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Abstract

This PhD focuses on several interrelated archaeological problems in identification of individuals, agency, and understanding the indigenous past as it was lived; through an indigenous and feminist perspective. The dissertation is comprised of three articles that have either been accepted in peer-review publications or are in the process of being reviewed for publication. The articles focus on the following subjects: 1) an indigenous spatial analysis of a Fur Trade era semi-subterranean pithouse within a larger village context; 2) reanalysis of the three small peripheral houses located in the village of Keatley Creek in the Mid-Fraser region of British Columbia; and 3) an indigenous comparative spatial analysis of the ancient floors (ca. 1275-1300BP) of Housepit 54 in the Bridge River Village. The results of these studies illustrate that by implementing GIS as a tool for understanding space through both western and indigenous belief systems we can begin to understand and interpret space in a manner that illuminates previous aspects of life and individuals that have proved challenging to identify such as: age and gender and space in terms of private versus communal, or shared spaced within the home and how individuals interacted through those spaces.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This PhD dissertation focuses on several interrelated archaeological problems in the Middle Fraser Canyon in the interior of British Columbia, Canada. The dissertation is comprised of three individual articles that are in the process of being reviewed for publication in the journal *American Antiquity* or in peer reviewed books to be published through The University of Utah Press. These three articles are submitted as an alternative to a single topic dissertation in accordance with the University of Montana Graduate School and Anthropology Department guidelines and protocols.

The three articles focus on the following subject matters: 1) household archaeological spatial analysis; 2) critical analyses of the archaeological past with specific focus on indigenous feminist perspectives; and 3) developing methodologies that allow us to merge traditional archaeo-scientific method with indigenous method (IM) to allow for more inclusive and culturally relevant interpretations and understandings of the ancient indigenous past.

RESEARCH PROBLEMS

Indigenous hunter-gatherer-fisher peoples have populated the interior Mid-Fraser Region of British Columbia for thousands for years (Hayden 1992, 1997; Prentiss and Kuijt 2012; Prentiss et al. 2008; Stryd 1973). Many of the river terraces in the region accommodate villages represented by groups of semi-subterranean housepits; from under ten to more than 110 (Hayden 1997, 2005; Prentiss and Kuijt 2012; Prentiss et al. 2008; Smith 2014). The descendant communities continue to live in the region and maintain their longstanding traditions and
connection to the land (Williams 2012). The research conducted for this dissertation addresses a number of research problems, concerned with indigenous understanding of the region, each described by topic and article as follows.

**Indigenous and Feminist Approaches to Community Ritual in the Middle Fraser Canyon of British Columbia**

Keatley Creek is a socially complex village on the British Columbia Plateau in the Mid-Fraser region of interior British Columbia that has been the focus of considerable archaeological research. Five small houses previously defined as “ritual” architecture, or men’s secret society houses, are located on the eastern terraces peripheral to the site’s core. Despite a comparative literature noting the lack of secret societies on the British Columbia Plateau, the most recent evaluation (Morin 2010) adamantly defends this notion.

At the Keatley Creek Village, three of these small peripheral houses, located at the eastern edge of the village, previously interpreted as being men’s secret society houses where men gather to manage resources and community members by manipulating resources, prestige objects, and social relationships (Hayden 1995; Morin 2006, 2010; Wittke et al. 2004) date to the proto-historic period. Descendant populations, as well as ethnographic monographs for the region, do not mention secret societies as part of cultural tradition for the St’át’imc peoples.

In this chapter I posit a new interpretation of these proto-historic houses through the theoretical lens of indigenous and feminist theories drawing from archaeological data and a rich regional ethnographic record. This new glimpse into the little houses, small peripheral structures located on upper terrace two at Keatley creek, suggests that ritual does play a significant role in the village and is not restricted to men and secret societies, but extends also to women and life
stage ritual. One strength of these approaches is the critique and consideration that it pays to Western scientific bias, post-colonialism, and the androcentric bias that has dominated scientific, and archaeological interpretation (Conkey 2003, 2010; Johnson 2010; Ferguson 1996; Trigger 2006; Wylie 1992, 2007). In addition, this research offers future implications for development of indigenous and feminist archaeology.

Indigenous Household Spatial Analysis in the Fur Trade Era at Housepit 54

The Bridge River Village encompasses more than 80 housepits with occupations spanning four time periods identified as BR1-4 (potentially ca. 200 -1850’s CE) (Prentiss and Kuijt 2012; Prentiss et al. 2008). Excavations at Housepit 54 were established and conducted in collaboration with the local descendant community on the Xwisten Reserve, the location of the Bridge River site. This chapter focuses on developing collaborative indigenous methodology drawing from an intentionally diverse range of sources including ethnographic, linguistic, archaeological, and indigenous perspective (oral histories, traditions, and values), allowing for an interpretation that challenges and enriches contemporary archaeological thought, intentionally reaching beyond the confines of traditional western science (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Conkey 2010; Harris 2010).

The examination of the Fur Trade Era occupation at Housepit 54 provides an opportunity to view life in a holistic indigenous perspective that favors the recognition of the actions of specific persons as defined by age, sex, gender, and their respective public/communal and private/personal spaces and interactions within a framework as conditioned by the practice of cultural traditions. This chapter seeks to address who, the people, of HP 54 were, and serves as a discussion and analysis of an indigenous household, one filled with people of varying life-stages, genders, with their unique social interactions and activities, as created and experienced through
an indigenous framework. The results provide a new baseline for conducting household archaeological research that extends beyond the Mid-Fraser Region for application world-wide.

**Indigenous and Feminist Spatial Analysis of Housepit 54 at ca. 1220-1200 cal. B.P.**

This article offers another examination of Housepit 54 at the Bridge River Village in the Mid-Fraser Region of interior British Columbia. Excavations during the 2012, 2013, and 2014 field seasons provide data from the ancient floors of this house. In this paper I focus on floors IIb and IIa, ca. 1220-1200 cal. B.P. conducting a full spatial analysis of layout, features, site furniture and all eco-facts and artifacts. Using indigenous methods in combination with standard archaeo-scientific methods I provide an overview and comparison of these two generational floors.

In this research, by implementing the baseline for coding based on cultural traditions outlined in the Fur Trade era paper, I seek to move spatial analysis in a new direction, one that allows a view of household based on interrelationships, personal and private spaces, communal spaces, and ultimately a view into a living household through an indigenous perspective.

While the indigenous approach has offered a variety of contributions to our discipline, including community relationships and outreach, indigenous and otherwise, this perspective has yet to reach its fullest potential in pre-colonial research. The goal of this paper is to provide an opportunity for the impetus to push indigenous archaeological research to reach beyond its current application, allowing a merging of theory and methods with more traditional approaches.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

Research methods for all three papers followed a similar research process and design. Descriptions of the methods used in each study are provided in each individual article. All research began with a broad background study and literature review on region, theory, and
methodological approaches. This preliminary work was followed by field, laboratory, and ethnographic review followed by consultation with First Nations colleagues. This resulted in the construction of databases combining both outcomes of laboratory analysis and traditional cultural classifications used for spatial reconstruction in ArcMap 10.2 GIS program.

In the case of the indigenous evaluation of community ritual at Keatley Creek, a thorough review of the literature concerning all previous excavation results (artifacts, features, and stratigraphy) was conducted for the purpose of analyzing and reinterpreting the results. Descendant community input and the use of ethnographic data compiled in part by and with a local native woman allowed for a culturally appropriate indigenous interpretation of the little houses of Keatley Creek. Once re-analysis and traditional interpretations of structures, features, eco and artifacts were constructed the information was depicted in GIS to allow for a visual reconstruction that could be reassessed or both a horizontal and vertical plane.

Research at the Bridge River Village was based on a research plan that included descendant community involvement from original research design to excavation procedures. Controlled excavation in the field allowed for the identification and mapping of finely bedded anthropogenic floors providing opportunity for reconstruction of spatial distribution of features, site furniture, lithic artifacts, debitage, faunal remains, botanicals, and geochemical signatures. All excavated items and samples were processed under standard laboratory protocols and were placed into individual databases, which then underwent traditional cultural interpretation and coding. They were then displayed as a discrete layer in GIS where queries could be made on any combination of categories. In both the Fur Trade floor and the 1220-1200 cal. B.P. floors of Housepit 54 this methodology was applied for a nuanced approach building upon the analysis of community ritual at the little houses at Keatley Creek.
Once data were gathered and research completed on all three topics, they were documented in article format following the guidelines of the particular journal or publishing house and were submitted for peer review. The three articles follow this introduction with summary conclusions afterwards.
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CHAPTER 2

INDIGENOUS AND FEMINIST APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY RITUAL IN THE MIDDLE FRASER CANYON OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Kristen Dawn Barnett

Kristen Dawn Barnett, Department of Anthropology, The University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812 (kristen.barnett@umontana.edu)

Keatley Creek is a socially complex village on the British Columbia Plateau in the Mid-Fraser region of interior British Columbia that has received considerable archaeological research. Five small houses previously defined as “ritual” architecture, or men’s secret society houses, are located on the southern and eastern terraces peripheral to the site’s core. Despite a comparative literature noting the lack of secret societies on the British Columbia Plateau, the most recent evaluation (Morin 2010) adamantly defends this notion. I posit a new interpretation of these proto-historic houses through the theoretical lens of indigenous and feminist theories drawing from archaeological data and a rich regional ethnographic record. This new glimpse into the little houses suggests that ritual does play a significant role in the village and is not restricted to men and secret societies, but extends also to women and life stage ritual. In addition, this research offers future implications for development of indigenous and feminist archaeology.

During the 2012 excavation at Housepit 54 at the Bridge River site, on the contemporary Xwísten Reserve, we recovered a small steatite figurine (Figure 2.1). It had a distended belly, small bent arms, crouched legs, closed eyes, and a vagina. Immediately, recognizing the distended belly and the vagina, we thought of pregnancy and women. A band member held it in
her hand, closely examining it, noting that she had not previously seen anything like it. She then stated with confidence that this was a mourning figurine; representing a female infant child that had passed (Ina Williams 2012, personal communication). The women elders later confirmed this. How did they know?

Stryd (1973) recovered three figurines from the nearby Bell site bearing the same features of a female infant (Figure 2.2). The figurines recovered by Stryd were nearly identical and were associated with a child’s burial in the floor of a house, a confirmation of the band members interpretation of its meaning. The lesson here is that we cannot discount the thoughts, memories, interpretations, and instincts of descendant communities regarding the meaning of the archaeological past; after all it is theirs.

Despite extensive theoretical advances (Binford 1962; Johnson 2010; Schiffer 1972; Trigger 2006), archaeologists have typically failed to allow equal consideration and weight to be given to indigenous interpretations of the ancient past (Atalay 2006, 2012; Ferguson 1996; McGhee 2008; Wobst 2010). Interpretations by indigenous peoples can offer important alternative avenues of inquiry. The little houses excavated at the Keatley Creek site provide an opportunity for applying ideas and practices from indigenous archaeology. Archaeology has been conducted at Keatley Creek using various theoretical frameworks to address a range of topics including social inequality, lithic technology and raw material sourcing, ritual structures, conflict, and subsistence practices (Hayden 1992, 1994, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2005; Hayden and Adams 2004; Cannon 1992; Kennedy and Bouchard 1992; Kuijt and Prentiss 2004; Prentiss et al. 2007; Rousseau 2000). This new study of the little houses at Keatley Creek seeks to illustrate the utility of indigenous participation and leadership in research, ultimately arguing for an alternative approach to interpretation (Atalay 2006; Barnett 2014; Harris 2010; Silliman 2010).
In order to effectively make this argument I begin with a theoretical discussion highlighting approaches that seek to challenge bias and emphasize their importance in archaeology, highlighting some differences and potential application. I then explore the use of ethnographic information and its application for archaeological interpretation. In addition to the remarkable amount of archaeological research in the Mid-Fraser region of interior British Columbia there is an equally impressive amount of ethnographic data in existence, one of the most significant being Teit’s 1900, 1906, and 1909 monographs from the St’at’imc (Lillooet), Nlaka’pamux (Thompson), and Secwepemc (Shuswap) First Nations. Ethnographic information may be derived from descendant communities, and may be accessed through oral histories, artwork, songs, stories, and language. A pressing question regarding the use of the ethnographic record in an archaeological context seems to be when, and how, we use these resources. Despite the challenges, I believe that these sources can be used effectively and with confidence in certain contexts. In this paper I will visit Keatley Creek, both past and present, and the archaeology of the little houses on the hillside. In conclusion, I will launch a discussion of future prospects for bridging gaps between western and indigenous ways of knowing. The indigenous past is not for archaeologists alone to define, explain, and recreate. It requires indigenous thought and perspective, beliefs, and insight to be incorporated and trusted.

**Theoretical discussion**

*Feminist and Indigenous theory*

My re-analysis of the Keatley Creek structures draws from a combination of both feminist and indigenous theories (Atalay 2006, 2012; Barile 2004; Bruchac et al. 2010; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Croes 2010; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Conkey 2003, 2010; di Leonardo 1991; Engelstad 2007; Ferguson1996; Harris 2010; Hays-Gilpin 2000, 2008; Johnson
2010; Lyons 2013; Marshall 2002; Nicholas 2010; Silliman 2010; Spector 1993; Stocket and Gellar 2006; Tomaskova 2007; Trigger 2006; Wylie 1992, 2007), allowing for a more expansive consideration of the original participants, including but not limited to: male, female, shamans, children, adolescents, adults, elderly, and both life-stage and community, along with ritual activities. It is valuable to remember that archaeology has always been gendered, although from an implicitly androcentric perspective, and with little to no interdisciplinary resistance until the introduction of feminist archaeology in the 1980’s (Hays-Gilpin 2008). Feminist theory is critical of a western, or first world, androcentric bias and thus allows for scientific interpretation that considers a combination of multiple theoretical aspects. One strength of these approaches is the critique and consideration that it pays to western scientific bias, post-colonialism, and the androcentric bias that has dominated scientific, and archaeological, interpretation (Conkey 2003, 2010; Johnson 2010; Ferguson 1996; Trigger 2006; Wylie 1992, 2007).

Over the years feminist theory has met with criticism and challenge, even the name has been modified on occasion (Engelstad 2007; Hays-Gilpin 2000; Wylie 2007). Attempts to reconstruct it as a theory solely of gender proves insufficient: gender is just one of the many focal points of feminist theory, which can be implemented to look at an array of aspects in the archaeological record (Tomaskova 2007). Practicing feminist theory is an intellectual challenge (Hays-Gilpin 2000) when used as intended, as a tool for challenging androcentrism and allowing for visibility of all underrepresented peoples and structures in the archaeological record. Feminist theory in the sciences should not be used as a mechanism for promoting women’s rights, or limited to only aspects of gender visibility. These principles are now antiquated and represent an earlier phase of feminism that should be utilized only as a launching point for future feminist research (di Leonardo 1991; Stocket and Gellar 2006).
Feminist theorists have not always agreed on what it means to practice this theoretical position. Wylie (2007) assumes that gender and oppression are inherently embedded in one another. I would argue that this perspective represents an ethnocentric approach, which inadvertently translates into the intention to “change” other cultures to how we see fit. Current thought in feminist theory is grounded in the situated experience of all peoples, and in developing different perspectives, rather than a specific focus on women (Hays-Gilpin 2008). Feminist theory, as an approach to interpretation should progress in this inclusive manner, the same as modern political, and social feminism is advancing (Hays-Gilpin 2008; Kunin 2012).

