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ABSTRACT

A Re-examination of the Early Pueblo I Components at Monument Village, 42SA971

Rachel K. Pollock
Department of Anthropology, BYU
Master of Arts

The Pueblo I period (A.D. 750–900) was a time of widespread change in population and settlement organization in the Northern San Juan region of the American Southwest. One major distinguishing feature of the Pueblo I period is the rapid appearance of villages in the late A.D. 700s. Monument Village in southeastern Utah was excavated by Brigham Young University in the late 1960s and early 1970s, but has never been adequately described. Monument Village has a substantial early Pueblo I occupation but the dating of various structures and the size of the overall settlement are unclear. This thesis re-examines architectural and ceramic data from Monument Village and compares Monument Village to better documented early Pueblo I Villages in the Northern San Juan region. Monument Village does appear to have been a small village comparable to other villages that formed in the early Pueblo I period.
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Introduction

The Pueblo I period (A.D. 750–900) was a time of widespread change in population and settlement organization in the Northern San Juan region of the American Southwest (Figure 1.1). While the Pueblo I period has a number of material culture elements that distinguish it from the preceding periods, one of the primary characteristics is the rapid appearance of villages (Brew 1946; Chuipka 2008a; Kidder 1927; Wilshusen 1991, 1999b).

Despite almost a century of archaeological investigations in the Southwest, early villages are poorly understood in the Northern San Juan region. This is particularly true of the earliest Pueblo I period villages that formed between A.D. 750 and 840 (Chuipka 2008a:2). Most of our knowledge of the Pueblo I period has been tied to individual site summaries or project reports and only recently has the variety in Pueblo I village organization been discussed and summarized (Allison et. al 2012; Chuipka 2008a, Wilshusen 1991; Wilshusen and Ortman 1999). Additionally, most of our understanding comes from literature on a relatively small sample of Pueblo I villages in the Northern San Juan region. Southwestern scholars have also argued that research on the Pueblo I period needs to involve larger spatial scales, more precise chronological data, and more systematic comparisons than were used in the past (Chuipka 2008a:8; Wilshusen and Ortman 1999:392).

Site 42SA971, also known as Monument Village, located at the junction of Montezuma Canyon and Monument Canyon in southeastern Utah (Figure 1.2), appears to be one of the earliest villages in the Northern San Juan region to exhibit a significant Pueblo I occupation. This thesis will examine Monument Village’s characteristics and chronology in an attempt to establish it as a village in the context of current research and understandings of villages in the Pueblo I period of the Northern
San Juan region. This thesis will also discuss how Monument Village fits into established patterns of variation and cultural diversity observed in the archaeological record throughout the region.

**RESEARCH IN THE AREA PRIOR TO AND DURING EXCAVATIONS AT MONUMENT VILLAGE**

Accounts from Fray Silvestre Valez Escalante’s Journal, written in 1776, contain the first known written references of sites in the Four Corners region (Dominguez and Escalante 1854; Brew 1946). William D. Huntington’s 1854 expedition was the next to encounter archaeological sites in the region. As part of the Hayden Surveys of 1875 and 1876, W. H. Jackson visited many
Figure 1.2. Regional map of southeastern Utah showing the location of Monument Village.
of the ruins in the San Juan drainage, including sites in Montezuma Canyon (Jackson 1876, 1878; Brew 1946). In 1877 Edwin A. Berber presented a paper describing regional reconnaissance work and ruins in Montezuma Canyon to the second meeting of the International Congress of Americanists in Luxembourg, Belgium (Wintch 1990). Mitchell T. Prudden was the next to describe the archaeological ruins of the area, including within Montezuma Canyon, and was the first to scientifically record and excavate the ruins in the San Juan drainage (Prudden 1903, 1914, 1918). In 1908 Alfred Kidder and Byron Cummings explored the area and conducted excavations at Alkali Point (Kidder 1910). In 1917 J. Walter Fewkes explored the region and in 1918–1919 he conducted a small scale excavation but did not produce a detailed publication of his work (Fewkes 1917, 1919a, 1919b). John O. Brew led the Southeast Utah Expedition from 1931 to 1933, which completely or partially excavated thirteen sites, including Site 13 at Alkali Ridge the largest Pueblo I site in the area (Brew 1946, Patterson 1975).

Intensive work in Montezuma Canyon began in 1959–60 when Dr. Ray Matheny began a survey of the upper (northern) portion of the canyon as part of his master’s thesis. Matheny’s survey resulted in the documentation of 136 archaeological sites (Matheny 1962, Forsyth 1972) and as a result of this survey it was determined that Anasazi cultural remains in the canyon ranged from Basketmaker III to Pueblo III times. Following the completion of Matheny’s survey only sporadic investigations of the canyon were undertaken for the next decade. Beginning in 1969, the Brigham Young University Summer Field School program began annual summer field work in the area under the direction of Dr. Ray Matheny. The 1969 season concentrated on two sites situated in the middle section of the Canyon; site 42SA863, originally noted as a house mound but later found to include three kiva structures and 14 rectangular rooms, and 42SA971, originally noted as a pit depression but later termed Monument Village (Patterson 1975). Further investigations of site 42SA971 were carried out through 1971 and in 1973 excavations conducted at the northern part of site were labeled 42SA971-N (Miller 1976). Further work in the canyon included surveys
done by BYU’s field school from 1970–1973, an extensive resurvey of the upper canyon and investigation of the lower canyon by Petrus A. DeHaan in 1972 (DeHaan 1972), and a Bureau of Land Management sponsored survey in 1973 covering the lower portion of the canyon; these last two surveys catalogued around 750 sites located within the main portion of the canyon (Patterson 1975). Baer (2003) and Wintch (1990) provide additional information concerning archaeological work performed in the canyon following the 1973 excavations at Monument Village and suggest over 2,300 sites have been located within the canyon.

Monument Village

Monument Village is located at the junction of Montezuma Canyon and Monument Canyon in southeastern Utah and is regionally within the Northern San Juan or Mesa Verde Anasazi cultural group. Monument Village was arbitrarily divided into two parts for excavation by the Brigham Young University field school with references to 42SA971 encompassing the area southeast of the mesa while the northern half was designated as 42SA971-N (Figure 1.3). 42SA971 was excavated in 1969 and 1970, with some minor trenching in the midden in 1971. During the course of excavations it was determined that 42SA971 exhibits some Basketmaker III (A.D. 500–700), a significant Pueblo I (A.D. 700–900), and minor Pueblo II (A.D. 900–1100) occupations (Forsyth 1972, Patterson 1975) (Figure 1.4). 42SA971-N was excavated in 1973 with a focus on the components making up what Miller called Prudden Units 1 and 2 which exhibit Pueblo III occupations (A.D. 1100–1300) (Figure 1.5). Research related to the Monument Village excavation has produced three Master’s Theses: Donald W. Forsyth’s (1972) study of ceramics from Montezuma Canyon, Gregory Patterson’s (1975) study of 42SA971 and Blaine Miller’s (1976) study of 42Sa971N. Several unpublished papers related to Monument Village and Monument Village research have also been written (Those known to me are: Baer 2001, Bodily 2008, Calleja 2007, Montoya 2001, Pollock and Bodily 2006, and Sinkey 2001).
Figure 1.3. Monument Village site map (Patterson 1975:Fig 2). 42SA971-N is the northern portion of the site and 42SA971 is the southern portion of the site.
Figure 1.4. 42SA971 site map (southern portion of Monument Village). Dashed walls were not found during excavation. This map has been redrawn from Patterson’s Map, 1970 student field notes, and aerial photographs.
Research Questions

While this thesis will review the characteristics of the Pueblo I period and village formation in the Northern San Juan region during that period, the overall thesis will be structured to provide a clarified description of site 42SA971, Monument Village, and two research questions: 1) Is Monument Village really, at least in part, an early Pueblo I village (A.D. 750–840)? And 2) If Monument Village is an early Pueblo I village, how does it compare to other early Pueblo I villages?

The first research question will be addressed in two ways, by establishing a chronology for the site and by establishing Monument Village as a village. In order to ascertain a chronology of Monument Village I will use both tree-ring dates from Monument Village and a comparative ceramic chronology. I will incorporate recently obtained tree-ring dates from the Monument Village site’s excavated wood samples analyzed by the Laboratory of Tree Ring Research at the University of
Arizona. The ceramics found at Monument Village will be re-analyzed and compared with those from other Pueblo I villages in the Northern San Juan region to further establish a chronology of the pit and surface structures at Monument Village. I will examine the ceramics to determine the various ware types for use in establishing a mean ceramic date for each of the components. I have specifically used the ceramics to determine the chronology of Component A, an oversized pit structure that appears to have been occupied in the early Pueblo I period and remodeled in the late Pueblo I period, looking at the ceramics found on the floor versus those found in the fill. An attempt will also be made to determine the chronology of the surface rooms by each room individually to see if they were occupied at the same time. Then a comparison of these two pieces of information will be reviewed to determine if Component A is contemporary with the surface rooms or, in other words, to determine if the public architecture coincides with the domestic architecture to complete the village.

The second part of this research question will focus on determining if Monument Village is really a village. This will be done using characteristics or “norms” of early villages as laid out in Wilshusen’s (1991) dissertation and Chuipka’s (2008a) thesis. Chuipka (2008a) defines a village as “an aggregated settlement with a population that is significantly larger than either a single household or hamlet site (Chuipka 2008a:63). Chuipka also states that these communities consist of a “group of households that live close to one another, have regular face-to-face interaction, and share the use of local social and natural resources (Chuipka 2008a:60, 92). Wilshusen (1991) describes villages as “aggregated communities, and in these communities there must be a constant balancing act between the social and economic needs of the community and those of the smaller corporate/descent groups that comprise the community. Villages represent at their most basic level a socioeconomic intensification at the community level” (Wilshusen 1991:29–30).

