to the west. Passing through the Dan River basin in 1672, a year before Bacon’s Rebellion, Lederer commented on the mineral resources he saw at the Saras’ Upper Saratown village on the Dan River:

“From these Mountains or Hills, the Indians draw great quantities of Cinebar, with which beaten to powder they color their faces: the Mineral is of a deeper Purple than Vermilion...I did likewise, and to no small admiration, find hard cakes of white Salt amongst them: but whether they were made of Sea-water, or taken out of Salt-pits, I know not: but am apt to believe the later, because the Sea is so remote from them. Many other rich commodities and Minerals there are undoubtedly in these parts, which is possessed by an ingenious and industrious people, would be improved to vast advantages by Trade. But having tied my self up to things only that I have seen on my Travels, I will deliver no Conjectures” (Lederer, 1672: 16; emphasis added).

While Lederer suggests that the Saras dug their salt from local “salt-pits,” there are no known salt flats or Halite deposits in the Dan River drainage. Rather, it seems more likely that the salt Lederer observed with the Saras was a trade good—a physical sign of the long-distance trading networks in which the Saras and other Piedmont communities were embroiled.

The nearest salt deposits are located in the “Saltville Valley,” located approximately 100 miles west of the Dan River drainage in Smyth County, Virginia (Withington 1965; Williams 2003). Saltville is the largest salt deposit for the Southern Appalacian region; the next largest deposit is located along Alabama’s Gulf Coast (Myers 2011:25). According to Myers (2011), communities living in and around Saltville during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and early seventeenth centuries—including those occupying the Trigg site in Montgomery County—were on the western “frontier” of the Mississippian world. Like copper and marine shell, these communities considered salt a prestige item—suitable for trade with eastern communities like the Saras (Brown 1980; Myers 2011; Muller 1984).

Archaeological evidence supports a connection between the Dan River Basin and the Mississippian west. Artifacts recovered from the prehistoric components of Philpott (44Hr4)
in Henry County, VA, and the Upper Saratown (31Rk6) in Stokesville, North Carolina, suggest that the Dan River Saras may have been part of the same Mississippian regional system as those living in the Saltville valley. Mississippian-inspired effigy pipes at Philpott and centrally-perforated shell gorgets with rattlesnake designs at Upper Saratown (typically found at sites in Georgia) were found alongside local Dan River series pottery (Smith 1998). Such a unique combination of cultural traits is indicative of a “transitional field” or cultural borderland (Barth 1969), and suggests that communities living in that Southern Virginia Piedmont may have been frontier nodes within broad Mississippian exchange networks that extended south across North Carolina and west across Virginia.

Traditional Mississippian motifs found at both sites, like bird effigies, rattlesnakes, and small anthropomorphic statues with the “weeping eye,” hint that communities as far north as the Dan River Saras may have even been part of the same prominent Mississippian polities mentioned in de Soto’s mid-sixteenth century accounts of his tours through North Carolina—only 100 years before Lederer visited the Saras at Upper Saratown.

Likewise, copper objects recovered from contact period sites across the Dan River Basin suggest that these southwestern trade connections persisted through the seventeenth century. Waselkov (1989) argues that copper objects found at Early Contact Period sites in the Piedmont—particularly copper disk gorgets—were originally produced by the Spanish for trade with interior communities. The Spanish produced and traded two types of copper sheet gorgets from Florida—an early form (1580-1650), with a large central hole greater than point 7 cm in diameter, and a late form (1630-1700) with a central hole less than point 7 cm in diameter. These perforated sheet gorgets were still in circulation when Lederer traveled through
the Piedmont in 1670, and remarked on the “odd pieces of plate or Builion (bullion)” he saw Native people wearing.

Burial A in Philpott’s historic component, dated between 1600 and 1650, contains a circular copper gorget and rolled tubular beads that may have originally been produced by the Spanish. The circular gorget is approximately 110 mm in diameter and fits Waselkov’s “large-holed” criteria (Davis 1998). A gorget with similar measurements was also recovered from the Trigg site in Montgomery County, Virginia (MacCord 1975). The Philpott and Trigg gorgets are currently the only two “large-holed” Spanish gorgets found in Virginia, though similar large-holed gorgets are found at sites across the Southeast with known ties to the Spanish.