Much of the opposition to feminist theory has resulted from the negative connotations associated with the word feminism, and the desire to stray from something perceived to be too political (Conkey 2003, 2010; Hill 1998; Wiley 1992). However, anthropology is, and has always been, from its inception, inherently political (Barile 2004; Conkey 2010; Ferguson 1996; Leone et al. 1987; Trigger 2006). At its historical inception, archaeology served as a tool for colonization and indigenous oppression (Ferguson 1996; Johnson 2010; Trigger 2006). Archaeology has been used to take land away from Native North Americans, as well as a justification for keeping American women out of the workforce and in the home, as their natural place in life (Johnson 2010; McGuire 1992). An attempt to rename feminist theory, and in turn provide the creation of gender theory, queer theory, and the theory of the disenfranchised, allows for a change in name that averts opposition, but does little to challenge the androcentric and western bias in scientific interpretation, or broaden our scope of inquiry (Engelstad 2007; Hays-Gilpin 2000, 2008; Tomaskova 2007; Wiley 2007). It is the challenge to interpretations of the past that make feminism extremely relevant to archaeology. It is also these challenges that unify feminist theory with indigenous theory (Conkey 2010).
The lesson from feminist, Indigenous, and other critical archaeologies, is that we should be
openly discussing what counts as experience and, furthermore, who gets to make that
determination (Conkey 2010 pg. 92).

Indigenous archaeology and its theoretical tenets were introduced little more than a
archaeology, accusing it of being a single-minded theoretical approach, which puts undue power
into the hands of indigenous people. This misconception is based on the notion that it promotes
indigenous peoples and perspectives over that of all others, where in actuality, there are many
different practices within it (Silliman 2010). It has also elicited responses that have sought to
more clearly define and expound the practice of indigenous theory (Croes 2010; Silliman 2010).
Like feminism, indigenous theory follows a general base of principals; the belief that it is
fundamental that archaeological practices undertaken by, for, and with indigenous communities
in ways that challenge the disciplines historical political economy and expand its intellectual
breadth (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010). Perceptions that archaeology is more scientific in
practice than cultural anthropology, lending it to fall somewhere between social science and
natural science (Tomaskova 2007), along with the gross misconception that science is politically
neutral (Hill 1998), are partially responsible for resistance to these critical perspectives.

Indigenous theory provides a thought-provoking corpus of ideas, worthy of
contemplation and practice; as a native person practicing archaeology it provokes consideration
of what it means to be an archaeologist and an indigenous thinker (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al.
2010). More specifically, indigenous theory constructs principles for all archaeologist to
incorporate; you need not be native to practice them and in turn, being native does not mean that
you automatically engage in this framework. It is an intellectual, and potentially personal,
challenge for people to bridge the gaps between indigenous communities and the study of the human past.

*Community Archaeology vs. Indigenous Theory*

Community archaeology is rapidly gaining popularity in its application. Most commonly found in Cultural Resource Management (CRM) and/or Cultural Heritage Management (CHM) (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Marshall 2002) it has been described as a non-research based collaborative methodology; a natural fit for CRM and CHM (Atalay 2006, 2012; Lyons 2013; Marshall 2002). Indigenous archaeology often implements and relies upon community involvement although the two are not synonymous; indigenous archaeology strives to be more than a collaborative methodology. Heavily influenced by indigenous theory, and to some extent feminist theory, community archaeology can be defined as the pursuit of multivocality and collaboration of all interested parties in which at least partial control of the project is embedded in the community (Atalay 2012; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Marshall 2002; Spector 1993). Community archaeology has seen two types of communities evolve from their practice: local communities or those peoples resided at or near the site of inquiry, and descendant communities, those directly descended from the inhabitants or creators of the site of inquiry. The combination of these communities, along with the interests of the archaeological team involved, marry a host of interests, meanings, and significance to be put forth for consideration (Marshall 2002). Community archaeology can, but does not always, involve indigenous communities and is not limited to the indigenous scope of involvement. There is also a reliance on community that pays particular attention to principles of understanding, dissemination, future planning and protection, emphasizing the resonance for this practice to be particularly effective in CRM/CHM (Atalay 2012) and becoming something quite different in the end than simply an indigenous theory.
This research relies heavily on indigenous and feminist frameworks. It serves to place indigenous belief, thought, and practices at the center of analysis rather than limiting the reliance on descendant indigenous community solely as labor participants or informants. Indigenous theory itself acts as a decolonizing practice, critiquing past archaeological practice while reconstructing a passageway that will allow for improvement in archaeological practice, theory, and methodology (Atalay 2006). The final goal of this study is to allow past and present peoples of the region to have visibility and voice in all aspects of their lives; seeing traditional thought, belief and meaning that is relevant to their life-ways. I do this by addressing the archaeological record through a localized indigenous framework. I actively incorporate the ethnographic record along with contemporary native voices as a method that informs interpretation of the past.

The Little Houses at Keatley Creek

The focus of this paper is the little houses at Keatley Creek (Figure 2.3) located on the eastern periphery of the site, up on a second terrace just below the tree line and to the north of a small stream, approximately 250 meters from the core of village (Morin 2006, 2010; Morin et al. 2007; Wittke et al 2004). These structures, 104, 105, and 106, have been the subject of significant consideration regarding ritual and non-domestic occupation patterns (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2006, 2010). Structure 109, previously grouped into an analysis with the others, lies on a terrace 50-100 meters below 104, 105 and 106 (Figure 3) is not discussed in this paper, although future inquiry into ST 109 is recommended due to its peripheral location and uncommon artifact assemblage (Morin et al. 2007).

Houses 104, 105, and 106 cluster together and are significantly smaller in diameter than core village structures, up to 16 meters smaller, and date to the proto-historic period with calibrated radiocarbon dates ranging from 400-200 BP (Morin 2006, 2010). While much of the
village core at Keatley has yet to be dated (Morin et al. 2007), a hearth outside Housepit 7 and radiocarbon dates associated with Housepit 3 provide contemporaneous dates to these small peripheral structures (Hayden and Adams 2004). It is the late occupation of these structures that allow for the direct application of the ethnographic record. Prior to globalization, industrialization, and assimilation, culture and cultural traditions worldwide changed at a much slower rate (Mcintosh 2005). Thus, traditions and beliefs could persist and be experienced as largely unchanging over many generations (Shils 1981). The ethnology of the Middle Fraser Canyon as recorded by James Teit and his wife Susannah ‘Lucy’ Artko/Antko (Figure 2.4), a Thompson Indian woman born in 1866, was established within one to two generations of these occupations. Presumably, as tradition would dictate, Lucy’s understanding and beliefs were ingrained in her by one, if not two, generations of elders who enculturated her as a small child (Cole 2001; Wickwire 1993, 2005).

Rarely mentioned, and nearly undocumented, the participation and insight of Lucy would bear significance on these documents (Greenhill and Tye 1997; Wickwire 1993, 2005). Her influence would result in a non-typical emphasis for that era in ethnographic research on women’s culture and their portrayal as “strong, independent, and fully-participating members of their communities” (Wickwire 1993, 2005). Her knowledge underscored the observations made in the ethnologies, the combination of her being a local indigenous woman and her fluency of the language as her first language aided and influenced what and how information was accessed, interpreted, and portrayed, as a result, the regional ethnographies explore, in detail, puberty ritual for both boys and girls and their transition into adulthood. In this paper I focus on the girl’s houses since they most closely fit the description of the case study with respect to location and artifact assemblage.
Signatures of Gender and Life-Stage

There has never been a question as to the cultural, as well as anthropological, relevance and importance of menstruation and what commonly represents a young girl’s transition into womanhood in many North American indigenous societies. Examples have been documented among the Nez Perce, St’át’imc, Nlaka’pamux, Secwepemc, Creek, Cherokee, Tenino, Southern Okanagan, Colville, and Yakama among others (Claassen 2011; Teit 1900, 1906, 1909; Wright 2003). Despite the cultural relevance and the wide dissemination of at least some level of knowledge, as Galloway (1997) points out, archaeology has done relatively little in the pursuit of identifying, acknowledging, and incorporating these life-stage transitions (eg. Crown 1985) until quite recently (Claassen 2011). The combination of expansive multi-generational occupations of the Mid-Fraser Canyon villages, such as Keatley Creek (Hayden and Adams 2004; Hayden 1997, 2005; Prentiss et al. 2005), along with the descendant community, and frequent use of the ethnographic record, created in collaboration with a local native woman (Wickwire 1993, 2005), make this an ideal case study for furthering archaeological approaches to exploring a holistic perspective on the past.

Ethnographies from the region discuss gender and life stage in great detail; specifically coming of age/puberty seclusion for both boys and girls as well as menstrual seclusion, and childbirth rituals and seclusion for both the mother and father (Teit 1900,1906). I draw from the Teit (and Lucy’s) ethnographies of the St’át’imc people. I exclude data recovered on the Secwepemc Indians as it has been suggested that the group was a relative newcomer to the northern Middle Fraser region, arriving post-1850’s, presumably after the little houses were vacated (Teit 1909). Under careful review it is possible to identify potential signatures of the coming of age houses.
Seclusion houses during puberty/coming of age, were part of a strong tradition for both the Nlaka’pamux and the St’át’imc and have many shared attributes. These houses were not temporary structures utilized for only a period of menses or menarche but were in use for a minimum of one, and maximum of four, years (Teit 1900, 1906), likely an average of about two years per individual. The amount of time invested in living in these structures makes them less ephemeral on the landscape than a puberty or menstrual house used for a more temporary duration or by peoples with a higher rate of mobility (James 1996; Wright 2003).

The regional villages of Mid-Fraser River Canyon include Keatley Creek, Bridge River, Bell and Fountain among others. Most commonly these villages are most often referred to as winter villages (Alexander 1992; Hayden and Adams 2004; Hayden and Cousins 2004; Kennedy and Bouchard 1992; Prentiss and Kuijt 2012; Prentiss et al. 2008). The label of “winter villages” can result in a misunderstanding of the occupation and use of these villages; although it is during the winter months that villages attained their peak population, they could be occupied year round. During the year community members would utilize an extensive range for purposes of hunting, gathering, fishing, gathering raw materials, socializing, and trade. In the colder months, as the daylight became restricted, communities and activities become centered in or near the home. It is the year round, rather than seasonal, occupation of these villages that accommodated the cultural tradition of these seclusion houses for the St’át’imc peoples of the Interior Plateau of British Columbia being occupied for extended periods of time. In addition, the seclusion houses were assigned to specific locations on the landscape with consideration of the village core; the culmination of these factors creates the opportunity for a strong archeological signature.

Young boys going into seclusion were to occupy areas on mountaintops, and at greater elevations above the tree line. For young girls, their small isolated lodges were located on the
periphery, above the village; far enough away to avoid smoke blowing down on them from other houses but still allow access for ease of visitation by mothers and others (Teit 1900, 1906; Wright 2003). Other forms of seclusion included men’s and women’s seclusion for a short period of time post childbirth, women’s and children’s seclusion post childbirth if twins were born, and extended puberty/coming of age if an individual intended to become a “shaman” (Teit 1900, 1906). The distinct location of the small structures 104, 105, and 106, on a terrace above and on the periphery of the village, yet below the tree line, suggests that these served as girls’ seclusion lodges.

As previously stated, girls’ seclusion lodges were typically occupied for a minimum of one year and a maximum of four years. These lodges were located above the core village but below the tree line and near running water, more often mentioned as a stream (Teit 1900, 1906). This historical practice is reflected in the current taboo of menstruating women spending daylight hours in the forest during menstruation (Ina Williams, personal communication 2012).

Tsqe’lp (in St’at’imcets), or *Pseudotsuga mucronata* (Douglas fir), branches or bark were used for roofing, although the height of the lodge was not standardized (Teit 1930). Rather, it depended on the girl’s height; if a girl was tall and didn’t want to grow anymore she would have a lower roof, if a girl was shorter and wanted to continue to grow the angle of the fir branches were steeper allowing for a taller roof. A hole would be excavated in the center of the floor for use during the first month of seclusion. The first menstrual period is referred to as *tlo’gamug* in St’at’imcets, in reference to the hole in the lodge (Teit 1900; Wright 2003).

After the first four days of seclusion, marked by fasting, a young girl’s mother or guardian would bring food. Food restrictions during seclusion were limited to fresh fish; once fish was a day old it was made available with no restrictions. Abstinence from quadrupeds, or
deer, but only for food purposes was followed; deer hooves were used, rattles made and hides utilized as part of the traditional seclusion practice. The young girls/women in transition also refrained from eating bear (Teit 1900). Roots could be consumed with no restrictions while berries were to avoided, both dry and fresh, until a month after the first ones were ripe.

Girls were equipped with a standardized tool kit specifically designed for the seclusion period: bone drinking tubes, birch bark cup, bone scratchers, combs, digging sticks, small smooth stones for a number of rituals, bone whistles, and also tools maintained for making crafts and baskets (Teit 1900, 1906). Girls painted their faces with red and yellow pigment and wore headbands of bark string decorated with dentalia or bone beads and ankle bracelets made from deer hooves. Girls also wore a bark string necklace on which they attached their towel and sponge. They wore robes fastened around their waist with bark string.

During the daytime, girls would stay in their lodge making traditional items such as baskets, mats, and other things, many in miniature form as practice items. These would be removed from the lodge and hung from trees or poles. Evening was a time for ritual and ceremony in which girls would leave their lodges, protected by masks and basket rattles to ward off harmful spirits, and make a fire. She would walk and run a great deal so she would be “light of foot”, and use her digging stick to create a small trench on either side of a trail in order to ensure that she would always dig roots fast and easy.

These ethnographical accounts provide a glimpse of the particular aspects of life within the coming of age seclusion lodges, while they tend to overlook casual activities that may have been considered to be typical, or mundane. While the overlooked aspects include daily tools and tool making, procurement of food, storage, and sleeping, I argue that given the specific characteristics of occupation and activities, a standardization of personal items, and placement on
the landscape, seclusion lodges associated with these large scale villages can be identified and are deserving of archaeological inquiry.

Given these in-depth descriptions we can expect to find a specific set of archaeological signatures. First, we can expect that these structures be located on the periphery of a village at an elevation above that of the core. We can expect a large pit in the center of the structure. We can expect minimal deer remains, those that are present should be representative of elements that would be associated with hide transport and processing, and an over representation of fish. In addition we should find evidence of *Pseudotsuga mucronata* (fir) botanicals from the roof, a specific set of tools, and low trampling of faunal and archaeological remains on the floor due to low household population, presumably just one.

Previous interpretation of these peripheral houses at Keatley Creek have been rooted in theories of aggrandizing strategies aimed at identifying the “rare, prestigious, or elite” peoples and activities, with an emphasis on male dominance and control (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2006, 2010; Wittke et al. 2004). These interpretations include a complete dismissal of regional ethnographic information in favor of ethnographies and data from as far away as the Neolithic Middle East and the Upper Paleolithic in Europe for the purpose of providing support for interpretations of the Mid-Fraser houses as men’s secret societies and men’s ritual houses (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2006, 2010). Such approaches to archaeological interpretation risk undermining traditional indigenous cultural beliefs and practices, resulting in mischaracterization of the traditions of indigenous peoples.