The characteristics that Wilshusen (1991) used to define early villages in conjunction with other studies (Chuipka 2008a; Murdock 1949; Rohn 1977; Varien 1999; Varien et al. 1996; Wilshusen 1995) are that while the villages are high-density aggregates of people, they typically occur on
landscapes with low overall population densities (1–5 people per sq km). Further, early villages in the Northern San Juan region have average populations of 250 people with a typical range of 70 to 650 people. There is little intensification of the economy, limited long-term storage, and substantial seasonal dependence on hunting or foraging. Early villages typically have a short average use-life, in the northern San Juan, early villages are typically only occupied from 15 to 70 years; many of them appear to last no more than 20 to 30 years, and the longer-lived villages typically are associated with particularly rich landscapes and more clearly defined social hierarchies.

For the purpose of this thesis a village is defined as a group of 10 or more households, or more than about fifty people that live close to one another, have regular face-to-face interaction, and share the use of local natural resources (i.e., land, water, raw materials for tool manufacture, and wild foods) and social resources (i.e., labor, experience, skills, creativity, intellect of fellow community members, and defense). I will address as many of these characteristics as possible with the data from Monument Village with the intent to establish it as an early Pueblo I village.

To answer the second research question, I will use data compiled from existing literature on Pueblo I villages in the Northern San Juan to compare the broader site attributes of architecture, settlement history, and ceramics. Additional attributes may include: estimated site size, estimated number of pit structures, pit structure shape, roomblock type, shared roomblocks, and earlier components vs. later components (Chuipka 2008a). I will also specifically be examining the relationship of public and domestic architecture using the inferred functions of community structures such as oversized pit structures and great kivas, in relation to surface structures used for domestic purposes at Monument Village and other early Pueblo I sites with such related features.

**THESIS ORGANIZATION**

Following this introduction to the topic of this thesis, the second chapter will discuss Monument Village. The chapter will provide an introduction to the geographic study area including a brief
description of the Northern San Juan region to information about the natural environment of Monument Village. Next, it will detail the Monument Village excavations and findings. This chapter will also examine each of the components (i.e. features/structures) at Monument Village. An important part of this chapter will be providing an accurate description of the site with accurate maps and figures.

The third chapter will provide an overview of the historical development of the region. The Pecos Classification scheme which begins with the origins of the Ancestral Puebloan (or Anasazi) will be referenced. The focus of this chapter will be the Basketmaker III period (A.D. 500–700) through the Pueblo III period (A.D. 1150–1300). The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate how the Pueblo I period figures into the prehistory of the Southwest.

Chapter four will discuss the chronology of Monument Village. This chapter will detail the absolute dating techniques used at Monument Village such as dendrochronology and archaeomagnetic dating. It will also include the re-analysis of the ceramic artifacts at Monument Village and discuss the chronology of the site using the ceramic data.

The fifth chapter will discuss whether or not Monument Village meets the criteria to be considered a village. Included in this chapter will be data compiled from existing literature on Pueblo I villages in the Northern San Juan such as Alkali Ridge Site 13 (Brew 1946), Martin’s Site 2 (Martin 1939), Morris 23 (Morris 1939; Chuipka 2008a), McPhee Village (Kane and Robinson 1988; Chuipka 2008a; Wilshusen 1991), Grass Mesa Village (Lipe et al. 1988; Chuipka 2008a; Wilshusen 1991), Blue Mesa (Chuipka 2008a; Chuipka and Potter 2007), and Sacred Ridge (Chuipka 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008b; Potter and Chuipka 2007). This chapter concludes with a review of the research questions and summarizes the results. At the end, there is also an appendix providing further information on data used and discussed in this thesis.
MONUMENT VILLAGE INTRODUCTION

Monument Village is located in the broad region of the American Southwest and the narrower region of the northern San Juan region. Monument Village is specifically located on a small knoll at an elevation of approximately 1,840 meters above sea level at the junction of Montezuma Canyon and Monument Canyon in the southeastern part of the state of Utah. Monument Village is between Monument Creek, an intermittent stream, about 400 meters to the east and Montezuma Creek, a perennial stream, about 500 meters to the west. At the time of BYU Field School’s excavations, the Monument Village site was on property owned by Mr. and Mrs. Max Dalton of Monticello, Utah (Forsyth 1972, Patterson 1975). This site appears to have been occupied during three periods, the Pueblo I, Pueblo II, and Pueblo III. Evidence suggests that the primary occupation of Monument Village is in the early Pueblo I period (A.D. 750–840). The Pueblo I occupation at Monument Village, site 42SA971, appears to be one of the earliest villages in the region. The excavated southern portion of Monument Village had a small pit structure, an oversized pit structure, 4 associated contiguous roomblocks, and a midden area. The architecture of these structures as well as their layout are characteristic of an early Pueblo I village. Excavations in the northern most part of the site also revealed a slab-lined Pueblo I habitation structure with a ramada. The ceramics from this structure were suggestive of the Pueblo I period as they were primarily Chapin Gray ware and Abajo Red-on-orange. A tree ring cutting date of A.D. 752 also came out of this structure.
The primary area of occupation for the Anasazi peoples discussed here, as shown in Figure 2.1, is termed the San Juan region. The broader San Juan region is divided into two parts, the northern San Juan and southern San Juan regions. The Northern San Juan is often referred to as the Mesa Verde region, based on Kidder’s (1917) synthesis in which he considered the entire San Juan watershed to be a single culture area, with a Mesa Verdean sub-area to the north of the San Juan River, a Chacoan sub-area to the southeast, and the Kayenta sub-area to the west. The terms Mesa Verde region and the Northern San Juan region have been used interchangeably (i.e. Lipe 1995; Wilshusen and Van Dyke 2006) but as the term Mesa Verde has also been used to refer to a national park, pottery types, and a culture its use in reference to the geographical region has caused some confusion. Thus, for the purposes of this thesis I will refer to the area north of the San Juan River as the Northern San Juan region. The Northern San Juan region includes the territory associated with the northern drainages of the San Juan River from its headwaters to its confluence with the Colorado River (Figure 2.2). The San Juan River is a significant feature and may have also served as an important boundary in the past (Chuipka 2008a; Glowacki 2006). Sites within the Northern San Juan Region also appear to exhibit a western and eastern pattern. For the purposes of this thesis, the western and eastern pattern will loosely be considered to be divided by the La Plata River.

**Montezuma Canyon**

Montezuma Canyon is located within San Juan County, Utah in the Four Corners region. Montezuma Canyon is a major northern tributary of the San Juan River. Montezuma Canyon begins about five kilometers southeast of Monticello, Utah and runs from north to south. The canyon’s drainage from the Abajo Mountains has cut the canyon down producing steep sandstone walls filled with a deep alluvium. The alluvial bottom, mesas, numerous rock shelters, ledges, and overhangs created through erosion of the canyon walls were often utilized by the canyon’s prehistoric inhabitants making Montezuma Canyon, at times, a heavily populated area. The recorded sites
Figure 2.1. Anasazi Culture Areas.
along Montezuma Canyon range from small single component sites to large aggregated villages primarily from the early Basketmaker through Pueblo III period (Baer 2003; Forsyth 1972; Miller 1976; Patterson 1975; Wintch 1990). Archaic, Navajo and historic sites have also been recorded in the canyon.

*Environmental Conditions*

The environmental conditions that existed during the prehistoric occupation of the past were probably very similar as those today. Montezuma Creek, an intermittent stream that forms
a tributary of the San Juan and runs the length of the canyon, and Monument Creek, another intermittent stream, are the closest known water sources. The growing season on the plateau is about 129 days, while in the canyon it is somewhat longer, providing a sufficient environment for agriculture (DeHaan 1972:2). In his thesis Blaine Miller notes that “A pollen analysis of soil samples taken from cache pits during excavation of the site [42SA971-N] identified pollen from most of the plants growing on or near the site today” (Miller 1975, Miller 1976: 4). Some of those include: Salicaceae (cottonwood), Cupressaceae (juniper), Pinus (pinyon pine), Fagaceae (scrub oak), Chenopodiaceae (greasewood and saltbrush), Compositae (sagebrush), Gramineae (miscellaneous grasses), Ephedraceae (brigham tea), Liliaceae (yucca), and Cactaceae (prickly pear cactus) (Miller 1976). The faunal species noted in Montezuma Canyon include: lizards, snakes, rabbits, ground squirrels, chipmunks, coyote, bobcats, and deer. Ducks, heron, hawks, eagles, and various other birds are also found in the canyon (DeHaan 1972:4 and Miller 1976).

**MONUMENT VILLAGE EXCAVATIONS**

Small-scale excavations mostly test pits and trenches were carried out at 42SA971 in 1961, 1963, and 1965 by Ray Matheny and some of his students. In their excavations at Monument Village, the BYU field school used the term component rather than feature and/or structure. To remain consistent I will continue to use the term component in place of feature/structure or I will use a descriptive name along with the letter designation (i.e., Component A or Pit Structure A). Component B rooms 1, 2, and part of 3 were excavated along with rooms 3 and 4 of Component F between 1961 and 1965. In 1969, the field school began its excavation at the site in a depression subsequently designated Component (Pithouse) A. The 1970 field school season expanded its excavations to include the surrounding surface rooms and other pit structures that appeared to be related to Component A. These included, excavating or conducting work in Components B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, and N. (Baer 2001, Bodily 2008; De Jong 1970; Forsyth 1970,
Components B and C are linear roomblocks located to the southwest of Component A. Components D and F were initially excavated as separate structures, but which form a single curving roomblock alignment to the northwest of Component A. Component E is a linear roomblock located to the northwest of Components D and F. All of these surface structures are likely related to a Pueblo I occupation (Patterson 1975). Component G is a slab lined structure.