Connecting Lederer’s anecdote to the archaeological record at the Philpott and Trigg sites offers newly compelling evidence that the Saras were maintaining long-standing trade connections to the Mississippian world throughout the historic period. Davis and Ward note that “although the Spanish supposedly traveled through the area… their visits left no discernible traces in the archaeological record” (1993: 422). Indeed, copper gorgets found at Trigg and Philpott may be the only “traces” of Spanish activity in the Virginia Piedmont. Rather than direct contact between the Spanish and the Saras, however, copper artifacts likely reveal an indirect connection to the Spanish by way of long-standing Native trade networks that persisted through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
Figure 18: Map showing the distribution of “Large-holed” Disc Gorgets across the American Southeast. Tight clustering across Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and western Virginia suggests that these artifacts passed through the same interior southeastern trade network (Waselkov 1989; Smith 1977, 1984, 1987). Figure drawn by author, adapted from Waselkov (1989).

An historical account by William Byrd II reveals that the Saras began trading more intensively with the Occaneechi and other Siouan communities to their east around the same time that Lederer saw them with salt from the west. While surveying the dividing line between Virginia and North Carolina in 1733, William Byrd II happened upon "a large beech tree with
the following inscription cut upon the bark of it, 'JH, HH, BB lay here the 24th of May 1673'' (Wright 1966:40). Byrd continued, "It was not difficult to fill up these initials with the following names, Joseph Hatcher, Henry Hatcher, and Benjamin Bullington, three Indian traders who had lodged at that place sixty years before in their way to the Sauro town" (Wright 1966:40).

Byrd's anecdote reveals that by 1673, just a few years before Bacon’s Rebellion and only a year after Lederer saw salt among the Saras living at Upper Saratown, the Saras were regularly trading deerskins with the English by way of Indian middlemen. This is consistent with the archaeological record of sites in the Dan River basin: Prior to Bacon’s Rebellion, trade items filtering from the Occaneechi into the interior were small, easily transportable decorative items like beads and gorgets made from new materials. Through the late seventeenth century, the Occaneechi restricted the kinds of items other groups could acquire. They refused to trade weapons or utilitarian items like scissors with interior groups. European objects found at the early seventeenth century sites throughout the Dan River basin most likely got their through indirect trade by way of Native middlemen like the Occaneechi. The paucity of tools in burial contexts at early contact period sites like Philpott makes sense within the context of this particular regional power struggle.

Following Bacon’s Rebellion, however, the southern Virginia/North Carolina Piedmont opened up to European deerskin traders and the types of goods that appeared at interior Siouan sites shifted dramatically. Piedmont communities—once buffered from direct contact with Europeans—became increasingly embroiled in expanding European deerskin trading networks. By the late seventeenth century, many interior communities were intensively hunting deer and processing hides for Eastern leather markets (Lapham 2012).
Material culture at the Late Contact Period Upper Saratow and the William Klutz sites hints at the widespread influence of these newly emerging Native economies. In addition to the decorative items found at Philpott, Late Contact period sites also contain guns and tools that interior groups were not allowed to access during earlier decades of the deerskin exchange. No longer restricted from trading directly with the English, the late contact period Saras began to acquire far more goods than the Saras who lived at Philpott decades before. Burials from the William Klutz contain items consistent with late contact period themes. One man, for example, was buried with an English pistol at his side (Davis and Ward 1993: 127).

As the eighteenth century progressed, Siouan communities entered new economic and political relationships with the English, clashed with Northern Native groups like the Seneca, engaged in the strengthening deerskin trade with the Occanechi, and faced the ravages of European-introduced diseases. As exchanges and interactions with Europeans intensified through the end of the seventeenth and into the early eighteenth century, interior Siouan groups became increasingly caught up in the European Deer skin trade and inter-native slaving wars spurred by colonist-driven slave markets. Combined with largely hostile forces, and the onslaught of European disease, Siouan groups who had long been buffered from Europeans and their germs and wars were now entangled in the same struggles their easterly neighbors faced in the early seventeenth century.