*Archaeological Data*

Data from the three small structures were recovered during field excavations that took place between the years of 1997-2005 (Morin 2006, 2010). Of these houses, ST 104 was 30%
excavated, ST 105 (impacted by looting) was 15% excavated, and ST 106, providing the main amount of data, was 90% excavated. Dating of these peripheral structures relied upon both diagnostic relative dating and radiocarbon dates (Morin 2010). Relative dating, using diagnostic point types are potentially problematic: it is not uncommon to have points from older horizons appear in a newer horizon (Prentiss et al. 2003). Radiocarbon dates must be carefully considered; samples taken from cache pits or rims are inherently unreliable due to the various taphonomic processes that could have placed the sample in its final context (Prentiss et al. 2003). Therefore, I will rely on dates associated with features that likely represent a single occupation period, such as hearths. Using this method, structures 104, 105, and 106 date directly to the proto-historic period (Morin 2010). The designation of these structures as peripheral relies on evidence of contemporaneous occupations in the village core. Of the approximately 119 pit structures at Keatley Creek less than 1/3 have been tested with 67% remaining untested (Morin 2010). Housepits 7 and 3 provide potential contemporaneous calibrated radiocarbon dates to these small peripheral structures (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2010; Prentiss et al. 2003). Artifacts recovered from ST 104 included several abraders, flakes, one unifacial denticulate, and one fragment of coiled basketry (Morin 2010; Wittke et al. 2004). Features A13 and A14 in ST 104 were classified as pit fill and included a spatula type tool and a carved incised bone fragment. Structure 105 produced the following artifacts: one awl, one bird bone bead (a hollow tube rounded at the edges of one end), one bone needle, one rounded bone needle, and 72 flat rectangular objects with a single hole in the center.

Structure 106 allows for a more in depth consideration of both stratigraphy and features (Figure 2.5). The overall sample size of artifacts for ST 106 is too low for statistical analyses (Morin 2010). However, this does not prevent an examination of artifacts in the context of either
floor or roof deposits. Strata I and II, alluvial surface and re-deposited roof covering the roasting feature will be omitted as they do not provide indicators of human activities. Stratum X, the meat-roasting feature (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2010) is located directly over the top of the roof of ST 106; therefore, the meat roasting feature and use of structure are not contemporaneous (Figure 2.6).

The roof sediments of stratum III are unusually thin for a house structure according to previous analysis (Morin 2010). At the southeast corner of the house a thick layer (approximately 9cm thick according to the profile drawing) of Douglas fir needles was identified. Artifacts in the roof sediments included two utilized flakes, one bifacial knife, two scrapers, one unifacial borer, a bone scratcher, three bird bone beads, and one cervid tooth bead; all previously defined (by Morin) as rare or prestigious. Artifacts with a known provenience are indicated on the map (Figure 2.7) using a thumbtack icon; others were assigned provenience with as much accuracy as possible using the data provided in previous studies (Morin 2006, 2010).

The floor layout of ST 106, Stratum IV, has four features identified: Feature 3 is a storage pit at the southern edge of the house located on the rim, Feature 5 is a shallow pit feature in the NE section of the house, Feature 6 appears to be two separate features: an approximately one meter wide conical pit filled with hearth-like sediments capped by an actual hearth. Feature 4 is located on the east side of the house (Figure 2.8). It has been identified as a meat roasting feature with three stratigraphic levels that contained four bifaces, two described as rather crude (Morin 2010) and one fan tail biface and one crescent shaped biface both described as “eccentric” (Morin 2006, 2010). This feature, located under the rim of the structure, does not appear to be associated with the floor and has never been dated; consequently, I cannot presume it to be associated with this house floor.
There were a total of twenty-four artifacts on the floor; twenty-two lithic artifacts represented by six or more scrapers, five piercers, one utilized flake, one miscellaneous biface and nine unknowns (Morin 2006, 2010). There were two bone artifacts: one an antler wedge (previously described as a war club), and a bird bone tube (drinking straw). In addition, there were three discreet ochre finds (Morin 2010).

The fauna “display an overwhelming dominance of salmon as a percentage of the total number of identified specimens” (Morin 2010:611) with an over-representation of salmon vertebra, ribs, and cranial elements. Two artiodactyl (deer) lower limbs were identified; one on the floor and one in a storage pit; none of the elements are associated with food consumption (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2010).

Reconstructing the past

Hayden and Adams (2004), Morin (2006, 2010), and Wittke et al. (2004) acknowledge the “domestic” or female nature of these artifacts (e.g. Gero 1991; Sassaman 1992), but instead favor a rare or elite explanation. I agree that these houses appear to be different than a “typical” domestic structure, but multiple possibilities occur at many levels within a community and can apply to various ages, gender, and activities, all for a number of reasons. A comparison of these structures including their location, organization, and artifact assemblage, provide strong indicators that these structures represent girls’ puberty seclusion lodges (Teit 1900, 1906; Ina Williams 2012 Personal communication).

The domination of piercers and scrapers along with the presence of two artiodactyl lower limbs suggest that hide preparation and sewing activities occurred in this house. Morin (2010) proposes that buckskin, or deer hide, was a rare or elite status item, yet ethnographic evidence suggests otherwise (Teit 1900, 1906). Ethnographic information also offers direct explanation
for the high amount of red ochre located on the floor; not only were young women’s buckskin aprons and cups painted red, but also their faces.

The overrepresentation of fish and their lack of trampling is exactly what we would expect under the hypothesis of girls seclusion with dietary requirements and minimal household population. Additional support lies in the bone and lithic artifacts; offering uncontested attributes of the “toolkit” (Figures 2.9 and 2.10) for this transitional stage in a girl’s life (Morin 2006, 2010; Teit 1900, 1906).

Recognition of the meter wide conical pit in the center of the house could be interpreted as the pit in the center that girls would initially crouch in. Although depth of the pit has not been published, recent personal communication with excavators present during the excavation of ST 106 indicate that the pit was also up to 1 meter deep, but more data are needed for confirmation (Amanda Marshall 2014, personal communication).

The typically war-related masculine elements, previously used to justify a “secret society men’s ritual house” are questionable. Morin (2010) argued that the antler “war club” found on the ST 106 floor had too great of curvature to be a wedge despite its appearance (Morin 2010). I compared the artifact with Teit’s example of a wedge, finding curvatures to be within 5 degrees of each other, 135 and 140 degrees respectively (Figure 2.11); slight enough that the artifact could not be ruled “ineffective” as previously suggested (Morin 2006, 2010).

The “tomahawk” identified on the bench of ST 106 is described as a quartzite spall, unifacially thinned with possible grinding on the margins (Morin 2010). A comparison of this spall (Figure 2.13) with tomahawks of the region (Figure 2.12), and with scrapers from the region (Figure 2.14) identified and illustrated by Teit (1900, 1906) implies a different interpretation. The illustrations and descriptions provided strongly suggest that this spall is more
representative of large scraper with consideration to the shape, the unifacial thinning, grinding on the margins, and thinning at the base for hafting purposes, likely marking it as ineffective as a tomahawk. With the absence of these weapons and eccentrics, there is no artifactual evidence to argue for the ethnographically unknown “men’s secret society houses” (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2006, 2010).

In the summer of 2012 I had the opportunity to walk the site of Keatley Creek along with St’át’imc tribal members, Ina Williams, Brenda Frank, Jack Narcisse, and Sarah Moberg. Upon arrival on the second terrace we stood observing taking in everything around us. The question was posed, “What do you think about these?” in reference to the small structures. There was pause, and Williams stated, “These are women’s houses”. This was a consensus indicated by nods of agreement, now fully supported by archaeological data.

Discussion

Significant archaeological investigations have been conducted at the Keatley Creek Site (e.g. Hayden 1992, 1997, 2005; Morin 2010; Prentiss et al. 2003, 2005, 2007, 2011; Wittke et al. 2004). This site represents one of the most substantial intact pithouse villages in the Mid-Fraser Canyon, a region with a rich archaeological history and numerous contemporaneous settlements. Hayden (1992) offers frameworks for explaining emergence of cultural complexity and culture change among hunter-gatherer peoples that occupied the region during the late prehistoric period. His argument builds on the notion that individuals are the principal movers of culture, but are also influenced by the environmental context. He argues that at approximately 2600 BP, under conditions of resource abundance, power seeking individuals used surplus labor resulting in surplus of resources; both food ‘objects of prestige’ to instill admiration for pretty, shiny things, thus resulting in the “luring individuals and families into debt or reciprocal obligations”
(Hayden 1998:12). This *aggrandizing* theory, suggests that elites used their surplus to build social networks and create extended corporate groups. These corporate households, headed by elite aggrandizers, controlled trade and resource distribution, the latter of which was manipulated primarily through competitive feasting events and contractual agreements that created debt relations between elites and the non-elites. While Hayden seeks to explain social inequality, his focus is clearly on the higher ranking, more powerful community members, and how this pattern of aggrandizing leads to unequal representation of the lives lived (Clark and Blake 1989; Hayden 1994, 1995, 1998). This model imposes a first world emphasis on capitalistic models as a means for social inequality (Chapman 2010) in an indigenous, non-western, society. This has influenced colleagues (Morin 2010; Wittke et al. 2004) to pursue an interpretation of Keatley residential structures as places used by shamans, chiefs, and men of power, despite ethnographical and archaeological accounts that are in direct conflict with these interpretations (Teit 1900, 1906, 1909). These have been powerful voices in the development of interpretations on household complexity and social ranking of Keatley Creek, so powerful that they allow little room for alternative interpretations and a broader range of inquiry.

This analysis is not intended to minimize the importance of the work that has been done at Keatley Creek, or other regional villages, by dedicated archaeologists (see Hayden 1992, 2005; Morin 2006, 2010; Prentiss et al. 2003, 2005, 2011; Prentiss and Kuijt 2012; Stryd 1976; Wittke et al. 2004); it is previous research that is central to this analysis, offering the foundation on which to build alternative explanations. The melding of indigenous and feminist theories with aspects of western, scientific practice, provides an opportunity for archaeologists to redefine the possibilities, restructure our questions, and in turn provide an opportunity to see beyond
contemporary first world notions of the haves and have-nots of a society, allowing us to challenge ourselves to see and understand with much greater nuance the lives of the people.

What becomes clear in addressing questions about gender, life-stage, or additional ‘difficult to seek out’ participants is that there is the need for a methodology that considers each unit of data individually and then unifies them only after each botanical and faunal remains, artifact, and feature has been considered on its own merits (see Barnett 2014; Claassen 2011; Hodder 1979, 1985). For example, a child’s practice point has a distinctly different meaning from that of an adult. Developing an understanding of the cultural meaning for each unit considered such as traditional uses of botanicals, food prohibitions, and lithic raw material preferences, as well as house construction and traditional beliefs about the land become crucial; in effect allowing for indigenous thoughts to be considered equally among western standardized units of analysis. With the cautious incorporation of ethnography and a careful consideration of how it was collected and who assembled the monographs, along with a broad partnership with the descendant community, we can begin to facilitate those answers.

The reanalysis of the little houses at the Keatley Creek Village serves to renegotiate how we look at the regional archaeological record: the questions we ask, the data we are willing to consider, and the potential for understanding not only the artifacts but the people that lived and created the rich past of the region. Archaeology is grounded in discovery. We know that baskets, drinking tubes, bone scratchers, beads, and deer hide were commonly used in the Mid-Fraser region of the Canadian Plateau, despite the uncommon occurrence of recovering them. My research allows for alternate possibilities, showing that while it is exciting to find something in the archaeological record that is ‘the first’, or an unusual or rare find, our own feelings of
specialness should not override the fact that such artifacts might have been viewed quite differently by peoples of the past.

Although I am confident that ST 106, and likely both 104 and 105, represent girls transitional seclusion houses, I believe that my analysis could be strengthened by better access to primary data and further testing, for example ethno-botanical sampling. The implications of this research are not restricted to regional applications. Indigenous theory implies the application of indigenous methods (Atalay 2012; Wobst 2010), the methodology being a set of principles rather than a set of directions or applied methods directing what data are collected and how we collect it, as well as the how we pursue our analysis. Although this research does not intend to prescribe a set of methods, it does offer one example of a way to go about pursuing indigenous archaeology.

Theorizing about the implications of a new approach to archaeology, essentially a reform or decolonization, and creating new pathways for a discipline relies heavily on theoretical conversations. It is the active engagement in this dialogue that will both challenge and innovate new thought and practice. When Lewis Binford (1962) began his challenge to the standard of archaeological practice of the time it was met with excitement, curiosity, and of course, eventually criticism (Hodder 1991; Johnson 2010; Schiffer 1972; Trigger 2006; VanPool and VanPool 1999). It was the criticism, in combination with enthusiasm that pushed proponents harder to define theoretical parameters, discuss methodology, and perpetuate case studies while continuing to argue the merits of this new approach. In the end it was these conversations that resulted in what has been perceived as a paradigmatic shift (Johnson 2010; Trigger 2006). As a discipline, archaeology will continue to progress in a response to the various new needs and
pressures of the practice, the inclusion of indigenous thoughts and belief will continue be one of the pressing needs awaiting, and benefitting from, our answer.
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Figure 2.1 Steatite mourning figurine, Bridge River Site.
Figure 2.2 Mourning figurine Bell site (Stryd 1976).
Figure 2.3 Keatley Creek site overview with terraces 1 (gray) and 2 (black) indicated by arrows.
Figure 2.4 LSusannah 'Lucy' Artko/Antko.

Figure 2.5 St 106 Profile (Morin 2010).
Figure 2.6 St 106 meat roasting feature on roof.
Figure 2.7 St 106 artifact distribution on roof.
Figure 2.8 ST 106 Floor distribution of artifacts.
Figure 2.9 Drinking tubes. Left (Morin 2010), Right (Teit 1900).

Figure 2.10 Scratchers. Left (Teit 1900), Right (Morin 2010).
Figure 2.11 Wedges. Top (Teit 1900), bottom (Morin 2010).
Figure 2.12 Tomahawk (Teit 1900).

Figure 2.13 Quartzite spall (Morin 2010).
Figure 2.14 Ethnographic scraper (Teit 1900).
REFERENCES CITED

Alexander, Diana


Atalay, Sonya

2006 Indigenous Archaeology as a Decolonizing Practice. American Indian Quarterly 30:280-310

2010 Indigenous Archaeology as a Decolonizing Practice. In indigenous archaeologies: A Reader on Decolonization. edited by Margaret M. Bruchac, Siobhan M. Hart, and H. Martin Wobst pp.79-85 Left Coast Press, Inc. Walnut Creek, CA

2012 Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities. University of California Press Berkeley, CA.

Barile, Kerri S.

2004 Race, the National Register, and Cultural Resource Management: Creating an Historic Context for Postbellum Sites Historical Archaeology, 38:90-100

Transcending Boundaries, Transforming the Discipline: African Diaspora Archaeologies in the New Millennium

Barnett, Kristen D.

2014 Indigenous Household Spatial Analysis. In The Last House at Bridge River: The Archaeology of an Aboriginal Household in British Columbia during the Fur
Trade Period, edited by Anna M. Prentiss. pp.495-527 The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City (In review)

Binford, Lewis R.

1962  Archaeology as Anthropology American Antiquity 26:217-225

Bruchac, Margaret M., Siobhan M. Hart, and H. Martin Wobst ed.

2010  indigenous archaeologies: A Reader on Decolonization. Left Coast Press Walnut Creek, CA

Cannon, Aubrey


Chapman, Robert


Chirikure, Shadreck and Gilbert Pwiti


Clarke, J. and M. Blake

Claassen, Cheryl


Cole, Douglas


Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, T.J Ferguson, Dorothy Lippery, Randall H. McGuire, George P. Nicholas, Joe Watkins, and Larry J. Zimmerman

2010   The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology *American Antiquity* 75:228-238

Conkey, Margaret W.