There are no detailed descriptions about Components H and I in the surviving 1970 field notes to know what type of features to which these letters were assigned. Component J is a slab lined cist just to the east of Component A. Component K is a pithouse located to the northeast of Component A. Component N is a slab lined cist (it was trenched through, but not fully excavated) that lies directly to the north of Component A. Patterson (1975) concluded that Components J, K, and N were affiliated with BMIII occupations, based on their architecture, although the majority of artifacts recovered from the fill appear to date to the Pueblo I period. Component M was another pit structure.

In addition to excavating these components in 1970, the field school excavated numerous 10 by 10 foot grids in their search for subsurface structures (Figure 2.3). The majority of the grids excavated lie between components but some of the grids overlap portions of Components A, B, D, F, and J. Various test trenches were also excavated in 1970 (Figure 2.4). Test trenches 1–5 were dug between Components A and F. The test trench dug through Component N was labeled Test Trench N (Bodily 2008; Forsyth 1972, Patterson 1975,). An unnamed test trench was excavated along the north wall of Component B. Another test trench was dug between Components D and E which was simply called Test Trench between D & E (Bodily 2008). Finally, two areas were excavated to the southeast, directly in front of Component E and were labeled Test Unit 3a and Annex E-4 (Bodily 2008). At the end of the 1970 season a test trench was run through another large depression located north of the other excavated features. This feature was designated Component
Figure 2.3. 10x10 foot grids that were excavated in 1970. Note that they overlap various components. This data was extrapolated from the 1970 student field notes.
Figure 2.4. Test trenches that were excavated in 1970. The location of some of these test trenches were extrapolated from the 1970 student field notes and others were extrapolated from aerial photographs.
L and was further excavated in 1971. It appears to be a large Pueblo I pit structure, and is probably
the large circle shown in the northeast portion of Patterson’s map, although a precise location is
not identified (Baer 2001; Forsyth 1972; Miller 1976).

Further excavations were conducted at the site in 1973 when the BYU field school focused its
attention on the study of Prudden Units; a type of small pueblo defined by Mitchell T. Prudden
(1903, 1914, 1918). To keep the later unit pueblos from being confused with the Pueblo I settlement
they were designated as 42SA971-N, since they are the northern most portion of site 42SA971
(Miller 1976). The structures excavated at 42SA971-N included two Pueblo III Prudden units, a
Pueblo II surface storage unit, a Pueblo I surface habitation unit, one Pueblo I pit structure, and
two partially excavated ramada areas. One Prudden unit (Prudden Unit 1) consisted of a surface
structure with five rooms and a kiva to the south. The other Prudden unit (Prudden Unit 2) had a
surface structure of three rooms and a kiva to the south.

**Discrepancies Addressed in Previous Works Concerning Monument Village**

It is difficult to gain an exact understanding of the Monument Village site and what is occurring
there from the field notes, theses, and other research papers on the site. Patterson’s (1975) thesis,
for instance, contains errors introducing uncertainty to his conclusion. Sarah Baer, a former
BYU student, wrote a paper in 2001 that identified and discussed the various inaccuracies and
discrepancies in Patterson’s thesis. These errors are understandable as it was written in the absence
of Dr. Matheny and Patterson was not personally involved in the 1969 excavations of Component
A, thereby obtaining his information second-hand (Baer 2001). Some of the errors in previous
works that will be addressed in this thesis include 1) discrepancies between what is written and
what is diagramed, 2) Inaccuracies about Component A, and 3) misdiagnoses of sherd types in the
ceramic assemblage.
Concerning discrepancies between what is written and what is diagramed, there are not consistent descriptions or diagrams (Figures 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8) of the components and site layout among the 1970 field notes making it difficult to fully identify each component, although the photographs do help (Figure 2.9). In addition, while Patterson provides the most comprehensive description of the site, his scales are off on his diagrams and maps of the structures of the site. For example, Patterson records that the diameter of Component A is 35 feet (his written dimensional data appears to be accurate for all of the site structures according to field notes) (Patterson 1975:13). However, in his diagram of Component A, the scale indicates that it is only 20 feet in diameter (Ibid: 14). Patterson is off on his scale by 15 feet. Dimension errors are consistent throughout his drawings, maps, and diagrams, also bringing into question the relationship of size between the structures themselves in his diagramed map of the village. There are also inaccuracies in some of Patterson’s description of the excavation, excavation findings, and conclusions about Component A. These will be discussed further in the section below discussing Component A.

MONUMENT VILLAGE COMPONENTS

A complete understanding of Monument Village layout and architecture is not fully known at this time as only a portion of Monument Village was mapped and excavated. While Patterson primarily focused on the 1969 and 1970 excavation of the site, his map shows additional structures that are not mentioned in his thesis or in the field notes of the excavators. Investigations of the site during a 2001 BYU class field trip revealed five additional rectangular structures to the west of the excavated portion as well as others to the north and west of the excavated portion of the site (Baer 2001; Montoya 2001). In Patterson’s map he shows three circular kivas located on top of the north mesa but does not include a coursed masonry structure noted by the field trip investigations to enclose the kivas and which probably corresponds to the Pueblo III period. Monument Village’s actual size and structures, particularly the precise location of roomblocks and associated pit
Figure 2.5. Diagram of Monument Village, 42SA971, with grid. From the 1970 Field Notes.
Figure 2.6. Diagram of Monument Village. From the 1970 Field Notes.
Figure 2.7. Diagram of the Layout of Site 42SA971 (Leonard 1970:2).
Figure 2.8. Diagram of Monument Village Components (Forsyth 1970:1).
Figure 2.9. Aerial photograph of Monument Village, 42SA971.
structures, need further establishment through additional survey. More excavation may also reveal additional information about the early Pueblo I period at Monument Village as many early Pueblo I sites have ephemeral surface indication and are difficult to interpret from survey alone, and the later components (dating from late Pueblo I through Pueblo III) may have obscured or obliterated some of the early Pueblo I elements.

**Component A**

Component A is an oversized pit structure with a diameter of 35 feet (or 10.7 meters) and was five to six feet deep (1.5–2 meters). Excavations began with a grid system of five by five foot squares with a 200’ east-west base line and a 250’ north-south line with the already established datum from 1965 (Baer 2001; Davis 1969)(Figure 2.10). The first five by five foot test pit was done over the old 1965 test trench and excavation proceeded from this test pit with two crews working on the structure. One crew began to work to the north and east of the structure, and the other crew worked to the south and west of the structure, both following and defining the wall and floor areas. The fill overlying Component A was removed in arbitrary 10-inch levels to completely expose the structure. Davis (1969) indicates that ground surface level was 20” below datum and was designated unit/level 3 (20”– 30” below datum). Once that level had been excavated, they excavated down unit 4 (from 30”– 40” below datum) and so on until reaching the final levels of 8 and 9 (70”- 90”). The majority of the cultural material was contained in levels 3 and 4 (Baer 2001). The fill was made of a variety of types of soils, from hard compact clay in the middle of the structure to sandy soils, and clay and charcoal lenses found at different levels throughout the structure. A natural occurring sandstone shelf was found around the south and southeast portion of the structure. During excavation a baulk, or stratigraphic profile wall, in the shape of an L, was left in the middle of the structure (Figure 2.11).
There is no evidence of a ventilator system or entrance, however, after reviewing the excavation notes it is possible that the ventilator shaft or entrance was missed as excavators were unaware of these features until later in the excavation and once informed and began looking ran into the sandstone shelf in the southern portion of the component. It is also possible that this feature was missed because excavation did not extend outside the walls of Component A (Baer 2001; Patterson 1975).

A 12 to 18 inches wide bench encircled the entire structure, approximately six to eight inches above the secondary floor (Figure 2.12). The bench was constructed of sandstone slabs set into clay mortar. The bench was removed to expose the primary floor, and to get a clearer picture of the pit house architecture. After the bench was removed a series of closely spaced postholes was found along the wall in association with the primary floor. There was material taken from the bench area that was quite rocky and was believed to represent either an enlargement of the bench or a result of a collapsed wall.
Figure 2.11. Photograph showing the baulk, or stratigraphic profile wall, in the shape of an L during excavation.

Figure 2.12. Photograph showing the bench in Component A.
Patterson (1975) notes evidence of two distinct occupations in the pit house, as excavators inferred two floor levels, with the later, “secondary” occupation only lying 4 to 6 inches above the earlier, “primary” level. The primary floor was first discovered in the 1965 test trench but it is unclear from the field notes what is actually occurring with the floors. The primary floor and features are all listed as being 70”– 80” below datum or 50” to 60” below ground surface or about five feet (Baer 2001). According to Larry Davis’ field notes, the primary floor is covered with red clay which sealed some of the floor features (Davis 1969:36). Davis infers that these features were used by the first occupants of the pit house and were later filled with river sand and gravel that contained a high charcoal content (Davis 1989:38). In regards to the secondary floor, Davis describes it as dark colored clay containing a large amount of charcoal. He states that the secondary floor was only about 1/4” thick and was difficult to find throughout the whole structure. He notes that it was primarily found in the center, west and south of the structure but became more difficult to find around the edges of the wall and near the bench. Davis later comments, however, that “all of the secondary floor is now exposed except for a small portion on the south side of the profile column and a very small area in the southern portion of the pithouse next to the wall” (Davis 1969:31) The Primary and Secondary Floors of Component A are shown in Figure 2.13.