In response to these pressures, interior Siouans like the Occanechis, Tutelos, Saponis, and Saras left the region entirely and moved to live together in larger groups by the mid eighteenth century. The Occanechi, Tutelo, and Saponi all moved to live together at Fort Henry in Virginia while the Saras moved south and eventually merged with the Catawba in North Carolina. Writing from the former location of the Upper Saratow site in the mid eighteenth
century, William Byrd II reflected wistfully on the “Sauro Indians...who had once been a considerable nation” (1903:9). “It must have been a great misfortune,” he noted, “to be obliged to abandon so beautiful a dwelling, where the air is wholesome, and the soil equal in fertility to any in the world” (Byrd, 1903:9).

Figure 19: Map showing the Piedmonts landscape at the start of the eighteenth century, when only the Saras remain in the Dan River Drainage. Figure adapted from Davis 2005.
Conclusion

“At a time when historians of the trans-Mississippi West have been asserting that nothing good can come from studying frontier history any longer, historians of the cis-Mississippi east have been quietly proving the contrary: to understand the colonial and national history of the United States one must pay close attention to the backcountry.” - William Cronon, in a review of the book “Contact Points”

Almost every author writing on the interior Piedmont region prefaces their Culture History section with a qualifying statement about the relative dearth of information describing the region’s seventeenth-century landscape and peoples (Davis and Ward 1993; Hudson 1970). As this paper suggests, however, archaeological research can help render a coherent picture of the seventeenth-century Native landscape. Shifting the conversation towards the material culture that played an active role in social and political negotiations along changing community boundaries, archaeologists can further enhance understandings of borderland dynamics in regions where few ethnographic records survive. While early Siouan scholars saw European trade goods as a gauge for increasing English influence in the region, I have argued here that they instead reflect long-standing trade relationships between interior Siouan communities like the Saras and eastern Siouan communities like the Occaneechi; relationships that crossed geographic and community boundaries as dynamic exchanges.

Pairing histories of Occaneechi expansion with archaeological evidence from Contact-period Piedmont sites reveals a more complete picture of how Native communities like the Saras navigated a changing frontier landscape over the course of the late seventeenth century. Connecting Lederer’s anecdote to the archaeological record at the Philpott and Trigg sites offers newly compelling evidence that the Saras were maintaining long-standing trade connections to the Mississippian world throughout the historic period. Archaeological evidence from Late Saratown phase sites reveal that participation in the European deerskin trade, combined with
pressure from Seneca raiders and European disease, “redirected Native trade networks (Usner 1992), altered political alliances and gave rise to the development of political factions and middlemen (Martin 1994; Ward and Davis 1993; Waselkov 1993), and reshaped gender relations and cultural belief systems (Martin 1978, for an alternative see Hudson 1981)” (Lapham 2012: 149).

As I have argued here, the types and quantities of trade objects found at Saras sites dating between AD 1650 (Philpott) and 1700 (Upper Saratown) reflect the Saras’ changing economic relationships through time—relationships that were a product of the dynamic social and political processes playing out across the region. Here, I have used use material objects – mortuary items that I see as the material representation of community connection and belonging – to not only examine the shifting boundaries of the Virginia Deerskin trade, but to understand how changing political and economic relationships impacted the ways that people embodied and materially represented their connections with other communities. By mapping and tracking trade objects through time across the Dan River basin, this analyses reveals that over the course of the seventeenth century, the Dan River Saras shifted their trading networks from the south/west to the east in order to participate in the European deerskin trade. Unlike other interior groups who traded with the English, however, the Saras maintained their traditional ties to place, choosing to remain in the Dan River Basin rather than relocate their settlement to the Occaneechi path.

The Saras were constantly transforming and adapting their traditional practices throughout the seventeenth century, enacting and reenacting long-standing burial practices by adorning their bodies in hybrid and sometimes entirely novel ways. Importantly, they were using both European and Native-made trade objects that were – in the words of Pat Rubertone - "imprinted with communal and intergenerational relationships" (Rubertone, 2011). More than
just signaling identity or affiliation, these European and Native-made trade items, and the changing relationships they represented, played a recursive roll in expressing, reproducing, and ultimately transforming frontier social networks. By understanding frontiers as zones of social and political linkages—pathways and trail systems—across Native spaces, this paper has allowed a more nuanced discussion of Native social connectivity in the seventeenth-century Piedmont. Rather than an uninhabited wilderness marking the edge of European expansion, the Piedmont’s Siouan frontier appears as a zone of novel transformation for Native communities and individuals.