2010   Dwelling at the Margins, Action at the Intersection? Feminist and Indigenous Archaeologies. In *indigenous archaeologies: A Reader on Decolonization*, edited by Margaret M. Bruchac, Siobhan M. Hart, and H. Martin Wobst pp.91-98 Left Coast Press, Inc. Walnut Creek, CA

Croes, Dale R.
2010  Courage and Thoughtful Scholarship = Indigenous Archaeology Partnerships  
American Antiquity 75:211-216  

Crown, Patricia L.  

di Leonardo, Micaela  

Engelstad, Ericka  
2007  Much More than Gender Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 14:217-234  

Ferguson, T. J.  
1996  Native Americans and the Practice of Archaeology Annual Review of Anthropology 25:63-79  

Galloway, Patricia  

Gero, Joan M.  
Greenhill, Pauline and Diane Tye

1997 Undisciplined Women: Tradition and Culture in Canada. *McGill-Queen’s University Press* Montreal, Quebec

Harris, Heather

2010 Indigenous Worldviews and Ways of Knowing as Theoretical and Methodological Foundations behind Archaeological Theory and Method. In *indigenous archaeologies: A Reader on Decolonization*, edited by Margaret M. Bruchac, Siobhan M. Hart, and H. Martin Wobst pp.63-68 Left Coast Press, Inc. Walnut Creek, CA

Hayden, Brian and Ron Adams


Hayden, Brian


2005 The Emergence of Large Villages and Large Residential Corporate Group Structures among Complex Hunter-Gatherers at Keatley Creek. *American Antiquity* 70:169-174

Hayden, Brian and Sara Mossop Cousins


Hays-Gilpin, Kelley


Hodder, Ian

1985  Postprocessual Archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 8:1-26

1991  Interpretive Archaeology and Its Role. *American Antiquity* 56:7-18

James, Caroline


Johnson, Matthew


Kehoe, Alice B.


Kennedy, Dorothy and Randy Bouchard


Kuijt, Ian and William C. Prentiss

Kunin, Madeleine M.


Leone, Mark P., Parker B. Potter, Jr., and Paul A. Shackel


Lyons, Natasha


University of Arizona Press Tucson, AZ

Marshall, Amanda

2014  Personal Communication interviewed by Kristen D. Barnett (April 2014) at the Society for American Archaeology 79th Annual Meeting, Austin, TX

Marshall, Yvonne


Mcintosh, Tracey


McGhee, Robert

2008  Aboriginalism and the Problems of Indigenous Archaeology *American Antiquity* 72:579-597

McGuire, Randall H.


Morin, Jesse


Morin, Jesse, Jon Sheppard, Ryan Sagarbarria, and Jamie Hoshkins


Nicholas, George P.

2010  Decolonizing the Archaeological Landscape: The Practice and Politics of Archaeology in British Columbia. In *indigenous archaeologies: A Reader on Decolonization*, edited by Margaret M. Bruchac, Siobhan M. Hart, and H. Martin Wobst pp.185-188 Left Coast Press, Inc. Walnut Creek, CA

Prentiss, Anna Marie, ed.


Prentiss, Anna Marie and Ian Kuijt

2012  *People of the Middle Fraser Canyon: An Archaeological History*. University of British Columbia Press Vancouver, BC
Prentiss, Anna Marie, James C. Chatters, Natasha Lyons, and Lucille Harris

2011 Archaeology in the Middle Fraser Canyon, British Columbia: Changing Perspectives on Paleoecology and Emergent Cultural Complexity *Canadian Journal of Archaeology/ Journal Canadien d’Archaeolgie* 35:143-174

Prentiss, William C., Lucille Harris, Sierra Mandelko, Jesse Adams, Catherine A Dietz, Melisse Burns, Nathan Goodale, and Michael Lenert

2003 Report of the 2002 University of Montana Investigations at the Keatley Creek Site (EeRi7).

Prentiss, William C., Michael Lenert, Thomas A. Foor, and Nathan Goodale


Rousseau, Mike

2000 Results of the Keatley Creek Archaeology Project Lithic Source Study. In *The Ancient Past of Keatley Vol. 1 Taphonomy*, edited by Brian Hayden pp.165-183

Simon Fraser University Press Burnaby, BC

Shils, Edward


Schiffer, Michael B.

1972 Archaeological Context and Systemic Context *American Antiquity* 37:156-165

Silliman, Stephen W.


Stockett, Miranda K., and Pamela L. Geller
2006    Feminist Anthropology: Perspectives on Our Past, Present, and Future. In
         Feminist Anthropology: Past, Present, and Future, edited by Pamela L. Geller
         and Miranda K. Stocket and Louise Lamphere (foreward) pp.University of
         Pennsylvania Press Philadelphia

Stryd, Arnoud H.

1973    An Archaeological Research Design for the Investigation of Pithouse
         Anthropology. In Aboriginal Man and Environments on the Plateau of Northwest
         America, edited by Arnoud H. Stryd and Rachel A. Smith

Teit, James A

1900    The Thompson Indians of British Columb Museum of Natural History Memoirs
         1:2 pp.163-390 AMS Press, New York

1906    The Lilooet Indian, edited by Franz Boas American Museum of Natural History

1909    The Shuswap, edited by Franz Boas American Museum of Natural History
         Memoirs 2:7 pp.447-789

Tomaskova, Silvia

2007    Mapping a Future: Archaeology, Feminism, and Scientific Practice. Journal of
         Archaeological Method and Theory 14:264-284

Trigger, Bruce G.

         Press. New York, NY

VanPool, Christine S., and Todd L. VanPool

Watkins, Joe


Wickwire, Wendy


Williams, Ina

2012 Personal Communication (June 2012) Interviewed by Kristen Dawn Barnett., 2012 University of Montana Field School. X’wisten (Bridge River), B.C

Wittke, Karen L., Brian Hayden, and Marie-Ange Lauwerys

2004 A Coiled Basket Fragment and Other Organic Artifacts from the Keatley Creek Site, British Columbia *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 28:144-150

Wobst, H. Martin


Wright, Mary C.


Wylie, Alison
2007  Doing Archaeology as a Feminist. Special Issue of the *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, guest edited with Margaret W. Conkey, 14:3
CHAPTER 3

Indigenous Household Spatial Analysis of Housepit 54 During the Fur Trade Era

Kristen D. Barnett 1,2
1Department of Anthropology, The University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812
2Corresponding author (kristen.barnett@umontana.edu)

Previous chapters have explored Housepit (HP) 54 in terms of subsistence, ecology, lithic technology, social organization, and a multitude of factors, all founded within a western analytical framework. These chapters inform us about various aspects of what and how particular types of decision making or activities were taking place. However, what they do not offer is a view of life on a holistic indigenous perspective that favors the recognition of the actions of specific persons as defined by age, sex, gender, and their respective public/communal and private/personal spaces and interactions within a framework based on cultural belief and practice. This chapter seeks to address who, the people, of HP 54, and serves as a discussion and analysis of an indigenous household, one filled with people of varying life-stages, genders, with their unique social interactions and activities, as created and experienced through an indigenous framework.

I draw from an intentionally diverse line of evidence including ethnographic, linguistic, archaeological, and indigenous perspective including oral histories, traditions, and values, allowing for an interpretation that challenges and enriches contemporary archaeological thought, intentionally reaching beyond the confines of traditional western science (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Conkey 2010; Harris 2010). Ethnographies can be problematic in their use of archaeological interpretation; a common issue that arises is a predominant western male bias
occurring in the collection of data. Additional complications can arise from the direct inferences directed across a wide temporal range, for example using post-contact era ethnography to interpret a pre-contact era can be misleading. In the instance of HP 54 both of these issues are reasonably resolved although the ethnographic data requires caution and further research before freely applying it for interpretation.

I will rely on the data addressed in the previous chapters, the difference being that I will create additional definitions for these elements based specifically on St’át’imc’ cultural conceptions drawn from traditional beliefs and practices. In doing this, the goal is to understand HP54 from a perspective and experience closer to that of the people who inhabited this home with a focus on the daily life and interactions of the host of individuals living in this traditional indigenous home.

Theory

I rely on Indigenous and Feminist theories as a framework for interpretation. Indigenous archaeology was introduced little more than a decade ago (Watkins 2005). Indigenous theory is grounded in the belief that “it is fundamental that archaeological practices undertaken by, for, and with indigenous communities in ways that challenge the disciplines historical political economy and expand its intellectual breadth” (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010). Indigenous knowledge is not unique to Native North America, or any particular native group; it is a worldwide phenomenon, shared among all indigenous peoples (Harris 2010). Integrating indigenous histories, drawing from oral histories, language and meaning, landscape use and belief as explicated in place names, songs, art and what our discipline refers to as Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), informs and strengthens archaeology, rather than perpetuating the manner in which some archaeological research can tend to objectify indigenous
peoples (Harris 2010). The visibility of indigenous people during the Colonial and Post-Colonial periods has been reduced through ideologies of racism, colonization, environmental degradation, and violence that have seeped into archaeological principles (Conkey 2010; Harris 2010; Rubertone 2000). My research paradigm seeks to defy these and attempts to reconcile first world archaeological approaches with indigenous beliefs with the application of a blended approach.

Both Indigenous and Feminist theories pose a challenge to past interpretation and the status quo that has been established in archaeology. It is also these challenges that unify Feminist theory with Indigenous theory (Conkey 2010).

“The lesson from feminist, Indigenous, and other critical archaeologies, is that we should be openly discussing what counts as experience and, furthermore, who gets to make that determination”.

Conkey 2010, pg. 92

Current thought in Feminist theory is grounded in the situated experience of all peoples, and in developing different perspectives, rather than a specific focus on women (Hays-Gilpin 2008). Feminism, as a scientific theory, will progress in this inclusive manner, the same as modern political, and social, feminism is progressing while challenging the androcentric nature of archaeological research and interpretation (Hays-Gilpin 2008; Kunin 2012). When carried out in combination with other archaeologies, these theoretical couplings become mutually beneficial and offer creative opportunities for the analysis and interpretation of the past and the pairing of other theoretical perspectives.

Background
Occupations at Housepit 54 occur in two periods, a long-term early series dated ca. 1000-1500 cal. B.P. and the late Fur Trade occupation, the subject of this research (Prentiss et al. 2008, 2014). Villagers experienced population growth and decline, including what is presumed to be abandonment at 1000 B.P. Housepit 54 was occupied during these periods including the re-emerge of occupations in the Mid-Fraser at about 600-500 B.P., whereupon it was reoccupied during the late BR 4 or Fur Trade period, circa 1830s-1850’s A.D. The reoccupation occurs after a period of unpredictable environmental conditions represented by the Medieval Warm Period (MWP), which impacted resource predictability through these environmental stresses. The reoccupation at of the village, and HP 54, coincides with the Little Ice Age and the stabilization of productive fisheries and subsistence resources and extends into the Fur Trade era, persisting into the 1850’s, the period of concern for this analysis.

Methods

For the purpose of this chapter I define the home as the living structure designed to house an individual, family, or multi-family group, a linkage through kinship or marriage being unimportant in this case. The physical parameters of the home include not only the interior of the structure, as is predominately the case in western science, but the exterior space associated with the home. This exterior space was traditionally included and seen as an extension of living space associated with the semi-subterranean housepit structure by St’at’imc with no finite boundaries. These concepts of property ownership were very different from that of our current urban culture, for example, a culture that sees linear physical boundaries assigned to the physical landscape (ex. My property line ends at the fence on the north, south and east edges of my property and at the hedge lining the street on the western edge.) In western culture there are
distinct property lines. Indigenous views of landscape are not linear and do not view the boundary of property lines as a solid and tangible boundary. Rather, the home extends beyond the door and out onto the landscape, a visual definition of home. For the purpose of analysis I will need to create some boundary and definition; therefore I will include the physical elements and space of the roof of HP 54 as an extension of the physical home while I include elements of the greater landscape and environment as impacting the living that occurs in that space.

Household and spatial archaeologies have been used to understand family units, social networking, and decision making throughout the world (Kroll and Price 1991). These have become valuable tools in understanding the day to day activities as they pertain to larger political and social domains. Implementing indigenous perspectives for the interpretation of this house requires drawing on a wide range of variables including language and linguistic analysis, oral tradition and accounts, ideological practices, ethnography, ethnobotany, and the cultural preferences and practices incorporated in tradition. By using indigenous beliefs for understanding artifacts, informing methods and implementing cultural categories as the units of analysis serves to guide and inform interpretation, allowing for a constant awareness and caution in imposing western cultural standards onto an indigenous structure.

Archaeological research in the Mid-Fraser Canyon has benefitted from an impressive ethnographic literature largely resulting from the work of James Teit (1900, 1906, 1909, 1973). It is the late occupation of HP54, dating into the 1850’s, that allows for the direct application of the ethnographic record. Teit arrived in the region in the late 19th Century as an ethnographer working under Franz Boas. After his arrival, he married Susannah ‘Lucy’ Artko, a Thompson Indian woman born in 1866, and member of the local Native community. While rarely mentioned and nearly undocumented, the participation and insight of Lucy would bear
significance on these documents. Her influence would result in a non-typical emphasis for that era in ethnographic research on women’s culture and their portrayal as “strong, independent, and fully-participating members of their communities” (Wickwire 2005).

Teit’s ethnographies cover aspects of subsistence, religion, household, manufacturing of tools and clothing, travel and trade, warfare, games, sign language, festivals, customs, migration, intermarriage, relations with other bands and “tribes”, social organization, medicine, life-stages including birth, puberty, pregnancy, marriage, and death, and art (Teit 1900, 1906, 1909). Teit offers observations on aspects of ethnobotany including traditions, medicinal, smoking, cleansing, ritual, magic, and traditional beliefs and uses of native plants and berries as well as the seasons and conditions best for location and use (Teit 1973). It is through these monographs we can understand a wide range of practices and interactions that center around the household as Teit and his wife ‘Lucy’ described them, all within one generation of the Fur Trade period occupation at HP54. Presumably, as tradition would dictate, Lucy’s understanding and beliefs were instilled in her by one, if not two, generations of elders before her who enculturated her as a small child (Wickwire 2005).

Other ethnographical information is developed through contemporary “living” traditions as passed down from generations via oral tradition and practice, songs, art, and dance. The Upper Lilooet Indians, or today’s St’át’imc, as described by Teit live on in a thriving community comprised of the descendant populations, some located on the X’wisten, or Bridge River Reserve. The contributions and collaboration at each stage of the Bridge River Archaeological project, from the development of research questions, excavation, interpretation and consulting along with the continual generous invitation to partner with them provides the very foundation of this paper.
Language, while changing over time, offers us insight into cultural values, beliefs, and ideology. It can tell us what is important; for example, a linguistic study of the Sami language of Norway, Sweden and Finland, determined 180 words directly related to snow and ice as well as up to 1000 different words for reindeer (Magga 2006). The high number of words related to either ice, snow, or reindeer is directly related to the cultural importance of these elements to the Sami. Van Eijk (1987) and Matthewson et al. (2005) both provide examples of language and vocabulary for the St’át’imc peoples of the Mid-Fraser canyon. These linguistic examples can highlight elements and aspects of cultural importance that we can apply directly to our archaeological research. The Salish language has various words used to access and explain different kinds of traditional sharing (Van Eijk 1987). Some of these include inter- and intra-household sharing with the infirm, sharing of special food during mourning or celebration, sharing of non-procured subsistence resources such as productive berry patches, sharing of knowledge, secretive sharing of sneakled or taboo items for establishing bonds, and non-celebratory meal sharing with kin (Matthewson et al. 2005). Sharing of food resources is a natural occurrence in a household, but sharing can take place at different rates and is expressed differently based on the type of sharing. It is well understood that sharing of goods and work is critical for survival and success of new generations (Sear and Mace 2008). Recent research suggests that this kind of investment may be even more critical during periods where food resources are costly (Smaldino et al. 2013a, 2013b).

Given the close proximity in time between the last occupation of Housepit 54 and Teit’s ethnographic research, we have the rare opportunity to make direct links between the archaeology of this household and the broad range of ethnographic information and cultural memories with confidence. Prior to globalization, industrialization, and assimilation, culture and
cultural traditions changed at a much slower rate (McIntosh 2005). Thus, traditions and beliefs could persist and be experienced as largely unchanging over many generations (Shils 1981). It is through the use of this information that we can begin to provide a micro-scale understanding that extends beyond regional and generic interpretations.