Sarah Baer (2001) thought that the existence of the secondary floor was doubtful based on the difficulty in finding it and from Davis’ writing, “Measurements were taken this morning of the bench area that appeared to correspond with the secondary floor…The south side of the pit house was the only area where this feature was encountered, however, and it may be that it did not cover the entire bench area of the structure or that it (a bench during the secondary occupation) was nonexistent” (Davis 1969:33). It is a little unclear here if Davis is referring to the secondary floor or the bench, which had not yet been fully exposed, however, B.J. Earle’s (1969) field notes explains that upon initially discovering the secondary slab-lined clay bench, the nature of the bench was indistinct except for in the SW corner where it was well defined. It was determined that the bench
was local, not contiguous (Earle 1969). Earle then notes that Davis went back to the south wall of the 1965 expedition and exposed the bench and with further excavation the bench was found to run completely around the structure, thus, clarifying that Davis was probably referring to the bench not the secondary floor. After discussing that the bench had been completely exposed, Davis (1969:35) remarks that they began removing the secondary floor. After removing the secondary floor Davis says that the bench seems to be directly related to the primary floor. Later on when discussing the lack of post holes related to the bench and the possibility of a different type of construction being used for the roof he again explains that the bench, with its red clay mortar, was probably associated with the red clay floor and the people who occupied the site during the time of the red clay primary floor. In her notes B.J. Earle comments that the thinness of the secondary floor probably represents a very short occupation. Earle comments that while in some places the bench seemed to be on the same level as the secondary floor at other times the clay floor associated with the bench dipped below that of the secondary floor. Earle also comments about the clay floor capped features, some filled with sand and gravel and others with floor fill. After reading the field notes it seems to me that the secondary gray clay floor wasn’t associated with the bench but the bench was connected with
the red clay “primary floor” and represented an occupation in which the pit structure was renovated or remodeled to add a red clay slab lined bench and cover the floor with red clay. The true primary floor occupation would therefore have been the occupation with the numerous post holes (Figures 2.14 and 2.15) in which posts supported the roof and before the bench and red clay were added. Patterson (1975:15) notes up to 50 minor post holes but the feature index lists 92 postholes, six of them large ones, all in the primary floor between 70–80 inches below datum. (Appendix 1).

Other floor features listed in the feature index include 4 “cache pits”, 1 “storage pit”, and 2 “pit depressions”, correcting Patterson’s count of 11 storage pits. Davis (1969) notes that the pit structure also contained a central fire pit with what he says appeared to be a horseshoe shaped deflector. In the photos, however, the hearth appears round. The relationship of a hearth/fire-pit to the secondary floor/occupation is not known as the only hearth found was under the profile column or baulk and was excavated after everything else had been taken down to the primary floor level. Patterson’s description of the fire-pit is much smaller than that listed in the feature index. In Patterson’s thesis he also makes a statement about all of the features in the primary floor being common to the secondary floor (Patterson 1975:17) but both Davis’ and Earle’s notes and the feature index show this to be incorrect. The only features corresponding to the secondary floor/occupation are #5–9 (Baer 2001; Davis 1969).

Patterson’s remarks also indicate that a number of metates and manos were recovered from Component A, either within the fill or in association with the secondary occupation level on the floor (Patterson 1975:17). Davis’ and Earle’s field notes on the other hand indicate that the metates were not in association with the secondary occupation floor level (Davis 1969; Baer 2001) but one was found against the wall in the 1965 test trench. The second was found, resting upside down on top of the wall (Davis 1969:32). The third metate was found on the east side of the structure, situated just above the bench (Davis 1969:34). Other artifacts included: a few chipped stone items particularly, “typical projectile points from the PI period (Davis 1969:20)”, two stone drills (11),
Figure 2.14. Photograph showing the Primary Floor of Component A.

Figure 2.15. Photograph showing the Secondary Floor of Component A.
and ceramics. Davis says, “A great deal of pottery is being found throughout the excavation of the site. For the most part, this pottery consists of grey ware substantiating Dr. Matheny’s idea that this is a BM III – PI pit-house” (Davis 1969:24). Davis also points out that most of the pottery found on or next to the secondary floor is gray ware and Abajo Red-on-Orange, placing the period of occupation in PI times (Baer 2001; Davis 1969:31).

The structure of the roof during the last occupation of Component A is vague. It appears that the roof associated with the occupation(s) of the primary floor of the structure was supported by a six post arrangement although after the bench was installed many of the post holes were covered up, although the six larger ones remained. As for the secondary floor with the bench, it is unclear if the six post arrangement continued, as the post holes appear to have been covered up and the roof structure appears to have been altered to a support of postholes outside the structure, or the roof was removed and the structure left open.

Patterson (1975) thought that the primary floor represented an occupation in the Basketmaker III period with the remodeling and addition of a bench occurring in Pueblo I times. However, as the original configuration of the pit structure is different from Basketmaker III structures, and instead, is very similar to the oversized pit structures at other early Pueblo I sites, particularly Alkali Ridge Site 13, along with this pit structure appearing to be associated with the early PI surface structures, and the ceramics suggesting a Pueblo I occupation, it appears Pit Structure A was probably not constructed in Basketmaker III but was most likely build in the late 700s and remodeled in the late 800s. The addition of the bench could signal a change in function of the structure, possibly converting the structure for ceremonial use (Baer 2001). Patterson (1975) speculated that remodeling of the structure took place in the Pueblo I period, with the secondary occupation turning Component A into a kiva.

It appears that this unusually large circular pit structure with a bench is similar in shape to other structures identified as Pueblo I great kivas, although the floor area is only about 90 m²,
making it smaller than most great kivas. Great kivas are believed to have served to integrate the community through rituals and are typically much larger and generally associated with ritual usage more than habitation (Wilshusen 1989a). Great kivas form two distinct groups based on architecture and internal features. In the Pueblo I, great kivas are typically oriented in a south or southeastern direction, have a circular shape, either an unlined wall, a pole and mud-lined or a slab-lined wall, a slab-lined bench, 4, 5, or 8 seating pits, and a fire pit. These great kivas do not contain crypts, vaults, antechambers, or peripheral rooms (McLellan 1969: 178). Based on these criteria, the remodeled Component A has many of the properties of a Pueblo I great kiva: large size, circular shape, a slab-lined bench, a fire-pit, and a southeastern orientation in relation to other roomblocks/storage units (Components D and F). Since this structure is significantly smaller than a great kiva this structure is believed, however, to be an oversized pit structure. Wilshusen (1989a) suggests that oversized pit structures were used for both habitation and ritual purposes throughout the Pueblo I times and most pit structures were typically located south of a group of roomblocks or storage rooms. In looking at the general settlement pattern of the area, Component A is the largest structure at the site with the possible exception of Component L and M which were not completely excavated and for which there is little information. It consequently, is likely that Component A played a major role in village life, formation, and organization, possibly even serving as the main focus of ritual for community cohesion and integration (Baer 2001; Wilshusen 1989a).

Component B

Component B consists of two adjacent, parallel, linear roomblocks forming seven contiguous rooms, with four rooms in the row that faces toward Component A (eastern-most part) and three rooms behind (comprising the western-most part). The walls are constructed using upright slabs that were placed in trenches and plastered into place with clay mortar (Figures 2.16 and 2.17). The function of these rooms may have varied from storage and food preparation to habitation, although
Figure 2.16. Component B. Created by Scott Ure.

Figure 2.17. Photograph of Component B.
the three front rooms with hearths suggest they were habitation rooms. See Table 2.1 for more detailed information concerning Component B. In Rooms 1, 2, and 3 there are two distinct floors which appear to indicate construction and utilization during the major Pueblo I occupation of the site that was then remodeled during the early Pueblo II period (Forsyth 1972; Patterson 1975).

Component C

This component consists of a linear series of five enclosed rooms on the north which are connected to what Patterson (1975) terms four “use-area” like rooms on the south; it may be that these rooms were enclosed but the walls were not well preserved and as some of them have hearths they may actually have been habitation rooms. Component C is built directly on the natural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Artifacts Present (According to Patterson)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1</td>
<td>10’3”</td>
<td>6’6”</td>
<td>Postholes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48 Sherds, 7 Lithic Flakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 2</td>
<td>12’9”</td>
<td>6’6”</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88 Sherds, 2 Mano Fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 3</td>
<td>15’</td>
<td>6’6”</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 Sherds, 2 Scrapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 3a</td>
<td>11’3”</td>
<td>7’4”</td>
<td>Hearth, Postholes, Small Depression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Hammerstones, 6 Mano Fragments, 1 Metate Fragment, 1 Fragmentary Projectile Point, Large Lithic Debitage, Ceramics</td>
<td>Archaeomagnetic Sample A.D. 920±20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 3b</td>
<td>8’</td>
<td>7’4’’</td>
<td>Hearth, Postholes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramics, Few Lithics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 4</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>7’4”</td>
<td>Hearth, Postholes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lithics, Ceramics, 1 Mano Fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 5</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7’4”</td>
<td>Postholes, Charcoal Lenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Mano Fragment, 2 Polishing Stones, Ceramics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Dimensions, Features, and Artifacts From Component B
sandstone bedrock and the main outer walls are constructed of coursed masonry (Forsyth 1972; Patterson 1975). See Table 2.2 for more information about Component C. (Figures 2.18 and 2.19)

### Component D and Component F

On the east side of Component D, facing Component A, are three rooms that appear to be habitation rooms, whose walls were not well preserved. These rooms are attached to three or possibly four enclosed contiguous room on the west side of the structure. Component F consists of five, possibly six, slab-lined rooms to the northwest, and four rooms to the southeast with a wall extending the partition between rooms 4 and 5 to Component N. Components D and F are actually a continuation of each other which together form a large crescent shaped series of surface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Artifacts Present (According to Patterson)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1</td>
<td>12’2”</td>
<td>6’8”</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lithics, Pottery Smoother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 2</td>
<td>13’7”</td>
<td>6’7”</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lithic Debitage, Ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 3</td>
<td>9’7”</td>
<td>6’1”</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramic, Lithic Debitage, 6 Turquoise Beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 4</td>
<td>3’3”</td>
<td>6’2”</td>
<td>Sandstone Shelf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramics, Lithics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 5</td>
<td>10’7”</td>
<td>6’2”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cermaics, Lithics, Burnt Corn Cob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 6</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7’2”</td>
<td>Hearth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mano Fragment, Metate Fragment, Lithics, Hammerstone, Polishing Stones, Ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 7</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>7’2”</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mano Fragments, 1 Metate Fragment, Lithic Debitage, Ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 8</td>
<td>12’3”</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>Hearth, 2 Sand-Filled Depressions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manos, Hammerstones, Polishing Stones, Ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 9</td>
<td>12’2”</td>
<td>11’</td>
<td>Sand-Filled Depressions, Secondary Burial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ceramics, 6 Polishing Stones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.18. Component C. Created By Scott Ure.