Prospectus

For me this study has raised as many questions as it has attempted to answer. Luckily, this master’s thesis serves as a foundation for continuing dissertation research on contact period social and political networks across the seventeenth century Dan River Basin and Piedmont beyond. As Davis writes in his 1998 report on the Philpott site, “the nest step toward understanding the late prehistoric societies of the upper Dan River drainage will be to examine closely the minor variations that existed within their material culture in order to determine better the spatial, temporal, and cultural relationships of their villages. Such a study, which also incorporates archaeological information from other contemporary sites in the region, will permit a much clearer definition of Dan River culture than presently exists” (Davis 1998: 85).

Excavations specifically tailored to address contact-period site structure and chronology will help reveal a clearer picture of how the Saras communities living at Philpott were part of broader regional exchange networks during the contact period. Likewise, elemental analysis of copper and brass artifacts recovered from Philpott and other sites across the Dan River basin using minimally destructive laser ablation characterization techniques (like those recently
employed by will further elucidate connections between Siouan communities and distant colonial economies. While copper objects—like the large disc gorgets found at Philpott—suggest that the Saras continued using the same networks, and perhaps the same physical trading paths—as their predecessors, further analysis are needed to definitively link the copper gorget found at Philpott with the Spanish.

As Hodges (1993) suggests, without using materials characterization to parse the subtle elemental differences between archaeologically-recovered copper and mortuary objects, it would be “extremely difficult” to reliably link copper and brass artifacts to either English or Spanish sources—especially when copper and brass ornaments are “produced in such nonculturally-specific forms” as tubular beads, tinkling cones, triangular pendants, or circular gorgets (1993: 23). It would be extremely difficult to trace the small-holed gorget form to either the English or the Spanish without elemental analysis. Building upon Stevenson’s (2013) elemental characterization project, future work will seek to source copper objects recovered from the Philpott site.
### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and Sex</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Burial</th>
<th>Associated Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children</strong> (burials without associated artifacts [n=9], total number of burials [n=32])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.2 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 rolled copper beads, 1 glass bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 columella beads, 7 glass beads, 4 long copper tube beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 columella segment beads, 17 columella disc beads, 1 turtle carapace cup, 34 bird long bone beads, 27 brass tinkling cones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>2062 glass beads, 13 brass hairpins, 4 copper rolled beads, 1 copper disk gorget, 1 flushloop bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 glass beads, 21 diamond-shaped pendants, bark and cane matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ceramic looper, 1 hammerstone, 1 “battered cobble,” 1 glass bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.102</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.107</td>
<td></td>
<td>8996 glass beads, 9 flushloop bells, cane matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ceramic vessel, 1 brass disk gorget, 20 rolled copper beads, 46 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1323 glass beads, 2 flushloop bells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>85 columella segment beads, 20419 glass beads, 23 flushloop bells, 1 wire fastener (tin?), cane matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>6080 glass beads, 1 brass disc gorget, 1 brass spoon, 3 flushloop bells, 7 Saturn bells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>16114 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>24253 glass beads, 16 flushloop bells, 2 triangular brass pendants, bark and cane matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>1902 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>1173 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>3260 glass beads, 5 copper fragments, 5 iron fragments, bark and cane matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.103</td>
<td></td>
<td>5218 glass beads, 1 brass animal effigy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescents</strong> (burials without associated artifacts [n=6], total number of burials [n=22])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Rki1</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 rolled copper beads, 5 columella beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44Hr4</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 circular copper gorget, 1 copper tinkling cone, 4 rolled copper beads, 24 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44Hr4</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.6*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 clay pipe, 180 glass beads, 14 rolled copper beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Rki6</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.112</td>
<td></td>
<td>1600 glass beads (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>215 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 clay pipe, 1 pottery vessel, 1 projectile point, 1 chipped stone drill, 1 columella pin?, rolled copper bead (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 clay pipe, 1 projectile point, ochre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>5040 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>581 glass beads, 1 lead shot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 glass beads, 3 sheet brass or copper fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 claw-effigy copper pendant, 251 glass beads, cane matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>4258 glass beads, 1 copper ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>1135 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>8158 glass beads, 5 flushloop bells, 1 triangular pendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 columella segment bead, 7328 glass beads, 15 flushloop bells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young Adult Females</strong> (burials without associated