Combining multiple sources of knowledge can significantly enhance interpretive frameworks in archaeology. For example, Binford (1978) created a utility index for faunal resources (subsistence animals), to rank faunal remains based on the total fat and protein content by species and element. This utility index has been applied in a wide range of archaeological interpretations. While this index proves useful for a generic cross-cultural explanation, it is generally accepted that some species and elements are traditionally viewed as more valuable and desirable, independent of caloric yield, based on cultural preferences (e.g. fish heads have a greater traditional value than western scientific utility ranking would allocate). In addition, there are cultural allocations of the “proper” foods for persons based on gender, age, and situation, such as menses, puberty, pregnancy, and childbirth, all bearing significant impacts on the use, storage, and disposal of these items of sustenance.

Cultural allocations are not limited to faunal remains, but extended to botanical remains, stone tools, raw materials, historic artifacts, and other items recovered or identified during archaeological excavations. Holistic interpretation may also depend on developing an understanding of spatial allocations for activity zones such as kitchens and sleeping areas allowing for identification of shared/public space and private/familial spaces within the home and how these all work in reference with each other.

Like most data collected during archaeological research, databases were created to accommodate organization and structure based on the provenience of each item. Each individual
tool, bone (fragment or complete), debitage, botanical sample, and historic artifact was analyzed and coded for traditional archaeo-scientific qualities and with traditional indigenous coding being added in order to enhance the existing analysis.

*Spatial Analysis*

An in-depth spatial analysis of Housepit 54 was undertaken utilizing the accumulation of artifacts, eco-facts, features, and botanical sampling recovered during 2012 field excavations at Housepit 54. ArcMap was utilized to create a spatial model of both roof and floor of the Fur-Trade era occupation, the final occupation of the house. The final results provide an interactive spatial reconstruction with which queries can be made based on any number of characteristics to better understand the household spatial organization and the dispersal of artifacts, both primary and secondary, and *de facto*, and features (e.g. Schiffer 1972).

In addition to standard western laboratory analysis conducted on lithics, fauna, botanical, fire-cracked rock (FCR), and historical remains, additional attributes utilizing the ethnographic record provided by James Teit (1900, 1906, 1909), ethno-archaeology work from the Mid-Fraser Region of B.C. (Laforet 1981), linguistic analysis (Van Eijk 1987; Matthewson et al. 2005), and with special consideration paid to Xwisten Band Members, the descendant community, sharing their insights and beliefs. All cultural and ideological aspects were applied for a wider array of coding and artifact characteristics and it is important to note that cultural categories are not mutually exclusive.

*Faunal*

Faunal remains incurred additional coding based on utility of element and utility of species all to a degree of high, medium, and low. In order to determine these classifications
Binford’s (1978; Madrigal and Holt 2002) utility indices were utilized and then supplemented by traditional cultural preferences (Teit 1900, 1906, 1909). In addition categories of age and gender were considered based on cultural taboos outlined in the ethnographic data (Teit 1900, 1906, 1909) although they proved to be inapplicable based on the faunal remains recovered. Xwisten band members and community supplemented this based on cultural memories, familial stories, and beliefs (Jack 2013; Williams 2012).

Lithics

In addition to standard categories of coding used in analysis, tools were coded by locality of material: local, non-local, and unknown (Rousseau 2000). The utility of material was coded for high, medium, and low categories based on a combination of both knapping quality and cultural preference. For example, slate would be ranked as a low utility due to the difficult nature of knapping it but received a high ranking based on the strong tool tradition of ground and chipped slate technology incorporated and culturally preferred at the Bridge River site (Prentiss et al. 2015). Categories were created for gender, utilizing both archaeological and ethnographic evidence (Gero 1991, Teit 1906), as well as probable curation: expedient and formal/curated (Andrefsky 2005). Debitage were subjected to additional coding for locality and utility based on the same criteria utilized for tools. While age can be difficult to identify in the archaeological record we understand that the learning process is part of becoming enculturated. Flint knapping is a learned behavior and is often learned though practicing on recycled material (Yu 2013). Consequently as a learning process, projectile points can be identified as practice, or learning points by the following criteria: 1) lack of symmetry; 2) lack of thinning; 3) raw material such as recycled or re-used materials, and FCR or other raw materials not typical of knapping and 4) irregular or unusable tools roughly created (Janny 2010).
**Botanicals**

Botanical results are coded for various categories based on the ethno-botanical record (Teit 1973; Turner 2010). Using both of these sources, but relying most heavily on Teit (1973) each identified botanical item was sourced for a variety of cultural traditions as depicted by genera and species, and then identified for a number of potential uses including: medicinal, food, mythology, drink, smoking, scents, dyes, special beliefs, life stage, gender, and manufacture purposes, none of which are mutually exclusive.

**GIS**

Each data set was entered into excel spreadsheet by specific x, y, and z coordinates, corresponding to the grid imposed on the site. Lithics, fauna, and historical artifacts were entered as one line per artifact, with the corresponding codes attached to the line item. Both lithic and fauna have a second databases with total counts per line by quad, unit, and point plot when available. FCR was entered by unit, quad, and point plot when available with a total count per line; botanicals were entered in the same manner. Each of these databases created its own layer in ArcMap. A base layer grid, referred to as a fishnet, was created in ArcMap representing the site grid, while an additional layer for the house floor was created, identifying non-negotiable features such as hearths, midden, cache pits, and post holes.

GIS is most commonly implemented on a macro-level looking at patterns over a landscape and was developed for disciplines such as geography. This research stretches the boundaries of GIS by applying it on a micro-level to the household. By recreating of Housepit 54 as a GIS model, I was able to eliminate the grid system, units, and quads used for control of excavation in the field. The removal of the grid allows for the observer to see the house as an
actual home rather than through archaeological controls imposed by the requirements of excavation. After creating a visual reconstruction, queries can be made on any number of levels utilizing the coding systems established for each artifact and ecofact. Standard archaeological (“Western”) units of analysis are options in this system but it is also possible to make these queries based on classifications informed by cultural concepts and beliefs, or any combination of the two. A visual reconstruction allows for us to truly see relationships the way they could have existed in contrast to viewing the data in tables. This reconstruction allows for an interactive and user friendly modeling system that can be implemented to address a wide range of questions and interests proposed by descendant communities, professionals, and the general public.

Discussion

The goal of this chapter is to move beyond the results presented in previous chapters. HP54 is uniquely understood as the longest “lived” household in the Bridge River Village and presumably the latest dating pithouse occupation at the Bridge River site extending into ca. 1850’s. We understand through previous interpretations that household and village population fluctuation is commonly dictated by ecology and food resources with an emphasis, in this case, on salmon and med/large game such as deer (Cowgill 1975; Hayden 1992; Kew 1992; Prentiss et al. 2011; Prentiss and Kuijt 2012).

While often proving difficult to see, household growth can be influenced by various factors but it is, at minimum, partially maintained through reproduction and childrearing. Children are not always desired and ethnographic accounts provide various options for controls over reproduction such as abortion, baby-gifting, adoption, and infanticide and surrogacy contribute to household population (Joyce 2008; Lee 1979; Malinowski 1927; Ragone 2008; Teit 1900, 1906, 1909). When a child is desired the infant is incorporated into the household
whereupon it/they become a source of pride, delight, and an indication of hope for the future (e.g. Smaldino et al. 2013a, 2013b). In contrast the loss of a child can result in a loss for not only an individual but a loss experienced by the entire household.

Pregnancy, birthing, and raising children require a certain level of investment from the household including the sharing in the domestic work and production of goods in order to offset lost production by the mother and potentially the father; the raising of children, and the sharing of resources to ensure the viability of pregnancy and birth and in turn, the household. This sharing of resources could also serve as an incentive for reproduction throughout times of perceived duress as a method of ensuring the amount, and the quality, of food resources that are preferred, desired, and eventually required for the success of the household, family, and/or individual.

Archaeology had begun, over the last decade, to actively pursue the visibility of women in the ancient past (Conkey 1997; di Leonardo 1991; Galloway 1997; Gero 1991; Joyce 1996) yet, just as we understand the presence of women in past societies we must acknowledge the presence of children, who may represent up to 50% of the population in precolonial societies (Chamberlain 1997; Domasnes 2008). Within this one floor of HP 54 we can seek an understanding of household population, demography, and the activities that inform us about social investments, the division and allocation of space, and sharing during the period of this late dating occupation. In my analysis of this indigenous home, through somewhat of a “side window,” I explore the archaeological visibility of a host of household relationships encountered and expressed on a daily basis, illuminating experience by a variety of age and gender categories. By virtue of new approaches to data collection and analysis I hope to provide the groundwork for recognizing processes that have not always been readily available to archaeologists.
Analysis and Results

Computer generated reconstruction of the Fur Trade roof using the distribution of artifacts, and eastern wall profiles confirms the likelihood that both roof and side entrances were established during this occupation. This architectural attribute is significant for understanding who the occupants of this home were. While we are confident that roof entrances were a standard for pithouses in this region there is not enough data to determine the predictability of side entrances. Ethnographic and ethno-archaeological accounts indicate that side entrances were used for the accommodation of the elderly, women, and children into the home (Laforet 1981; Teit 1906). Traditional use of the side entrance begins to offer us a view of the occupants of the home and establishes a baseline household demography that includes a range of ages and genders and the social roles and interactions that they incorporate.

Rather than considering the household as an internal, protected structure I will consider the living space to be both internal and external with the roof and immediate surrounding area acting as an extension of the internal spaces within the confines of the structure. The landscape is a culturally created phenomenon that is created and recreated throughout time and reflects distinctly gendered aspects of understanding (Potter 2004; Sikkink and Choque M. 1999). Gendered studies of households have shown a delineation of male and female space depicted by the external/landscape and the internal/household respectively (Chesson 2013; Gero 1991; Kuokkanen 2009). Men, tending to project themselves outward onto the landscape associating their space with the visual landscape and all it possesses. In turn, women tend to project themselves inward to the internal structure and the act of “home-making” (Chesson 2013; Kuokkanen 2009). Projectile points associated with the Fur Trade occupation were predominantly represented on the roof at 92% while the remaining 8% located within the floor
of the home; 91% of the latter were classified as children’s or practice points. At HP 54 we can see this expressed in the tool distribution based on gendered tool designations (Gero 1991). The external living space has an over-representation of male tools (projectile points) while the internal household structure has an overrepresentation of women’s tools (Figure 3.1).

Artifact and ecofact deposition on the roof, an extension of household space, as discussed in Chapter 10 (this volume), has a distinct faunal discard zone on the northeast section of the roof while the southern and the southwestern portion are interpreted as a tool production area. However, activities taking place on the roof were more complex than simply removing trash and making tools. The southwestern portion of the roof, receiving the greatest amount of sunlight and warmth throughout the year but most importantly in the cooler seasons, included also multiple pipe fragments. Well away from the eastern side entrance but within close proximity to the roof entrance, you can imagine men sitting amongst each other smoking, resharpening tools and putting tool kits in order for future hunting expeditions all while being within easy earshot of the interior spaces of the home and exchanging experiences and knowledge with one another.

The northern section of the roof, a cool area with frequent discarded items, revealed not only FCR and food remains, but also a single adult tooth wrapped neatly in a birch bark package representing an investment in the personal care and disposal; ritual behavior. These small outliers, often not quantitatively significant, serve to remind us of the cultural traditions practiced by the individuals residing in HP54.

Ethnobotanical evidence within the house provide a base-map for gendered and age spaces and various activities by understanding and applying traditional values represented by these remains including medicinal activities, smoking areas, and areas with high likelihood of use by children and adolescents (Figure 3.2) (Teit 1973; Turner 2010). Alone, this evidence
offers provocative results. When combined with evidence from lithics, faunal remains, and the natural environment, such as the angle of the winter sun, we are able to glimpse the people within the home not only cooking, making tools, but interacting with and living amongst one another.

The organization of the house shows a strong communal pattern with a focus on a central hearth area, a single large midden in the southwest section, and three cache pits located along the southern perimeter of the home. Just as relevant to these features is the roof entrance and the natural light and warmth it allows to permeate. Despite these houses likely being occupied year round, it was during the winter that these housepits were at their highest populations with winter activities centered in and around the home. The angle of the winter sun would not only allow for warmth and light but would also create a delineable space on the floor, just north of the central hearth, set apart from the kitchen and cooking areas, this space attracted a range of activities and individuals. Two pipes were recovered here as well as a predominance of women’s and children’s tools (Figure 3.3), up to 60% of the children’s tools being located in this area. Faunal remains show the majority of low utility species confined to this area, which are also represented by low element utility (Figure 3.4). The combination of factors suggests a shared public area where leisurely, or less intense, activities, socializing, or perhaps finding retreat would occur.

The southern area of the home contains the large midden, the three cache pits and a strong botanical signature for a range of multigenerational activities from smoking and medicine to children’s play (Figure 3.2). The southeastern section contains the side entrance access offering limited morning sunlight illuminating at least a portion of the entrance. This eastern portion appears to represent a hide production area. Although the hide production area is deeply
gendered towards women it is the southwest area that offers a glimpse into the deeper complexities of life.

Described as a kitchen area due to the storage areas and large midden, this area provides a most diverse range of artifacts and some of the least common as well, from scrapers, piercers, and knives to stone beads and a single ornamental item. It is in this area that 30\% of children’s, tools are located (60\% located in the north-central area) tucked among the southern edge along the perimeter of the home and one in the midden. It is amongst these that spindle whorls, tools for spinning presumably dog or mountain goat hair into yarn for weaving or sewing, were located, an activity confined to this area alone.

Within the midden, a steatite figurine was located amongst discarded fauna, lithic tools and debitage, and FCR. This carefully carved and finished figurine represented an infant female child (Williams 2012; Stryd 1976), with a descended belly, small bent arms and legs, a belly button, vagina, and closed eyes (Figure 2.1). Identified by band members and elders as a mourning figurine, a female infant child that had passed, it further confirms the identification not only of women and children but suggests a complicated process associated with pregnancy, birth, loss, mourning, and finally closure. A mother sitting among other women and children in the dark and cool corner of the home, while regular activities such as spinning and weaving take place around her, children playing, helping, learning as they salvage materials from the refuse of the midden (Yu 2013) publicly mourning her loss, a loss for the entire family. Another possible scenario would be her returning from her own mourning seclusion amongst northern corners of the house, finding closure in the discard of her infant figurine and integrating herself back into the buzzing activities amongst a multigenerational women’s work space.
Having established the likelihood of shared or public spaces of this home as the exterior roof, southern and north-central areas of the home it leaves an opportunity to postulate about the private spaces within the home that accommodate personal activities such as rest, sleep, or other quiet or simply privacy. Laforet (1981) has describes the Mid-Fraser pithouses as having “corners”, these corners representing rooms, or designated areas in which a nuclear family, or smaller familial unit, may retreat. In HP54, the northeast and northwest corners offer the potential space for these personal spaces. With a lower accumulation of artifacts and ecofacts and no features, raised sleeping benches may have lined each of these corners. In the northwest corner the lithic tool representation includes those that could be classified as personal tools for textile or craft production: a multi-tool piercer/knife, a drill, and a single scraper. The northeast corner contains a knife, hammerstone, scraper, and a piece of incised slate. The distribution of fauna in these corners is much lower as well. Ethnobotanical data are much lower in quantity and samples are equally less diverse in their representation of traditional uses: medicine, food, and mythology being most represented, if at all. By defining these spaces we can identify a full range of not only activities, but the participants of this traditional indigenous household.