Figure 2.19. Photograph showing Component C.
Figure 2.20. Components D, F, and N (Patterson 1975:Fig 8).

Rooms, and represent the largest surface unit excavated at the site (Forsyth 1972; Patterson 1975) (Figures 2.20, 2.21, and 2.22). See Table 2.3 for room measurements, features, and artifacts found. Rooms 4, 5, 6, and 7 of Component D and rooms 7 and 8 of Component F are referred to in the field notes (Leonard 1969) by grid number rather than room number so the exact dimensions and features of these rooms is unknown. Artifacts from these rooms include metates, mano fragments, gaming pieces, pendants, projectile points, drills, bones, and ceramics. Excavation in front of (just east) Components D and F revealed a possible multi-use plaza, containing hearths, pottery fragments, and many manos and metates. There appeared to be only one floor occupation of this roomblock and the entire structure was destroyed by fire at the time of abandonment. Patterson (1975) notes that a dendrochronology sample was taken from a post in Room 5 of Component F but no dates were received. Wood Fragments from Rooms 1, 4, and 5 were sent for tree-ring analysis for use in this thesis but only three came back with dates. From Room 4 the dates were 755 r comp and 755rB comp. From Room 5 the date was 581vv.
Figure 2.21. Rooms 5 and 9 of Component F and Component N. Created by Scott Ure.

Figure 2.22. Photograph showing Components F and N.
### Table 2.3: Dimensions, Features, and Artifacts From Components D and F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Artifacts Present</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 1</td>
<td>22’6” 7’6”</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked Stone, Shaped Ceramic, Ceramic Object, Lithics, Ceramics, 1 Metate Fragment, Corn Cob Fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 2</td>
<td>8’4” 6’4”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seed Jar, Ceramic Vessels, Ceramics, Gaming Piece, Pendant, Serrated Chipped Stone, Stone Axes, Trough Metate, Manos, Lithics, Corn Cobs, Worked Bone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 3</td>
<td>7’9” 6’4”</td>
<td>2 Storage Cists, Rectangular Pit, Postholes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramics, Stone Pendant, Mano, 8 Polishing Stones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component F</td>
<td></td>
<td>48’ 5’5”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 1</td>
<td>10’ 5’2”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metate Fragments, 3 Mano Fragments, 3 Hammerstones, Axe, Lithic Debitage, Ceramics, Red Ware Vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 2</td>
<td>7’9” 5’5”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mano Fragments, 1 Polishing Stone, Ceramics, Stone Pendant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 3</td>
<td>9’ 5’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramics, Lithics, 3 Metate Fragments, 2 Manos, 1 Mano Fragment, 3 Hammerstones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 4</td>
<td>9’ 4’3”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithics, Trough Metate, Miniature Trough Metate, 5 Manos, 3 Hammerstones, Ceramics</td>
<td>755rB comp 755 r comp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 5</td>
<td>12’4” 5’4”</td>
<td>Hearth, Postholes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slab Metate, 2 Trough Metate Fragments, 5 Manos, Groundstone Axe, Charred and Fragmentary Worked Bones (Awls), Jar, Ceramics</td>
<td>581vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 6</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5’4”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Manos, 2 Chipped Stone Axes, Ceramics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 9</td>
<td>11’ 6’4”</td>
<td>Hearth, Slab-Lined Bin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Trough Metates, 6 Trough Metate Fragments, 5 Manos, 3 Hammerstones, 2 Chipped-Stone Axes, Lithic Debitage, Ceramics, 2 Partially Restored Vessels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component N

Component N is a round pit structure measuring 10 feet by 11 feet (3–3.5 meters) and is 33 inches deep. Component N was discovered while excavating room F-10 and, due to lack of time, only a single trench was dug across it. The walls of Component N were constructed of large sandstone slabs, in some areas two courses were noted, which were plastered. The plaster showed signs of extreme heat and charring most likely caused by the fire that destroyed Components D and F. Artifacts recovered included a mano fragment, a projectile point blank, two combination side and end scrapers, an *Olivella* shell bead, and ceramics. Patterson suggested that while this component resembles a large cist characteristic of the Basketmaker III period it is believed to be contemporaneous with or slightly earlier than Component F. The function of this structure is unknown (Forsyth 1972; Patterson 1975).

Component E

Component E is made up of a single line of six contiguous slab-lined rooms (Figure 2.23). All the rooms are relatively the same size and depth and appear to have been used for storage. It is probable that there were habitation rooms in front (or southeast) which were not thoroughly explored or were poorly preserved, or both. There was no evidence for remodeling of this roomblock (Forsyth 1972; Patterson 1975). See Table 2.4 for more specific details.

Component G

Component G is a slab lined structure in line with 170 N. It appears excavation of this structure was begun but not completed upon identification of its possible association with the Pueblo II period.
This component showed evidence of two construction phases. Initial construction appeared to resemble a large circular cist made of very large, flat stones set upright in the soil and held together with clay mortar (Figures 2.24 and 2.25). The dimensions of Component J are 10 feet by 6 feet 7 inches (or 3 meters by 2 meters). This structure bears strong resemblance to Basketmaker III.
Figure 2.24. Component J (Patterson 1975:Fig 10).

Figure 2.25. Photograph showing Component J.
cists. The second construction phase expanded the area by removing the slabs along the eastern wall and constructing new walls using smaller stone slabs. Patterson (1975) wrote the artifacts included one metate fragment, 8 manos, projectile points, lithic debitage, a partially restored jar, and ceramic sherds. There were two floors, a primary and secondary, suggesting more than one occupation. There are also two burials in close association just north of Component J and directly east of Pithouse A (Forsyth 1972; Patterson 1975). Patterson (1975) believed that the original construction dates to Basketmaker III times, when the structure was used for storage purposes, while the modification was done during the Pueblo I occupation, possibly modifying the structure into a small habitation unit resembling a pit house. However, other than the architecture, there are no indications that this structure is associated with the Basketmaker III period.

Component K

This structure was not visible from the surface and was discovered as a test trench was run through the eastern portion of the site. It is a small pit house, measuring four meters in diameter, with four main roof posts which supported the superstructure (Figures 2.26 and 2.27). The floor level contained a fire pit, several bell-shaped pits, and a mano and metate. The skeletal remains of two dogs were found near the fire pit. The ventilator shaft consisted of a tunnel dug through the clay and an earthen bench about 35 cm. wide encircled the structure. The building timbers were removed after abandonment and the floor features were filled with sand and capped. The structure was then used as a trash area (Forsyth 1972; Patterson 1975). Patterson suggested this was a Basketmaker III or Pueblo I pit house. As Component K is architecturally similar to the typical early Pueblo I pit house, I would suggest that it is most likely a Pueblo I structure. Patterson (1975) lists the artifacts to include a complete trough metate, five mano fragments, 4 projectile points, an olivine basalt hammerstone, from the floor level, 1,871 pieces of debitage, recovered from the fill, numerous charred corn cobs, and ceramics.
Figure 2.26. Component K. Made by Scott Ure.

Figure 2.27. Photograph showing Component K.
Test Trenches

Test trenches between Components F and A revealed either a possible plaza or multi-use area or possible habitation rooms with lightly built walls. Artifacts included polishing stones, a projectile point, Chapin Gray vessels, a trough metate, two manos, 2 unidentified green stones, a shell pendant, and an olivine basalt hammerstone (Patterson 1975). Three test trenches in the trash mound/midden yielded cultural material including 3,584 ceramic sherds, mainly dated to the Pueblo I period, and a small amount of lithics (Patterson 1975).
Component L

Component L is large pit structure measuring 59 feet (18 meters) in diameter (Figure 2.28). Excavations revealed a floor and a clay bench. Other identified features were found but are unknown (Figure 2.29). Archaeological evidence indicates that construction was not completed and the structure, possibly intended as an oversized pit structure or great kiva, was not put into full use. Cultural material suggests that Component L was constructed during the Pueblo I period, although fill material suggests that subsequent groups may have temporarily occupied the structure or used it for a midden (Forsyth 1972, Baer 2001, and Montoya 2001).

Component M

Component M is located “about 400 yards north of the hill which is the location for most components of 971” (Wilke 1970:40). In Robert Guilbault’s (1970:20) field notes he states the
location of this structure is “near the gate leading up to 971.” He also states that this structure has a separate site number, but doesn’t know what it is. Component M is a pit structure measuring “68’ from rim to rim. The center of the depression is some 3’ to 3 ½’ lower than the rims” (Wilke 1970:40). Only two days of excavation were carried out at Component M in the form of a test trench through the center of the structure. It appears the walls of the structure were chipped into the stone bedrock and the structure may have contained a bench. Very few artifacts were found, although no screening was done. Ceramics were “all plain utility grayware sherds” (Guilbault 1970:20).
42SA971- N Surface Structure 1

This Pueblo III structure may originally have consisted of six rooms which were later modified into five one-storied rooms (Figure 2.30). A ramada structure was probably attached to the southern wall of the structure. The north wall measures 9.10 meters long while the south wall measures 9.40 meters. The east wall is 4.6 meters long and the west wall is 4.5 meters long. All walls except those in Room E are simple walls of scabbled masonry. The east wall and part of the south wall in Room E are compound walls. Room A had three floor pits, a fire pit, and a post hole. Room B had a shallow fire pit while Room C contained a slab-lined fire pit and two floor pits. No floor features were found in Room D but Room E had three floor pits. Small numbers of sherds and lithic flakes were found throughout the structure. Mostly corrugated pottery, one mano, a grinding stone, and numerous egg shell fragments were found in Room A. Room B contained a mano, a bone awl, and a tchamahia. Room C contained a corn cob and two projectile points. Room D contained an almost complete bowl. Rooms A, B, and C all contained fire pits and therefore could have been used for habitation or for food preparation, although ash and occupational debris, consistent with use, were not spread over the floors (Miller 1976).