artifacts [n=1], total number of burials [n=10])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.5(G)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 columella beads, 17 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>15919 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>18917 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cirocco style “antelope” gorget, 1 glass bead, 7 rolled copper beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 columella segment bead, 1 columella barrel bead, 531 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.109</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 columella segment beads, 2 columella barrel beads, 55845 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>145 columella segment beads, 2 columella barrel beads, 9 disk beads, 24 purple wampum, 157 white wampum, 43804 glass beads, 136 brass flushloop bells, 1 Saturn bell, 1 brass disc gorget, 15 triangular brass pendants, 2 copper tinkling cones, 339 rolled copper beads, 1 mouth harp, 2 pairs of scissors, 1 tin-plated copper spoon, 2 elk astragal, cane matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 glass beads, 3 rolled brass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>5427 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mature Adult Females</strong> (burials without associated artifacts [n=1], total number of burials [n=6])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1197 glass beads, 17 rolled copper beads, bark and cane matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 glass beads, 1 rolled copper bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 clay pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 columella segment beads, 4 disk beads, 22658 glass beads, 28 brass rings, 1 brass wire coil, 1 copper disk gorget, 2 bone handled knives, 1 hoe blade, 1 wrought iron nail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older Adult Females</strong> (burials without associated artifacts [n=0], total number of burials [n=3])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 columella segment beads, 2 glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 columella segment bead, 1 unidentified worked bone, 386 glass beads, 1 brass ring, 1 cast brass button, 15 flushloop bells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Ski1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>9002 glass beads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<8 = child, 8-14 = adolescent, 15-24 = young adult, 25-34 = mature adult, >34 = older adult.
EC = Early Contact (1607-1650), MC = Middle Contact (1650-1670), LC = Late Contact (1670-1700).
Associated artifacts do not include “unidentified” objects, floral materials (e.g. "bark," "cane matting").
44Hr4 Bu.6* is a multi-burial (Davis 1998).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and Sex</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Burial</th>
<th>Associated Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Adult Males (burials without associated artifacts [n=6], total number of burials [n=6])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31R6</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.90</td>
<td>15 copper tubular beads or hairpipes, 32 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.2</td>
<td>2 columnella segment beads, 11 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.68</td>
<td>3406 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.108</td>
<td>1 clay pipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Adult Males (burials without associated artifacts [n=4], total number of burials [n=4])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31R6</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Bu.65</td>
<td>1 rectangular copper breastplate, 41 rolled copper beads, 300 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.28</td>
<td>97 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.104</td>
<td>1 clay pipe, ochre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.62</td>
<td>2168 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adult Males (burials without associated artifacts [n=4], total number of burials [n=4])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.73</td>
<td>1 clay pipe, 634 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.74</td>
<td>11 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.75</td>
<td>1155 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.100</td>
<td>1 columnella segment bead, 22121 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adult, Sex? (burials without associated artifacts [n=1], total number of burials [n=1])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.27</td>
<td>5 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.29</td>
<td>2 clay pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.38</td>
<td>17513 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.41</td>
<td>13963 glass beads, 3 rolled copper or brass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.42</td>
<td>1 clay pipe, 22794 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.45a</td>
<td>1 projectile point, 1 ochre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.49</td>
<td>1 clay pipe, 9 rolled copper beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.81</td>
<td>231 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.10</td>
<td>1861 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.28</td>
<td>1 glass beads, 2 rolled copper beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.36</td>
<td>252 glass beads, 22 rolled copper beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.39</td>
<td>328 glass beads, 1 rolled copper bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Bu.106</td>
<td>191 glass beads, 11 rolled brass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Adult, Sex? (burials without associated artifacts [n=1], total number of burials [n=1])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.6</td>
<td>3211 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.13</td>
<td>5759 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adult, Sex? (burials without associated artifacts [n=1], total number of burials [n=1])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31Sk1A</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Bu.3</td>
<td>1 clay pipe, 10911 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<8 = child, 8-14 = adolescent, 15-24 = young adult, 25-34 = mature adult, >34 = older adult
EC = Early Contact (1607-1650), MC = Middle Contact (1650-1670), LC = Late Contact (1670-1700).
Associated artifacts do not include "unidentified" objects. Floral materials (e.g. "bark," "cane matting").
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