Conclusion

The collaborative nature of the Bridge River Archaeological Project with the local descendant community allows us to take a holistic view of HP54, one that incorporates traditional cultural beliefs and categories for the accumulation of data. In addition, it allows for incorporating the greater landscape and environment, and recreating the home using visual modeling. Drawing upon these perspectives I provide an opportunity for archaeologists to look deeper into the past and apply a methodology that incorporates the who, allowing for a greater visibility into the people whom we know to have existed but often struggle to see. Applying
quantitative statistical methods to indigenous categories and cross-referencing them along with
the visual nature of the reconstruction maintains a scientific validation of the process that applies
indigenous perspective and beliefs.

As archaeologists it is ultimately the human experience of the past that we seek to understand. While our research often requires us to focus on particular elements of the past such as subsistence, ecology, lithic technology, and social organization, utilizing these significant works in combination with one another and expanding them to include traditional belief systems and indigenous categories of reference ultimately aids us in this humanistic endeavor.

It is not only gaining an understanding the human experience of the past that is essential to our discipline, but also disseminating this knowledge to both professional and public communities alike, with a great responsibility to descendant communities. As the extensive collaborative nature with the Bridge River community has displayed, providing access to an understanding of the past that is meaningful and relevant to all communities strengthens our research as well as our interactions with this broader audience.
Figure 3.1 Household tool distribution by gender and age (Male, Female, and Child).
Figure 3.2. Ethnobotanical distribution by traditional cultural use.
Figure 3.3. Distribution of ethnobotanical remains by traditional cultural use and children’s tool distribution.
Figure 3.4. Distribution of faunal low utility species and element and distribution of children’s tools.
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CHAPTER 4

Indigenous feminist spatial analysis of Housepit 54 at 1220-1200 cal. BP
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Missoula, Mt  59812
kristen.barnett@umontana.edu

Introduction

Regional archaeologists have conducted spatial analyses of indigenous houses in the Mid-Fraser region of interior British Columbia over the last several decades (Hayden 1992, 1994, 1997, 2005; Lepofsky et al. 2009; Morin 2006, 2010; Prentiss et al. 2003; Prentiss et al. 2005; Prentiss et al. 2013; Prentiss and Kuijt 2012; Stryd 1973). Spatial analysis has informed us a great deal in regards to the organization of space based on human activity in Binfordian terms, for example: work zone, drop zone, toss zone, etc…(Binford 1978). Analyses at the Keatley Creek, Bell, and Bridge River Village sites have enriched our knowledge of architecture and design, and use of domestic space. The goal of this research is to move spatial analysis in another direction, one that allows a view of household based on interrelationships, personal and private spaces, communal spaces, and ultimately a view into a living household through an indigenous perspective.

Prior to presenting an indigenous framework I would like to address some issues of western bias that challenge discipline-wide interpretations and understandings of the past. Archaeology, at its inception, was a western endeavor (Johnson 2010; Trigger 2006). Initially established as a privileged white male undertaking, it has been used as a tool to objectify, colonize, and perpetuate discrimination amongst ethnic minorities as well as women (Johnson
2010; Trigger 2006). While we are part of an evolving discipline there are particular aspects of these foundations that are deeply embedded and consequently difficult to disengage from. For example, in the United States we are enculturated in a western framework of science, ideology, and political structure, all of which influence the way we approach and interpret the ancient past. In addition, aside from historical archaeological research, it is the Native peoples that occupied this land that American archaeologist’s study, people who did not live by these same pretenses by which we conduct research. Most archaeologists live modern, non-indigenous lives thus making it challenging to holistically understand the peoples and lifeway’s of the past without deconstructing these biases to gain better understanding.

Archaeological research and interpretation through an indigenous framework is rapidly expanding (Atalay 2012; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Lyons 2014; Silliman 2009; Vitelli 2011; Watkins 2010). Much of this work is framed within a community archaeology experience in cultural heritage management (CHM). While community archaeology collaborates with indigenous communities it does not privilege them in terms of partnership (Marshall 2002). Additional research has approached indigenous theory in terms of dialogue (Wobst 2010), as well as practice (Silliman 2009; Vitelli 2011), providing a new direction in archaeology over the past 10 years. Indigenous applications have been particularly prevalent in historical or post-colonial research (Atalay 2012; Marshall 2002). While the indigenous approach has offered a variety of contributions to our discipline, including community relationships and outreach, indigenous and otherwise, this perspective has yet to reach its full potential in pre-colonial research.

Indigenous theory has been criticized for placing undue power in the hands of native/indigenous peoples (McGhee 2008). The more relevant critique highlights the challenges
we face in connecting to the indigenous present to understand the ancient indigenous past using a direct historical approach. This last challenge, while reasonable, emphasizes some of the contemporary political challenges native peoples are confronted with to justify their connection to their ancestors and in turn their long term history, resulting in hesitancy for archaeologist to make this connection. This critique is substantiated by the way that pre-colonial archaeologists are often forced to rely, even cautiously, on the direct historic process in understanding the meaning of the ancient past using ethnographic monographs most often compiled and created by non-native western trained men, a process that has come under critique for obvious reasons. Despite this critique of direct historic application, it should not act as a barrier in consideration of whose input counts. Vitelli (2011, pg. 177) eloquently points out, “Native philosophies structured the human experience”, therefore without implementing a regionally appropriate Native philosophy and belief we limit our understanding of the ancient past to a western archaeological consideration of things, i.e. “material culture”, rather than the deeper, and attainable, understanding of the lives lived within these indigenous spaces.

I will begin this chapter with a brief theoretical introduction to both current indigenous and feminist thought in archaeology followed by a discussion of household space. I will provide an overview of Housepit 54 and review some of the previous regional household spatial analysis. I will then outline my methodological approach followed by an analysis and discussion.

Theory

As reflected in the title of this chapter, I rely specifically on a framework rooted in indigenous and feminist theories. Feminist theory, having been present in archaeological research throughout the past 20 years, can still bring with it misunderstanding. The goal of this feminist theory, as a scientific theory, is to seek to provide visibility for all participants active in
the creation of the archaeological record, thus not privileging the role of women or any other demographic. The value of feminist theory in archaeology is its challenge to the inherent androcentric bias of our discipline and in turn seeking opportunity to provide voice and visibility to all agents of the past regardless of sex, gender, age, class, or cultural affiliation (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 2008). Archaeology, as a relatively young discipline, has been rooted in the western perspectives of the men who developed it. It is these disciplinary foundations at its inception that forced archaeology, like other sciences, into an androcentric paradigm of research questions, methods, and interpretation.

Indigenous theory has often become considered to be synonymous with community archaeology that, like feminist and indigenous theory, is thought of as a critical approach. Although the concepts found within community archaeology have been strongly influenced by both indigenous and feminist approaches, it is quite different. The most pointed difference is that it seeks an inclusivity of all “shareholders” (Marshall 2002) including descendant populations, both indigenous and non-indigenous, local interested or affected communities (again both indigenous and non-indigenous), archaeologists, as well as any other governing agency since this is often an approach used in CHM.

Indigenous theory draws from locally specific indigenous/native peoples worldviews, interpretations, insights, and values creating a significant difference from community archaeology. In addition, as an archaeology that is critical of western/first world privilege, indigenous archaeology acts as a decolonization process, allowing for indigenous peoples to be incorporated as equals, guiding the process of research design, questions, process, interpretation, and publishing, to whatever extent desired, resulting in an archaeology that is with, by, and for indigenous peoples (Atalay 2012; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Marshall 2002; Spector 1993).
Indigenous/community archaeologies, due to their critical nature, work well in conjunction with other theoretical and methodological practices providing opportunities to further potential outcomes of our research due to the constant challenge and reflexivity required in their practice.

*Household Spatial Analysis*

Spatial analysis has been important in archaeology for decades with significant contributions coming from various regions around the world (Fredrikson 2007; Lopez Varela and Dore 2010; Schmid 2011; Souvatzi 2007). Binford’s (1978a) preeminent work with the Nunamiut fueled this line of research by defining “zones” within an area creating labeled spaces based on concepts of tool and food production and refuse removal. Binford’s contribution was substantial in using ethno-archaeological experiences to connect contemporary cultural practices to the past. Although this made a significant contribution to the practice of archaeology it was not without shortcomings such as the failure to include native peoples as equals in the archaeological process to move them beyond informant status. In addition, Binford’s belief in universality for human history undermines indigenous agency, thought, practice of tradition, and the individual customs beliefs and adaptations of distinct indigenous groups.

Spatial analyses of the household in historical archaeology has identified methods of looking at artifact assemblages over time as an identification of generational change and familial/cultural continuity within a single house over hundreds of years (Groover 2001). Though this research focuses on a western household in a postcolonial era it offers an opportunity to share methodology in order to replicate results in any household; including an indigenous pre-colonial household (Groover 2001). Household analyses in the northwest region of North America have sought out an understanding of household space grounded in identifying social inequality and ranking, demographic changes, communalism, architectural aspects, and cultural

Samuels (2006) household analysis at the Ozette household site transformed the way we see the “household” and the individuals in it, thus challenging archaeologists to seek greater insight into the lives lived within structures in terms of gender roles, etc. (Samuels 2006). The analysis at Ozette served as an impetus in northwest coast archaeology for archaeologist to seek out a greater range of identities. Although Samuels worked closely with the Makah, final interpretation of identities were based on western frames of reference and fall short fully incorporating indigenous lifeways in indigenous framework of both theory and method.

The research contained within this chapter seeks to build upon previous approaches by applying a critical framework in order to reconstruct questions regarding identity, beliefs, roles, interactions, and the meaning contained in them through an indigenous feminist lens. As previously stated, the indigenous lens works in combination with the feminist lens to challenge the inherent androcentric, first world bias inherent to western science. Collaboration with local descendant peoples in order to accommodate their ability reconstruct their own past in partnership with archeological research, consciously choosing to privilege indigenous worldviews, beliefs, traditions, and meanings over western concepts, establishes a unique avenue for producing this understanding.

Methods

For the purpose of this research I define the home as a living structure designed to house an individual, family, or multi-family group, identification of linkage through kinship or marriage being unimportant in this case. The physical parameters of the home include not only the interior of the structure, as is predominately the case in household analysis, but the exterior
space associated with the home. Although we have no roof data to associate with the floors analyzed in this research we understand, based on cultural tradition and regional data that these semi-subterranean houses of the region included roofs constructed of wooden beams, mats, and sod (Lepofsky et al. 2009; Teit 1900, 1906, 1909). This exterior space, the roof, was traditionally included and seen as an extension of living space associated with the semi-subterranean housepit structure by St’át’imc with no finite boundaries. Also included in the exterior household space was the heavens; moon, sun, stars, and sky and external elements that bore a tremendous influence on the lives of these ancestral peoples as it still does for their descendant populations (Frank 2015; Williams 2012).

Concepts of property ownership in both current and past indigenous cultures vary from that of our current western urban culture, a culture that sees linear physical boundaries assigned to the physical landscape. Although there is no single Indigenous view of landscape, it is often not perceived as in linear terms of westerners who view property lines as a solid and tangible boundary. Rather, the home extends beyond the door and out onto the landscape, a visual definition of home, however, the purpose of analysis I will still need to identity and utilize a boundary of space; therefore I will utilize the excavation boundary, recognizing the limitations it imposes, while organizing the elements of the greater landscape of environment that impact life in the household.

As previously discussed, household and spatial archaeologies have been used to understand family units, social networking, social inequality and ranking, demographic changes, communalism, architecture, and cultural identity, and decision making throughout the world (Coupland et al. 2009; Kroll and Price 1991; Lepofsky et al. 2009; Morin 2006, 2010; Samuels 2006; Springer and Lepofsky 2011; Stryd 1973; West 2010; Williams 2013). These have
become valuable tools in understanding the day-to-day activities as they pertain to larger political and social domains, among other things. This research is unique in the way that it implements indigenous perspectives, for the interpretation of this house requires drawing on a wide range of variables including language and linguistic analysis, oral tradition and accounts, ideological practices, ethnography, and the cultural preferences and practices incorporated in tradition. Using indigenous beliefs specific to the peoples of this region for understanding artifacts, informing methods, and implementing cultural categories as the units of analysis guides and informs interpretation, allowing for a constant awareness and caution in imposing western cultural standards onto an indigenous structure.

The contributions and collaboration at each stage of the Bridge River Archaeological project, from the development of research questions, excavation, interpretation, and ongoing consulting along with the continual generous invitation to partner with them provides the very foundation of this paper. Ethnographic information is developed through contemporary “living” traditions as passed down from generations via oral tradition and practice, songs, art, and dance. The Upper Lilooet Indians, or today’s St’át’imc, live on in a thriving community comprised of the descendant populations, some located on the Xwisten, or Bridge River Reserve.

Archaeological research in the Mid-Fraser Canyon has benefitted from a substantial ethnographic literature largely resulting from the work of James Teit (1900, 1906, 1909, 1973). It is the late occupation of Housepit 54, dating into the 1850’s, that allowed for an initial direct application of the ethnographic record with the approval of the First Nations. Teit arrived in the region in the late 19th Century and worked at a trading post later marrying Susannah ‘Lucy’ Artko, a Thompson Indian woman born in 1866, and member of the local Native community. It was after Teit’s marriage to Lucy that he was hired by a desperate Franz Boas, as an
ethnographer. While rarely credited, the participation and insight of Lucy bore significance on these documents. Her influence resulted in a non-typical emphasis for that era in ethnographic research on women’s culture and their portrayal as “strong, independent, and fully-participating members of their communities” (Wickwire 2005).

Teit and Lucy’s ethnographies cover aspects of subsistence, religion, household, manufacturing of tools and clothing, travel and trade, warfare, games, sign language, festivals, customs, migration, intermarriage, relations with other bands and “tribes”, social organization, medicine, life-stages including birth, puberty, pregnancy, marriage, and death, and art (Teit 1900, 1906, 1909). As the author of record, Teit offers observations on aspects of ethnobotany including traditions, medicinal, smoking, cleansing, ritual, magic, and traditional beliefs and uses of native plants and berries as well as the seasons and conditions best for location and use (Teit 1973). These monographs offer insight to a wide range of practices and interactions that center around the household as Teit and his wife ‘Lucy’ prepared these ethnographic descriptions during a time when pithouses were still in use, bearing a significant relationship to these pre-colonial floor occupations at Housepit 54 (Prentiss et al. 2014). The significance of this timing is that if, as tradition would dictate, Lucy’s understanding and beliefs were instilled in her by one, if not two, generations of elders before her who enculturated her as a small child, her knowledge reflects the traditions maintained by the occupations of these homes (Wickwire 2005).

The last lived floor in Housepit 54, was occupied during the Fur Trade Era, ca. 1850’s (Prentiss et al. 2013). A household spatial analysis of the late dating floor was conducted using the same theoretical and methodological approaches used here, as outlined in Chapter 3. As previously pointed out, this close proximity in time between the last occupation of Housepit 54 and Teit and Lucy’s ethnographic accounts offers the opportunity to substantiate links between
the archaeology of this household and the broad range of ethnographic information and cultural memories with a rare confidence. Authority for the implementation is placed in the descendant community, working closely in person, through e-mails, texts, and phone calls, to establish the accuracy of ethnographic monographs collected in the early 20th century.

With the establishment of the extensive life of Housepit 54 it becomes essential to this research to recognize that prior to globalization, industrialization, and assimilation, culture and cultural traditions generally changed at a much slower rate, barring a catastrophic event (McIntosh 2005). Thus, traditions and beliefs could persist and be experienced as largely unchanging over many generations, a generation in this sense being an established group of peoples representing a single step in the line of descent from one ancestor to another (Shils 1981). Tilley (1999:31) reminds us that although the spoken word of past rituals may be lost to us, the archaeological record shows patterns of persistent material forms of symbolic expression that can be interpreted in the terms of one of more past cultural traditions and their associated meaning systems (Tilley 1999; Turner 1973). With the baseline for indigenous household understanding at Housepit 54 having been established during the Fur Trade era, I use this to seek out older past cultural traditions, testing for cultural continuity and/or change as we step back in time several generations in this long-lived house.