Kiva I

Kiva I is a six-pilaster circular kiva oriented in a southeast direction about three meters from Surface Structure 1. Kiva 1 has a diameter of about 4.5 meters (14 feet 8 inches). Three masonry styles were noted in the walls of Kiva 1. Below the bench the walls were built of a Mesa Verde style. About the bench the walls were made of vertical sandstone slabs with scabbled and rough masonry between them. The southern wall was modified and rebuilt with tabular sandstone in a style reminiscent of Chacoan masonry. The six pilasters, generally 70 centimeters wide, were unevenly spaced and built upon the bench. The ventilator shaft is located on the south wall under the bench with a deflector stone located on the floor to the north of the ventilator shaft. Other features include
three niches, a clay-lined fire pit with a stone slab at the south, a possible sipapu, and three small depressions of unknown function. After abandonment most of the roof was probably removed and the kiva was used as a refuse dump (Miller 1976).

Surface Structure 2

Surface Structure 2 appears to have a Pueblo III occupation and consists of three adjacent rooms. The structure measures 9.3 meters (30 feet 5 inches) on the east and west walls by 2.1 meters (6 feet 9 inches) on the north and south walls. Room 2 was the only room that had a floor feature, consisting of a shallow fire pit. Very few artifacts were found in this structure. Adjacent to the north wall of Surface Structure 2 is a pit structure. This pit structure, Pit Structure 1, is small, 2.7 meters by 2.86 meters (8 feet 8 inches by 9 feet 4 inches) and about 1 meter deep (3 feet 3 inches). The fill was separated into two levels by a clay layer. The function of this pit structure is unknown. Artifacts in the lower level appear to be from the Pueblo I or early Pueblo II period while those from the upper level were a mixture of Pueblo I through Pueblo III. The pit structure was completely covered up at the time the surface structure was constructed (Miller 1976).

Kiva 2

This kiva is built in the typical Mesa Verde keyhole style just south of Surface Structure 2. Kiva 2 is 5.8 meters in diameter above the bench and 4.5 meters in diameter below the bench. Below the bench the wall was built of sandstone blocks reminiscent of Chaco Canyon style masonry while the wall about the bench is in the Mesa Verde style. Kiva 2 has five pilasters and a ventilator shaft located under the southern recess. Kiva 2 floor features consist of a deflector stone, fire pit, and sipapu (Miller 1976).
Surface Structure 3

Surface Structure 3 is a slab-lined Pueblo I habitation structure with a ramada located to the south. Surface Structure 3 consists of three rooms, each measuring about 3 meters by 1.9 meters. The exterior walls are made of vertical sandstone slabs plastered with clay and the two partition walls, dividing the structure, were probably made of adobe or early Pueblo masonry. The only floor features found were the postholes in each room. Artifacts recovered from the floor included a Chapin Gray Jar, an Abajo Red-on-Orange bowl, and a couple of manos. The ceramics noted by Miller (1976) are located in Table 2.5. Other artifacts which were probably on the roof of the structure include an axe, a maul, several manos, and another Chapin Gray jar. Surface Structure 3 was destroyed by fire and had a roof beam that yielded a tree ring cutting date of A.D. 752. The ramada had eight fire pits, four cache pits, eight post holes, and some wall alignments (Miller 1976). It is unknown if this Pueblo I habitation unit stands alone or if it is part of the village. If it is part of the village then there may be additional Pueblo I houses in the areas excavated in 1969-1970, 42SA971, and the area excavated in 1973, 42SA971-N. If there are additional houses then the village is much larger than the areas excavated.

Surface Structure 4

This structure was found near the end of the season and was not fully excavated. Surface Structure 4 is a Pueblo II storage unit consisting of two rooms; Room 1 measuring 3 by 2 meters and Room 2 measuring 2.8 by 2 meters. The walls are constructed of rough and scabbled stone masonry. Room 1 had two large pits in the floor, one of which was full of sandstone building stones (Miller 1976).

CONCLUSION

Analysis of field notes, plan maps, and photographs indicate the overall size and layout of Monument Village is large and complex. As there is no documentation of the unexcavated portions
of the site, at this time, there is no way to judge how much more might be there unexcavated and undescribed. Based on the excavated architecture, particularly the oversized pit structure (Component A) with the associated contiguous double row roomblocks, Monument Village appears to have a major aggregated occupation in the Pueblo I period and possibly early Pueblo II period followed by additional occupation in the late Pueblo II and Pueblo III periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.5. Ceramic Types, noted by Miller (1976:41), in The Pueblo I Structures at 42SA971-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Structure 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramada 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT

The intention of this chapter is to show how the Pueblo I period figures into the diverse prehistory of the northern American Southwest and particularly the San Juan region. Although there are many regional and even subregional variations in the attributes that combine to make up a period, there is sufficient evidence for homogeneity to warrant the use of a classification scheme such as the Pecos Classification (Kidder 1927), which is used as a framework for discussing the Ancestral Puebloans (or Anasazi). Following a discussion of the Pecos Classification scheme is a more detailed discussion of each cultural period.

In 1927 a meeting of Southwestern archaeologists at the first Pecos Conference held at Pecos, New Mexico formulated the Pecos Classification scheme (Kidder 1927). Although it has since been amended (Brew 1946, Morris 1939, and Cordell 1997’s amendments will be applied here) the general Pecos Classification continues to serve as the framework for discussing the prehistory of the San Juan region. This amended classification divides the prehistory of the San Juan region, or Ancestral Puebloan culture area, into eight periods: the Archaic, Basketmaker II-III, and Pueblo I-V. These periods are generally distinguished from one another on the basis of architecture, pottery assemblages, art, cranial attributes of human burials, subsistence strategies, and elements of material culture (Brew 1946; Chuipka 2008a). The original Pecos Classification only developed a sequence of cultural development; it wasn’t until developments in absolute dating methods such as dendrochronology and radiocarbon that temporal ranges were specified for each of the periods (Cordell 1997; Chuipka 2008a). While there continues to be debates as to the usefulness
of normative period schemes (Cordell 1997; Lipe et al 1999), and the exact dates associated with each period, the currently accepted Pecos categories and their respective date ranges for the San Juan region are summarized in Table 3.1