Additional affirmation to the use of this baseline, informed by the St’át’imc community and the ethnographic record, is provided by the radiocarbon (\(^{14}\text{C}\)) dating results of the floor sequence from the excavations of this house (Figure 4.1). Cultural memories, as well as the ethnographic record, recognize that the construction of new floors was a generational occurrence (Teit 1900). The \(^{14}\text{C}\) results received from the ancient floors of Housepit 54 support that this
tradition has undeniably persisted for multiple generations, from an estimated 1400-1200 cal. B.P.

Figure 4.1. Calibrated dating sequence of housepit 54 floors. Floor designation (ex. IIa) are located on the left (graphics by Thomas Foor).

In addition to the use of dating techniques for the identification of continuity or shift other resources include linguistic data. Although language changes throughout time, it offers us insight into cultural values, beliefs, and ideology. For example, a linguistic study of the Sami language of Norway, Sweden and Finland, determined 180 words directly related to snow and ice as well as up to 1000 different words for reindeer (Magga 2006). The high number of words related to either ice, snow, or reindeer can be directly related to the cultural importance of these elements to the Sami. Van Eijk (1987) and Matthewson et al. (2005) both provide examples of language and vocabulary for the St’át’imc peoples of the Mid-Fraser canyon. These linguistic examples can highlight elements and aspects of cultural importance that we can apply directly to our archaeological research. The Salish language has various words used to access and explain
different kinds of traditional sharing (Van Eijk 1987). Some of these include inter- and intra-household sharing with the infirm, sharing of special food during mourning or celebration, sharing of non-procured subsistence resources such as productive berry patches, sharing of knowledge, secretive sharing of sneaked or taboo items for establishing bonds, and non-celebratory meal sharing with kin (Matthewson et al. 2005). Sharing of food resources is a natural occurrence in a household, but sharing can take place at different rates and is expressed differently based on the type of sharing. It is well understood that sharing of goods and work is critical for survival and success of new generations (Sear and Mace 2008). Recent research suggests that this kind of investment may be even more critical during periods where food resources are costly (Smaldino et al. 2013a, 2013b).

Combining multiple sources of knowledge can significantly enhance interpretive frameworks in archaeology. For example, Binford (1978) created a utility index for faunal resources (subsistence animals), to rank faunal remains based on the total fat and protein content by species and element. This utility index has been applied in a wide range of archaeological interpretations. While this index proves useful for a generic explanation based on fat and protein content, it is generally accepted that cultural traditions dictate some species and elements are more valuable and desirable, independent of caloric yield, based on cultural preferences such as taste or ideological beliefs (e.g. fish heads have a greater traditional value than western scientific utility ranking would allocate) (Jack 2012). In addition, there are cultural allocations of the “proper” foods for persons based on gender, age, and situation, such as menses, puberty, pregnancy, and childbirth, or times of starvation, all bearing significant impacts on the use, storage, and disposal of these items.
Cultural allocations are not limited to faunal remains, but extended to stone tools, raw materials, and other items recovered or identified during archaeological excavations. Holistic interpretation may also depend on developing an understanding of spatial allocations for activity zones such as kitchens and sleeping areas allowing for identification of shared/public space and private/familial spaces within the home and how these work in reference with each other.

Once the data was accumulated, databases were created to accommodate the organization and structure of all artifacts and ecofacts collected during field excavations based on the provenience of each item. Each individual tool, bone (fragment or complete), and piece of debitage was analyzed and coded for traditional archaeo-scientific categories and then supplemented by coding for traditional indigenous meaning and interpretative in order to enhance the existing analysis.

Spatial Analysis

An in-depth spatial analysis of Housepit 54 was undertaken utilizing the accumulation of artifacts, eco-facts, and features excavated at Housepit 54 during the 2012, 2013, and 2014 field seasons. ArcMap 10.1 was utilized to create a spatial model of two generational floors, IIb and IIA ca. 1220 and 1200 cal. B.P. respectively. The results provide an interactive spatial reconstruction with which queries can be made based on any characteristic to better understand the household spatial organization and the dispersal of artifacts, both primary and secondary, and defacto, and features (e.g. Schiffer 1972) for comparative analysis of the two floors spaced at an interval of approximately 25 years, or a generation apart.

In addition to standard western laboratory analysis conducted on lithics and fauna, additional attributes were applied utilizing the shared knowledge from the descendant community, the ethnographic record provided by James Teit and Lucy Antko/Artko (1900, 1906,
1909), ethno-archaeology work from the Mid-Fraser Region of B.C. (Laforet 1981), and linguistic analysis (Van Eijk 1987; Matthewson et al. 2005) all with special consideration paid to the shared knowledge of Xwisten Band Members. All cultural and ideological aspects were applied for a wider array of coding and artifact characteristics, none of which are mutually exclusive.

Faunal

Faunal remains incurred additional coding based on utility of element and utility of species: high, medium, and low. In order to determine these classifications Binford’s (1979; Madrigal and Holt 2002; Williams 2013) utility indices were utilized and then supplemented by traditional cultural preferences (Teit 1900, 1906, 1909). In addition, categories of age and gender were considered based on cultural taboos outlined in the ethnographic data (Teit 1900, 1906, 1909) although they were not applicable to the fauna remains recovered. Xwisten band members and community supplemented this based on cultural memories, familial stories, and beliefs (Williams 2012; Jack 2012).

Lithics

In addition to standard categories of coding used in analysis, tools were coded by locality of the source material: local, non-local, and unknown (Rousseau 2000). The utility of material was coded for high, medium, and low categories based on a combination of both knapping ease and cultural preference (Prentiss et al. 2010). For example, slate would be ranked as a low utility due to the difficult nature of knapping it but received a high ranking based on the strong tool tradition of ground and chipped slate technology incorporated and culturally preferred at the Bridge River site (Prentiss et al. 2015). Categories were created for gender of the tool user, utilizing both archaeological and ethnographic evidence (Gero 1991; Teit 1906), as well as
probable curation: expedient and formal/curated (Andrefsky 2005). Debitage were subjected to additional coding for locality and utility based on the same criteria utilized for tools. While age can be difficult to identify in the archaeological record we understand that the learning process is part of becoming enculturated. Flint knapping is a learned behavior and is often learned through practicing on recycled material (Yu 2013). Consequently as a learning process, projectile points can be identified as practice, or learning points by the following criteria: 1) lack of symmetry; 2) lack of thinning; 3) raw material such as recycled or re-used materials, FCR or other raw materials not typical of knapping and 4) irregular or unusable tools roughly created (Janny 2010).

GIS

Each data set was entered into Excel spreadsheet by specific x, y, and z coordinates, corresponding to the grid imposed on the site. Two separate databases for lithics, fauna, anddebitage were created: one entered as one line per artifact, with the corresponding codes attached to the line item and another with total counts per line by quad, unit, and point plot when available. Each of these databases created its own layer in ArcMap. A base layer grid, referred to as a fishnet, was created in ArcMap representing the site grid, while an additional layer for the house floor was created, identifying features such as hearths, cache pits, and post holes.

GIS is most commonly implemented on a macro-level looking at patterns over a landscape and was developed for disciplines such as geography. This research stretches the boundaries of GIS by applying it on a micro-level to the household. By recreating of Housepit 54 as a GIS model, I was able to eliminate the grid system, units, and quads used for control of excavation in the field. The removal of the grid allows for the observer to see the house as an home rather than through archaeological controls imposed by the requirements of excavation.
After creating a visual reconstruction, queries can be made on any number of levels utilizing the coding systems established for each artifact and ecofact. Standard archaeological (Western) units of analysis are options in this system but it is also possible to make these queries based on classifications informed by cultural concepts and beliefs, or any combination of the two. A visual reconstruction allows for us to truly see relationships the way they could have existed in contrast to viewing the data in tables. This reconstruction allows for an interactive and user friendly modeling system that can be implemented to address a wide range of questions and interests proposed by descendant communities, professionals, and the general public (Barnett 2014).

Analysis

Layout

The following analyses will focus on floor IIb and IIa dating to 1220-1200 cal. B.P. The layout of the floors offer initial insights into house size and organization (Figures 4. 2 and 4.3) of space based on the layout of hearths, postholes, and site furniture such as a large grinding stone situated in the southeast portion of the house.
Figure 4.2. IIb, ca. 1220 cal. B.P., floor layout.

Figure 4.3. IIa, ca. 1200 cal. B.P., floor layout.
During the IIb occupation hearths are located in all four sectors of the house suggesting private heath-based activities rather than a central communal hearth found during the Fur Trade era. The southwest and northeast hearths are spatially associated with the in-ground cache pits while the southeast and northwest hearths are associated with grinding stones and a wooden bench supported by small post in the northwest. The two grinding stones in both the southeast and northwest areas indicate processing, or kitchen type activities associated with hearths with a series of small postholes in the northwest area of IIb indicating a wooden bench, used for sleeping and the underside of the bench used for storage as indicated by the smaller grinding stone located behind the post holes (Figure 4.2).

Just one generation later, on the IIa floor, a shift from underground cache pits to above ground storage occurs, items likely being stored in wooden boxes, hanging from roof beams, or in external cache pits or structures. While hearths remain in the northwest, southwest and southeast areas of the house the southeast contains numerous small hearths still associated with the large grinding stone from the previous generation, and a lack of hearth(s) in the northeast area of the house (Figure 4.3). The spatial organizations of these features suggest a shift within the house, one that with the addition of artifact queries we can begin to see on a micro-scale.

Age and Gender

Tool categories structured by age and gender, as described in the methods section, can provide insight into household demography and designation of space. The IIb floor has a strong representation of both male and female designated tools/activities as well as the presence of children with the exception of the area associated with the southeast hearth (Figure 4.4). Furthermore, we can identify a strongly gendered space with each area of the house showing
women’s and men’s areas having a stronger association with hearths next to cache pits in the southwest and northeast areas of the house.

Comparison with the IIa floor shows an increase in the number of tools. The gender representation heavily favors female tools/activities, most specifically in the southeast hearth area where the number of hearths increased to four from one and the number of female tool increased at nearly the same proportion (Figure 4.5). In addition to the increase in tools and female representation, the representations of children decrease and are located only in the northwest and southwest areas of the house.

![Figure 4.4. IIb tools by age and gender.](image-url)
Expedient and Formal Tools

The distribution of tools categorized by expedient versus formal in IIb shows a fairly equal distribution of both categories throughout the house (Figure 4.6). The IIa floor shows a variable distribution in these classes. In the northwest hearth area there is an increase in formal tools nearer the hearth with some expedient tools outlying at a distance (Figure 4.7). Additionally there is an increase in formal tools in the southwest corner while the northeast hearth area maintains a fairly equal ratio despite the increase in tools overall. In the southeast corner we see the greatest degree of change represented by a significant increase in the total number but also a shift, from formal to a greater representation of expedient tools.
Figure 4.6. IIb Tools by curation.

Figure 4.7. Ila tools by curation.
Tools by Activity Type

Pipes exist in both IIb and IIa floors although they are located only in the northeast area of the house.

Sewing tools, represented by drills and piercers are represented during the IIb occupation near all four hearths although there as twice as many associated with the eastern than western half of the house. During the IIa occupation there is an absence of sewing tools in the southwest hearth area although in the northwest and southeast hearth areas there is a consistency in their presence on both floors, IIa and IIb. In the northeast area of IIa, where there is an absence of a hearth(s), sewing tools occur at twice the density of the other areas.

Cooking and processing tools: manos, metates, bowls and mortars are absent on the IIb floor and appear in IIa: manos in both northeast and southeast areas, a single bowl in the southwest, and a mortar northwest.

In addition, there is a lack of ornamental objects represented in the IIb floor while there are two in southeast corner and one in each of the northwest and southwest areas of the IIa floor.

Faunal Distributions

Overall faunal distribution on the IIb floor shows a great accumulation of faunal remains in the northwest and northeast hearth areas, greater than 1000 NISP (number of individual specimens), while reflecting a significantly reduced accumulation in the southwest corner in association with the cache pits, less than 70 specimens. The southeast hearth area has a significantly reduced amount, less than 100 specimens. The generational shift to the IIa floor shows a significant reduction in faunal remains throughout the entire floor although the most significant reduction is in the northwest portion, from greater than 1000 specimens in IIb to less
than 300 specimens in IIa, the exception being the southeast portion of the IIa house where the representation stays consistent with the IIb floor. On both floors, fish is dominant followed by ungulates with the exception of the southwest hearth on the IIa floor where ungulates outnumber fish but are few in number. The northeast and southwest portions of the house also contain bird and dog remains during the IIb floor. While the northeast stays consistent with both bird and dog in the IIa floor, birds are restricted to this area. The northwest hearth area also has dog remains present.

*Fauna Distribution by Utility of Element*

Faunal remains by the utility of element, as described in the methods section, are dominated by medium utility throughout the IIb floor followed by low utility. High utility elements occur in the southwest, northwest and northeast but have a greater representation in the northeast (Figure 4.8). During the IIa occupation there is a significant increase in high element utility throughout the whole house and an increase in low utility elements as well. The northeast portion of the house shows this increase but also maintains the greatest numbers of medium utility elements (Figure 4.9).
Figure 4.8. Ilb fauna by utility of element.

Figure 4.9. Ila fauna by utility of element.
Debitage

Distributions of debitage based on the locality of raw material are dominated on both IIb and IIa by local raw materials. Shifts in the representation of non-local raw material from floor Ib to IIa include a decrease in non-local material in both the northwest and southwest hearth areas and an increase in the northeast and southeast areas in the IIa floor. Distribution based on the raw material utility illustrates a greater frequency of medium raw material utility throughout both IIb and IIa floors. On the IIb floor the northeast hearth area displays a greater proportion of low utility materials than the rest of the house. The distribution of high utility material is fairly equal throughout the northeast, northwest, and southwest areas of the house but appear less prevalent in the southeast although on the IIa floor there is a noticeable increase in high utility material in the southeast hearth(s) area.

Debitage by Size

The overall distribution of debitage during the IIb occupation shows a greater accumulation near the northwest and northeast hearths with the greatest accumulations being in the northeast (Figure 4.10). Throughout the house, most of the debitage falls into the extra small, or small size categories with medium debitage represented in a smaller proportion throughout the house. It is only in the southwest hearth area of the house where large size debitage was identified. On the IIa floor the total amount of debitage in the northwest corner is reduced while it remains consistent in both the southeast and southwest hearth areas (Figure 4.11). The northeast portion of the house still has the highest accumulation of debitage although the variability in size is consistent with both the southeast and northwest hearth areas exhibiting mostly extra small and small sizes, then medium and finally large debitage being present in all
areas of the house to a lesser degree, with the exception of being non-existent in the southwest hearth area.

Figure 4.10. IIb debitage distribution by size.
Discussion

Although the IIb and IIa floors offer a comparison of just two generations, both during the Bridge River 3 period, we can identify both continuity and shifts in this house. The earlier IIb floor layout falls well within the descriptions and memories of a house with “corners” (Laforet 1981) for what is described in contemporary terms as nuclear families living within a larger household context. With four hearths total, each located in its own area, i.e. northeast, northwest, southwest and southeast, it supports this previous interpretation. However, consideration of the artifacts and their distribution throughout the house I believe we can identify a more nuanced understanding of the lives within this home. Close examination of the distribution of features and site furniture, such as grinding stones, illustrate that although we have four hearths, the northeast and southwest corners mirror each other, both with a hearth and a cache pit, while the northwest and southeast also mirror each other, each containing a hearth and grinding stone.
Small post holes suggesting small wooden benches could have provided sleeping areas in the northwest and possibly the southeast. During the earlier IIe occupation the house expanded to the east, doubling in size to that of the IIb and IIa house. This literal doubling in size offers an explanation for the mirrored layout of the house. The implications would be that the hearths represent smaller group/familial or private use areas for larger group/familial peoples, to split into smaller groups for more individualized or personal activities.