**BASKETMAKER III**

I will discuss the Basketmaker III period (A.D. 500-700) as it is a precursor to the Pueblo I period and is important to its understanding. The Basketmaker III period is characterized by the use of domesticated crops, the introduction of pottery, the introduction of the bow and arrow, and residential sites of pit and slab-lined houses. A change in subsistence occurs in the Basketmaker III period. While wild plants such as pigweed, goosefoot, sunflower, beeplant, and lubsquart are essential to the diet; along with seasonal fruits, nuts, and berries there is an increased dependence on domesticated plants such as corn, beans, and squash. There is also a decrease in hunting and increase in storage of food (Wilshusen 1999a, Baer 2003). As changes in agriculture affected the diet of the Anasazi, their settlement patterns also change. The typical settlement pattern of the Basketmaker III period consists of one to two households, around 5-11 people, residing in what is classified as a small hamlet. A hamlet consists of a domiciliary pit structure, usually a 20-25 square meter subrectangular main chamber with a south-facing antechamber connected by a short passageway and a common suite of interior features and type of roof construction, storage features such as covered cists and/or partly above ground storage rooms, activity areas, and a midden area (Wilshusen 1999a; Wilshusen 1999b; Chenault and Motsinger 2000; Kane 1986a; Baer 2003; Chuipka 2008a) (Figures 3.1 and 3.2). These dispersed hamlets seems to be located adjacent to deep soils, sources of water, and access to woodland. Throughout the broader San Juan region large hamlets or villages consisting of more than two households became more common throughout the Basketmaker III period and continuing into the Pueblo I period. These Basketmaker III large hamlets or villages may also have public architecture, such as very large
Table 3.1. Chronological Periods Summarized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paleo-Indian</td>
<td>10,000–5000 B.C.</td>
<td>Humans began to adapt to local conditions, intensively exploit a broad range of plant and animal species, and eventually mark the beginnings of a more sedentary way of life (Lyneis 1995; Eckert 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>5,500 B.C.–A.D. 1</td>
<td>Corn appears and subsistence patterns vary from foragers with some agriculture to farming dependent people (Lipe 1999, Baer 2003). Pottery is absent. The general habitation includes shallow, semi-subterranean pithouses with slab-lined entryways or antechambers or cists (Baer 2003; Lipe 1978; Matson et al. 1988, Wintch 1990). A typical Basketmaker II hamlet consisted of one to two households, although a few exceptional sites have an estimated four to seven contemporary households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketmaker II</td>
<td>A.D. 1–500</td>
<td>Use of domesticated crops, the introduction of pottery, the introduction of the bow and arrow, and residential sites of pit and slab-lined houses. Wild plants, seasonal fruits, nuts, and berries are essential to the diet with an increased dependence on domesticated plants: corn, beans, and squash. Decrease in hunting, an increase in food storage. Typical settlement pattern is a small hamlet of one to two households, around 5-11 people, consisting of a subrectangular domiciliary pit structure with a south-facing antechamber connected by a short passageway. Storage features include covered cists and/or partly above ground storage rooms. There are activity areas, and a midden area. Large Basketmaker III hamlets or villages may have great kivas. Artifact assemblages are simple and characterized by stone and ceramic artifacts. Stone implements include trough metates, small basal-notched arrow points, and grooved stone mauls. The dominant and diagnostic ceramic type is Chapin Gray. Other ceramics are brown wares, usually Sambrito Brown or Sambrito Utility and white wares, usually Chapin Black-on-white.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketmaker III</td>
<td>A.D. 500–700</td>
<td>Rapid increase in population, different architectural and ceramic traditions, and a shift to above ground pueblos and the first true villages. Change in site layout, with roomblocks to the north, pit structures to the south, middens south of the pit structures, and plaza work areas, hearths, ramadas, and other work features located between the pit structures and roomblock. Surface structures made of jacal-style walls, earth-and-stone walls, composite walls, and masonry walls. Dryland agriculture forms; corn is the primary staple and large amounts are being stored. Pueblo I ceramics show increased variability in manufacture, vessel morphology, and decoration or design styles. The ceramics are primarily plain gray ware. Neck-banded gray wares and red wares are introduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo I</td>
<td>A.D. 750–900</td>
<td>A rapid increase and growth in individual habitations, densely aggregated communities, and community centers; some of the largest sites in the northern San Juan region are Pueblo III sites. Changes in subsistence occur and turkey becomes very important. New and extreme behaviors compared to the previous periods including intensification of water control features, defensive architecture, local specialization of refinements in architecture and ceramics, formal chipped stone tools become less common, and increased hostility. Pueblo III ceramic pots have thicker walls and the surfaces are much smoother than previous periods. Bowl interiors and white ware jar exteriors are smoothed and polished. McElmo Black-on-white and Mesa Verde Black-on-white enter the white ware assemblage. Dolores Corrugated, distinguished the gray ware assemblage. Polychrome pottery is also introduced during this period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo II</td>
<td>A.D. 900–1150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pit structures called great kivas (Wilshusen 1999a; Reed 2000; Roberts 1929; Van Dyke 2007, Wills and Windes 1989). Several such sites in the Southern San Juan region include Cove Mesa, Juniper Cove, Broken Flute Cave, and Shabik’ eshchee (Wilshusen 1999a). While many large hamlets have been documented in the Northern San Juan region, none have yet been considered a Basketmaker III village and population studies estimate the regional population was only close to 1,000 people by the mid-seventh century with a possible rise to 2,000-3,000 people by the end of the Basketmaker III period because of migration from south of the San Juan River (Berry 1982) and a high rate of natural population growth in the succeeding generations (Stodder 1987; Wilshusen and Perry 2008). “Although the largest Basketmaker III settlements in the Northern San Juan region consist of no more than two to three households, the presence of large dance circles,
oversized pit structures, great kivas, and rock art panels all provide evidence of periodic ritual gatherings of 100 to 400 people. There are at least 17 known oversized pit structures, dance circles or great kivas that predate the early Pueblo I period in the Northern San Juan region (Wilshusen et al. 2008). These large structures have been interpreted as community ritual centers (Wormington 1968:65; Wilshusen et al. 2008)” (Chuipka 2008a:23). Work in southeastern Utah (Brew 1946; Dalley 1973; Camili 1975; Casjens and Seward 1980; Christensen 1980; De Haan 1972; Jacklin 1984; Keller et al. 1974; Lindsay 1978; Mohr and Sample 1969; Montoya 2003; Nielsen 1978; Nielson 1979; Nielson et al. 1985) and Birkedal (1976) provide more in depth information on Basketmaker III sites and possible communities. Grass Mesa, a large hamlet, with 12 pit-structures
dating between AD 700-780, and a great kiva, that postdates the Basketmaker III period, (Lipe, Kohler et al. 1988) may also be a village candidate but for now in the Northern San Juan region it appears that while Basketmaker III hamlets did in fact form dispersed communities, it was without the organizational component of large aggregations or villages (Chuipka 2008a).

Basketmaker III artifact assemblages are relatively simple and are characterized by stone and ceramic artifacts. Stone implements include trough metates, small basal-notched arrow points, and grooved stone mauls (Cordell 1997). A ceramic chronology for the San Juan area has shown that the earliest sherds associated with Basketmaker III sites are brown wares, usually Sambrito Brown or Sambrito Utility (Eddy 1966). The main dominant and diagnostic ceramic type during the period however is Chapin Gray. Gray wares are used for utility or storage vessels and usually comprise about 95 percent of ceramic assemblages at Basketmaker III sites. White wares also show up by the late sixth century and comprise about the other 5 percent of the Basketmaker III ceramic assemblages. The most common white ware being Chapin Black-on-white, which is also called Lino or La Plata Black-on-white and are typically found as bowls that are usually polished and painted (Wilshusen 1999a, Blinman 1986, Baer 2003).

**PUEBLO I**

Researchers working in the Northern San Juan have generally favored local period schemes like those of the Navajo Reservoir Phase Sequence developed by Eddy (1966) and discuss Pueblo I sites in the terms of Rosa (early) and Piedra (late) phases. The Pueblo I period however, is often divided into two sub-periods, to differentiate early and late Pueblo I characteristics. As mentioned, some archaeologists suggest simply two sub-periods: early Pueblo I (AD 750-840) and late Pueblo I (AD 840-900) (Wilshusen and Ortman 1999; Chuipka 2008a), Allison et al. (2012) divides Pueblo I, using ceramic assemblages, into three sub-periods: early Pueblo I (AD 750-825), middle Pueblo I (AD 825-880), and Late Pueblo I (AD 880-950+). While there are varying discussions as
to how the Pueblo I period should be sub-divided, for the purpose of this thesis I will use the two sub-period divisions of early Pueblo I (AD 750-840) and late Pueblo I (AD 840-900). In addition to the Pueblo I period being sub-divided into periods there also appears to be at least two types of village settlement organizations, a western and eastern pattern (Wilshusen and Ortman 1999; Chuipka 2008a) representing distinctly different cultural histories and ethnic groups.

The Pueblo I period (AD 750-900) marks a time of rapid demographic and organizational change of the Ancestral Puebloans (Anasazi) in the Northern San Juan. This period has long been recognized as a shifting from Basketmaker pithouses to above ground pueblos (Kidder 1927; Nickens 1982; Plog 1979; Brew 1946; Cordell 1997; Wilshusen 1991 and 1999b). “This “pithouse to pueblo” transition is marked by a change in site layout, with roomblocks to the north, pit structures to the south, middens south of the pit structures, and plaza work areas, hearths, ramadas, and other work features located between the pit structures and roomblock (Wilshusen 1999b:201). Surface structures vary in architectural building styles and some pueblos are made of jacal-style walls, earth-and-stone walls, composite walls, and masonry walls in their construction (Wilshusen 1988:623)” (Baer 2003:30). The importance of this transition to the prehistory of the Southwest cannot be over exaggerated, as it represents a turning point in the pattern of the way that the Anasazi people in the Northern San Juan region organized themselves on the landscape for centuries afterward (Chuipka 2008a). In the eastern portion of the northern San Juan region, this pithouse-to-pueblo transition is less pronounced until well into the ninth century (Wilshusen 1999b).

The most important difference from earlier settlement patterns is the formation of the first true villages. It is during that Pueblo I period that villages begin to proliferate and are common settlement feature by AD 840-880. During the Pueblo I period, regional population estimates based on site use-life, occupational dates of sites, and population density figures (people/square kilometer) can fall between 9,500-10,500 people. The rapid increase in population, different architectural and
ceramic traditions, and a change of village aggregation all point to cultural change in the form of migration of large numbers of people into the region during the Pueblo I period (Wilshusen 1999b; Baer 2003).

During the Pueblo I period the contribution of wild plants and animals, to the diet varies across the region. Dryland agriculture is believed to have formed a large part of the subsistence during the Pueblo I period and most studies of macrobotanical, faunal, and storage remains show that maize (corn) was the primary staple throughout the northern San Juan region (Wilshusen 1999b). During the Pueblo I period it appears most households attempted to store a significant amount of food, mainly corn, possibly preparing for drought (Wilshusen 1999a; Chuipka 2008a). “Corn is also found in field houses, which are usually found on the periphery of villages and closer to agricultural fields than major communities, supporting the notion that Pueblo I communities were controlling their resources (Wilshusen 1999b:231)” (Baer 2003:32).

Because of the intense excavations done on Pueblo I village sites there is a wealth of information on ceramic changes for this period (Blinman 1988; Wilson and Blinman 1993). There are three different ceramic traditions that exist in the Northern San Juan region, each having distinctive production traits and decorative styles. These styles include: the Bluff tradition in southeastern Utah, the Piedra tradition in the Mesa Verde area, and the Rosa tradition in the New Mexico San Juan region (Wilshusen and Ortman 1999). Even though most, 80-90 percent, of the ceramics found in Pueblo I sites are plain gray ware shards, the Pueblo I ceramic assemblages show an increased variability in ceramic manufacture, vessel morphology, and decoration or design styles from the previous Basketmaker III period. Pueblo I ceramic assemblages are also distinguished from the earlier Basketmaker III period by the addition of neck-banded gray wares and the introduction of San Juan Red Ware types. Ceramic assemblages for the Pueblo I period are distinctive in the western and eastern portions of the Northern San Juan region.
In the pithouse-to-pueblo transition period, pit structures continue to be built but they get much deeper (Bullard 1962; McKenna and Truell 1986; Wilshusen 1988a) and have more pit features excavated into their floors (McKenna and Truell 1986; Wilshusen 1988b). During the period that pit structures increase in depth, surface structures become more substantial in size and construction (i.e. rooms change from oval to square or rectangular and are joined into contiguous units, or roomblocks. The roomblocks include both living rooms and storage facilities (Brew 1946; Gladwin 1945; Hayes and Lancaster 1975; McKenna and Truell 1986; Morris 1939). Wilshusen (1984, 1988a) suggests that the reason for the changes in pit structure depth and form is that Pueblo I pit structures and surface structures are interrelated for construction purposes. Basketmaker III pit structures are excavated only deep enough to provide dirt for the construction of their own roofs. Pueblo I pit structures are excavated so that the soil from their excavation is used in constructing associated surface structures, as well as contributing to the roofing of the structure itself (Wilshusen 1988a, 1989a). Lekson (1988) suggested that pit structures in the early Pueblo I period may have been used as additional domestic space but Wilshusen (1986a, 1988b) has suggested the reason Pueblo I pit structures have more pit features involves a change in pit structure function to also include more important ritual features as these pit structures may have served as a place for integrating multiple household units (Figure 3.3).