The analysis of the tools for the IIb floor supports this by suggesting the division of space is gendered. Signatures of women’s tools are located throughout the floor, supporting the cultural tradition that women’s spaces are more interior home based while men’s spaces project out onto the landscape. This does not mean that space is not shared within the home but men’s tool and activity signatures within the house do not exist to the same degree as women’s and are associated near the cache pits areas of the house. Sewing tools such as drills and piercers are associated with all four hearths, as are scrapers, again suggesting that activities undertaken on an individual basis occurred at each hearth.

The north end of the house shows a greater accumulation of faunal remains and a wider representation of tool/activity types, including the only pipes associated with this floor. Smoking of Kinnickinnick (Lyons et al. 2015) is a long established tradition that was not restricted by gender or ritual ceremony, but rather an activity that adults participated in regularly (Teit 1900, 1906, 1909). During the Fur Trade era occupation of Housepit 54 pipes were also restricted to the north end of the house (Barnett 2014). The north end of the house is the area that would receive the most natural light from the central roof entrance, and there appears to be a longstanding continuity in the use of this space, more than 1200 years, as a social gathering place within the house where individuals of various ages can come together for a wide range of
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activities or simply gathering to socialize with participants living within the house, village, or traveling through the area. Additional indicators of the north/northeast area being utilized as a gathering place for a wide range of activities include a higher density of faunal remains and debitage accumulation. The IIa floor reflects this traditional use of space.

The IIa floor does not make use of underground cache pits suggesting a shift towards above ground storage. In addition, the hearth in the northeast area of the house is apparently eliminated while in the southeast area the number of hearths increases to four, maintaining the large grinding stone from previous floors. It appears as though, throughout both floors that this house has different levels of both shared and divided spaces. The entire house likely participated in the shared space of the northeast area but also appears to have a division through the middle of the house along the north-south line with the eastern half and the western half each maintaining their own association. Beyond this division, it is further divided into four areas: northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest, to accommodate smaller units for private activities such as sleeping, etc. The shift in the organizational layout of the house in IIa further supports that the north-south connection of shared space.

Representations of gender and age in tool classes still favor women’s tools/activities, most heavily around the hearth areas consistent with the previous floor. Indications of children through tool classes are reduced by more than half, potentially illustrating a progression in life-stage, learning, and a changing of household demography through a generational timeframe; relatively short with consideration to the long use of this house.

Identification of activities by tool class shift heavily on this floor, while sewing activities are maintained throughout the house, there is a new representation of manos, mortars, and stone
bowls as well as ornamental objects. The arrival of these items could well represent an
introduction of new technology or conversely it could be possible that this technology is non-
disposable; meaning that the time invested and the household and personal importance of these
items may carry through over generations, the analysis of more floors will provide clarification.

The northeast corner of the house appears to be maintained as a social/shared space used
for a wide variety of activities and possible the center of household activities. In the older IIb
floor the north end of the house includes concentration of faunal remains; on the IIa floor the
concentration of faunal appears in the northwest corner along with the wide range of tool classes
mentioned previously including the only pipe associated with the floor, and the highest
occurrence of knives. Consequently, the northeast area of the house appears to serve as a hub of
activity, indicating socializing, sewing, smoking, and a wide range of shared activities potentially
including the butchering of game, presumably for disbursement to the private areas for smaller
social units within the house.

Conclusion

The analysis and discussion of the generation shift from 1220-1200 cal. B.P in Housepit
54 allow us to see both shifts in household strategies as well as the cultural continuity that
underlies the overall dynamics. The layout and location of hearths is slightly different between
the two floors and storage methods change as well. The social structure underlying these shifts is
remarkably consistent. The household space is continually organized through a gendered space
of activities and roles, with hearth areas being central to women’s space and activities. Individual
hearth spaces suggest that the larger household unit retreats into privately designated spaces for
cooking, sleeping and familial activities. Despite these smaller units, there is a clear area of
shared space for socializing, doing shared chores or activities, smoking (ritual or otherwise), and the butchering and division of resources presumably traveling from the north (IIb) or northeast (IIb and IIA) area of the house for distribution to the smaller social units associated with the hearth areas. About 800 years later, during the Fur Trade era, we continue to see these traditions persist (Barnett 2014).

Returning to the theoretical discussion at the beginning of this chapter I have shown how a household spatial analysis through an indigenous perspective can invite us into the lives of the individuals living within Housepit 54. Previous household spatial analyses in the Mid-Fraser have contributed to discussion of household space in terms of zones, such as production zones, cleaning zones, or kitchen zones (Williams 2013) with interpretation focused on the economic unit of the household or the social inequalities in terms of prestige or elite status of artifacts (Hayden 1994, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2005; Hayden and Cousins 2004; Morin 2006, 2010; Prentiss and Kuijt 2004; Prentiss et al. 2003; Prentiss et al. 2011; Wittke et al. 2004; Williams 2013). Implementing an indigenous framework and methods allows for a view into Housepit 54 that focuses on the aspects of daily indigenous life and interactions consequently shifting the focus away from socio-political and economic issues to identity, social interactions, public versus private space, and continuity and change in cultural traditions.

Housepit 54 offers the unique opportunity to understand a single household throughout 15 or more individual, generation floors. Further analyses of these floors will provide understanding of social and cultural shift and continuity based on economic, environmental, and social dynamics in a diachronic space, furthermore illuminating the strength and persistence of the St’át’imc peoples of the Bridge River Village throughout the ancient past and well into the present times.
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CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

These three articles were prepared for professional publication based on research at the Keatley Creek and Bridge River Village Sites in the Mid-Fraser region of interior British Columbia. The conclusions of each study are provided in detail in each individual article and summarized here according to the topic with final conclusions and a synthesis of all three articles to follow.

ARTICLE SUMMARIES

The Peripheral Little Houses at Keatley Creek

The little peripheral houses at Keatley Creek, ST 104, 105, and 106, date directly to the proto-historic period from 400-200 BP at the Keatley Creek Village, likely used contemporaneously to Housepit 3 and 7, at minimum (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2006, 2010; Prentiss et al. 2003). Previous archaeological research and interpretation has identified these houses as ritual houses, namely men’s secret society houses or ritual houses for elite men to gather and engage in various ritual activities (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2006, 2010; Wittke et al. 2004).

The artifact assemblage from these houses associated with the proto-historic floors include a basket fragment, 2 bone needles, more than 9 scrapers, 3 bird bone beads, 2 elk incisor beads, 72 bone buttons, several abraders, an antler tool previously described as a war club reinterpreted as a wedge, a tomahawk reinterpreted as a scraper, and a bird bone drinking tube (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2006, 2010; Morin et al. 2007; Wittke et al. 2004). This
artifact assemblage, along with a large quantity of salmon bones on the floor of ST 106 and a deep meter-wide pit in the center of the structure, represent what is ethnographically described to be women’s coming of age seclusion houses.

The descendant communities’ belief that there are girls/women’s coming of age seclusion houses provides the basis for this in-depth deconstruction and reevaluation of the archaeological record that considers landscape, architecture, ecofact, artifact, and traditional practices in St’át’imc culture. The results of this reanalysis support the cultural perception of these houses as community ritual structures used for coming of age seclusion houses for the young women of Keatley Creek. This research lays the groundwork for an indigenous feminist approach to archaeology in the Mid-Fraser of British Columbia pointing toward a holistic consideration of the pre-colonial past.

**Housepit 54 during the Fur Trade Era at the Bridge River Village**

Housepit 54 is one of 80+ housepits located at the Bridge River Village site on a river terrace central to the Xwisten reserve near Lillooet, British Columbia, approximately 10 kilometers from the Keatley Creek Village Site. Use of the Bridge River Village spans the past 2,000+ years: Bridge River (BR) 1, ca.1800-1600 cal. B.P.; BR2, ca. 1600-1300 cal. B.P.; BR3, ca. 1300-1000 cal. B.P.; BR4 ca. 600-100 cal. B.P. (Prentiss and Kuijt 2012). Housepit 54 has been the most recent focus of field excavation and research there and was isolated for research due to its long life, with an estimated 15 anthropogenic floors spanning the BR2-4 periods.

Results from the 2012 field season indicate that Housepit 54 was occupied into the Fur Trade era based on $^{14}$C results and the relative dating of trade goods such as glass beads imported from Europe (Prentiss et al. 2013). Fine grained excavation methods allowed me to draw on
architectural data, archaeological features, ecofacts, artifacts, ethno-botanical evidence, and geochemical signatures for interpretation. Traditional artifact and ecofact codes were entered into Excel and supplemented with categories that coded for cultural tradition and belief whenever possible, none of which were mutually exclusive. Cultural categories were created using ethnographic monographs, linguistic data, and additional interpretations offered by Xwisten members. These data bases were loaded into ArcMap 10.1 and then projected onto a reconstructed base map of Housepit 54 to allow for a holistic interpretation, in effect quantifying what has previously been considered to be more qualitative or supplemental data.

The results of this research provides a new methodology for interpreting household space, one that blends theory and method to incorporate and privilege indigenous beliefs about the past while still working within an archaeological framework, a justifiable approach due to the late occupation of this house and the ease in which to apply beliefs from contemporary descendant community. The implementation of indigenous traditional beliefs provides a lens for seeing the house as it was lived-in rather than through a western, first-world perspective that interprets things through a contemporary belief system entrenched in its own socio-political system that often precludes indigenous world-views (Johnson 2010; Trigger 2006; Conkey 2010). By privileging the descendant people’s traditions, beliefs, and experiences, this approach serves as a decolonizing method for indigenous communities (Atalay 2006; Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2010).

**The Ancient Floors at Housepit 54 ca. 1220-1200 cal. B.P.**

This study offers another spatial analysis of Housepit 54 data from an indigenous feminist perspective. Drawing on data from 2012, 2013, and 2014 field excavations at the
Bridge River Village, this research focuses on two pre-colonial floors dating to ca. 1220 cal. B.P. and 1200 cal. B.P., just one generation separating the two floors during the BR3 period. Archaeological interpretation of pre-colonial households or sites relying on ethnographic, linguistic, and descendant community knowledge have received critiques which focus on a perceived disconnect between ancient indigenous culture and tradition and that of contemporary indigenous culture and tradition. This critique highlights some of the political issues indigenous peoples face when negotiating civil, cultural, and treaty rights. While caution is advised when taking a direct-historical approach, in this paper I provide a creative methodology that allows a process for identifying cultural continuity as well as change and an attempted representation of all household members, their use of community and private spaces, and the development of a household understanding that departs from seeing the household as solely an economic unit (Coupland et al. 2009; Hayden and Cannon 1982; West 2010; Williams 2013).

The results of $^{14}$C dating of the floors, based on samples drawn from in situ features such as hearths, supports the indigenous belief and ethnographic accounts, that these semi-subterranean homes underwent a re-flooring process on a generational basis, establishing a reference point for integration and consideration of St’át’imc traditions (Anderson 2014; Teit 1900, 1906, 1909). The procedures for coding for household cultural items in traditional indigenous terms were maintained from the Fur Trade era analysis and supplemented when/where needed for new categories. Ethnobotanical remains were not used for these floors due to data limitations. ArcMap 10.1 was utilized to create a base map for each floor that included both features and site furniture with the corresponding floor data projected over it based on a wide range of queries establishing relationships between tools, debitage, and fauna,
allowing for an in depth and holistic indigenous interpretation for each generational floor and then a comparison of the two.

The results of these analyses show a generational shift in storage strategies, from below ground to above ground, but also indicate a strong continuity of space based on different aspects of gender and age, family based space, and communal space. This analysis suggests that throughout these floors, as in the Fur Trade Era floor, the north/northeast portion of the house is a communal space used for socializing during a wide range of shared activities, as well as the area for which resources entering the house were processed and presumably distributed and shared among household members moving these resources away from the communal area and into private spaces.

**DISSERTATION CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS**

The three research articles contained in this dissertation focus on the Mid-Fraser region of the interior of British Columbia but the research impacts are not restricted to a regional perspective. The intent of this research is to influence archaeological inquiry in a pre-colonial context to reach beyond current approaches. I began with a critique and deconstruction of the small peripheral houses at Keatley Creek in order to build a framework for employing indigenous feminist approaches, effectively proving the validity of this approach, demonstrating the strength of indigenous voices, and the way archaeology can be used in conjunction with native perspectives. The reanalysis of the little houses provides an opportunity to see how differently the past looks when we attempt to remove western bias and allow people to effectively create their own past. Secondly, with the Housepit 54 Fur Trade floor research, I
designed a new methodology for incorporating these approaches into research design and established its effectiveness throughout three different floors at Housepit 54 spanning BR 3-4.

For the Mid-Fraser Region this research creates new opportunities for approaching and interpreting social organization, household demography, and interactions. Previous research refers to these villages as ‘Winter Villages’ and relied specifically on ethnographic accounts for understanding the household demography in which ranking and social inequality was focal as well as restricted to economic relationships (Hayden and Adams 2004; Laforet 1981; Prentiss et al 2008, 2012; Prentiss and Kuijt 2012; Williams 2013). Much of this research has been grounded in developing occupation sequences relying on subsistence and ecological variables for a focus on village growth, origins of social inequality, and village abandonment using theoretical frameworks grounded in cultural and political economy and evolutionary theory (Hayden and Adams 2004; Morin 2006, 2010; Prentiss et al. 2003, 2005; Wittke et al. 2004). The accumulation of research in the area combined with my research and proposed theoretical blending of indigenous feminist and processual approaches creates an opportunity to depart from long-sustained intellectual debates (Hayden 2005; Prentiss 2005) and move towards a focus on the people living within these villages with a nuanced perception of life within households.

While there is a significant amount of ethnographical information on the area (Laforet 1981; Teit 1900, 1906, 1909, 1973) this research underscores the caution in using direct applications of ethnographic accounts for understanding household organizations. For example, ethnographic works indicate that these households were inhabited by large groups that were organized within the house into smaller family groups, with space being divided and organized within the four *corners* of the house (Laforet 1981). The implementation of methods outlined in the Housepit 54 research incorporated into this dissertation and projection of data within an
ArcMap reconstruction of the house shows that not only is this not always the case, but the organization and use of space within this particular house is far more complex than previously understood. This model does not simply use constructs of gender, but develops categories that extend beyond the dualistic model of male/female and look toward age, cultural values, and preferences to seek out activities, relationships, sharing, socializing, and retreating to private spaces, resulting in an enhanced understanding of life within these villages.

Development of a new methodological approach can have implications that reach far beyond the Mid-Fraser region. Indigenous approaches are often limited to historical archaeology or other sub disciplines such as cultural anthropology (Atalay 2012; Silliman 2009; Vitelli 2011). This means that prior to, and still after this research, there is a limited resource base for providing examples and guidance in developing indigenous research in pre-colonial archaeology. By developing this methodology, it is possible to extend the prospect of increasing indigenous research beyond Cultural Resource/Heritage Management and historical archaeology furthering research potential for understanding and interpreting the past in a new way. Although I do not propose a new theoretical model, I provide a unique blending of theories that offers prospects for future development and collaboration within innumerable archaeological perspectives, seeking to enhance and enrich collaboration and worldviews, in turn reestablishing the way we understand the past.
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