Many Pueblo I sites have been recorded including Dos Casa Hamlet (Brisbin et al. 1986), a good example of a typical Pueblo I hamlet, and many villages including: Badger House Community (Hayes and Lancaster 1975), the Duckfoot site (Lightfoot 1994), Martin Site 1 and 2 (Martin 1939), Morris’ Sites (Morris 1939), McPhee Village (Kane and Robinson 1988), Grass Mesa (Lipe, Kohler et al. 1988), Sacred Ridge (Potter and Chuipka 2007), Alkali Ridge Site 13 (Brew 1946), and Monument Village (Patterson 1975; Miller 1976).
Figure 3.3. Typical Pueblo I pit structure domicile in the Northern San Juan region showing the typical features and configuration of the timber and earthen roof (after Wilshusen 1999b:Fig 7-3; Chuipka 2008a:Fig 4-1).

**EARLY PUEBLO I**

Even though site layout, architectural features, and artifact assemblages of the period vary with the locality (Matheny 1962) and at times may even appear contradictory there do appear to be some generalities within the pithouse- to-pueblo transition.

**Western Pattern**

In the western part of the Northern San Juan region, early Pueblo I sites are typically laid out in a north-south orientation, with middens to the south of the habitation unit. These sites are typified by adobe and slab constructed linear arcs of roomblocks that are two rooms wide,
with habitation rooms, as evidenced by hearths within the rooms, to the south and storage rooms
behind them to the north (Figure 3.4). Pithouses were typically square or rectangular with rounded
corners and had a ventilator system rather than antechambers (Wilshusen 1999b; Chuipka 2008a).
According to Wilshusen (1988) pithouses are excavated deeper and roof construction is based on
a four post design with secondary posts set into a bench to help hold up the roof. Hearths and ash
pits, ritual activity areas, and wing walls were also common features of early Pueblo I pithouses
(Kane 1986a).

Ceramics from the western region correspond to the Bluff and Northern San Juan Ceramic
Tradition (Piedra) and contain crushed igneous rock temper (Chuipka 2008a:31). The western
region ceramic assemblage is dominated by plain gray wares, such as the already present Chapin
Gray; although it does includes a large proportion of neckbanded ceramics after about AD 775.
Neck-banded gray ware types include Moccasin Gray and Mancos Gray (Blinman 1986). White
wares are dominated by Piedra Black-on-white beginning in the middle to late AD 700s (Hurst et al. 1985). Red ware percentages of the site assemblage varies throughout the region and generally make up less than 10 percent of the site assemblage but in Montezuma Canyon, where some red wares are believed to be manufactured, the percentage is much higher. Red wares primarily include the San Juan Red Wares, Abajo Red-on-orange and Bluff Black-on-Red, and other local red painted and unpainted wares (Breternitz et al. 1974; Blinman 1986; Chuipka 2008a; Baer 2003; Brew 1946; Forsyth 1972; Varien 1999b).

**Eastern Pattern**

Early Pueblo I period sites in the eastern part of the Northern San Juan region are more variable in their layout and composition. These sites are typically in a southeast-northwest orientation, with middens to the east of the habitation unit, although middens can also be located to the north or west. Surface roomblocks are almost always adobe and are usually only a single room wide. These rooms are generally storage rooms with domiciliary rooms being rare (Carlson 1963; Silverman et al. 2003; Chuipka 2008a:32). Pit structures in the eastern part of the Northern San Juan are generally circular in shape with bifurcated ventilator systems, benches, corner bins, and ritual activity areas (Silverman et al. 2003, Chuipka 2008a:32) (Figure 3.5). “While pit structures are found in close proximity, excavation has consistently revealed them to have been sequentially occupied. In many instances, the domestic space around pit structures is enclosed by a brush and pole stockade that separates it from the midden. Similar types of enclosures include cobble rings and arcs of cobbles and gravel referred to in the literature as “cobble aprons” (Chuipka and Potter 2007:222).”

The eastern region ceramics “correspond to the Upper San Juan Ceramic Tradition (Rosa) and typically contain sand or quartzite temper” (Chuipka 2008a:33). Gray wares also dominate the eastern region ceramic assemblage but neckbanded ceramics only comprise a small percentage of the total ceramic assemblage and are not present until around AD 800 (Silverman et al. 2003).
White wares are dominated by glaze-painted Rosa white wares, with lesser amounts of mineral painted Piedra Black-on-white wares. The red wares also generally only make up one to 10 percent of the site assemblage and primarily include Abajo Red-on-orange and Bluff Black-on-Red (Potter and Perry 2007:33; Chuipka 2008a:33).

**LATE PUEBLO I**

Like the early part of the Pueblo I period, there was variability between the late Pueblo I period sites and a western or eastern pattern existed. In the late Pueblo I period large aggregations were more common compared to the early part of the period (AD 750-840), however, many of these aggregations rapidly fell apart in the late AD 800s (Wilshusen 1999b).

**Western Pattern**

It is during the late Pueblo I period that above-ground structures become more common and formalized in layout, particularly in the western portion of the region (Breternitz et al. 1986).
The late Pueblo I sites in the western part of the Northern San Juan region are therefore an extension of those characterized in the earlier period (i.e. typified by arcs of roomblocks that are two rooms wide, with habitation rooms to the south and storage rooms behind them to the north. Like the earlier western Pueblo I roomblocks, the storage rooms are arranged linearly within the contiguous roomblock and one or two are associated with each from habitation room.) In the late Pueblo I period in the western part of the Northern San Juan roomblocks were mainly earth-walled structures with minimally shaped or unshaped stones, particularly in the lower walls. These sites are typically in a north-south orientation, with middens to the south of the habitation unit. Pit structures are square to rectangular with a single-hole ventilator system and most lack a bench. Late Pueblo I pit structure features include a central hearth and ash pit, deflectors and wing walls, and ritual activity areas characterized by small circular pits that may have anchored an altar (Kane 1986a:417-418). In the late Pueblo I period habitation units generally consist of 8-20 individual rooms and 1-3 pit structures (Kane 1986a:413). Most late Pueblo I sites in the western part of the Northern San Juan region also have oversized pit structures. These large structures generally contain more complex ritual-ceremonial features such as a roofed, rectangular central vault to the north of the hearth/ash pit complex (Kane 1988). There is considerable debate as to the purpose of these oversized pit structures. The characteristics associated suggest that most oversized pit structures served as habitation, work space, and integrative facilities (Kane 1988). The Duckfoot site, or 5MT3868, located near Cortez, Colorado (Lightfoot 1994) was occupied from A.D. 850 to about 880. The Duckfoot site is a typical late Pueblo I period habitation of the western tradition (i.e. arcs of roomblocks that are two rooms wide, with domiciliary rooms to the south and storage rooms behind them to the north). Duckfoot consists of 19 contiguous surface rooms, four pit structures, and dense midden (Figure 3.6).

The late Pueblo I ceramic assemblages in the western part of the Northern San Juan are more diverse than assemblages from the early Pueblo I period. “They are characterized by high
Figure 3.6. Map of the Duckfoot site, a typical late Pueblo I period (A.D. 840-900) habitation of the western part of the Northern San Juan region (after Lightfoot 1994:Fig 1.2 and Wilshusen 1999b:Fig 7-7; Chuipka 2008a:Fig 2-8).

frequencies of neckbanded gray wares (Moccasin and Mancos Gray), Piedra Black-on-white, Chapin Black-on-white, Cortez Black-on-white, Bluff-Black-on-Red, McPhee Black-on-Red, Deadman’s Black-on-Red, and McPhee Black-on-Red (Blinman 1986:74)” (Chuipka 2008a:34).

**Eastern Pattern**

The late Pueblo I period habitation sites in the eastern part of the Northern San Juan region, like their earlier counterparts are more variable in layout and composition than sites in the western area. Late Pueblo I eastern habitation sites have roomblocks that are relatively ephemeral and are associated with one or two pit structures. Following the pattern of the early Pueblo I period habitation sites in the eastern part of the region, surface roomblocks are almost always adobe construction.
and only a single room wide. These rooms are typically storage rooms with domiciliary rooms being less common. The pithouses are circular with bifurcated bent tunnels, partial benches, wing walls, deflectors, and molded adobe milling bins (Sesler and Hovesak 2002). Midden locations are variable in relation to the habitation unit. “Most roomblocks in the eastern part of the region contain fewer than 10 rooms and are often non-contiguous” (Chuipka 2008a:37) (Figure 3.7).

The eastern region ceramic assemblages from the late Pueblo I of the Northern San Juan region are also more diverse than assemblages from the early Pueblo I period but contain fewer ware types than sites in the western pattern. “Ceramic assemblages from the eastern part of the region are characterized by high frequencies of neckbanded grayware (Rosa Neckbanded and Moccasin Gray), glaze painted whitwares (Rosa and Bancos Black-on-white), Rosa Brown, Piedra Black-on-white, Bluff Black-on-Red, (Reed and Goff 1999)” (Chuipka 2008: 38).

**PUEBLO II**

The Pueblo II period can be divided into an early phase (AD 900-1050) and a late phase (AD 1050-1150). The Pueblo II period corresponds with the abandonment of Pueblo I villages and
a low regional population during the early phase. The early Pueblo II period resulted in a shift from large villages to dispersed community clusters (Nickens 1982; Winter 1976; Swift and Pwers 1983; Janetski and Wintch 1985). The “unit type” site defined by Prudden is representative of this period. Sites typically consisted of one or two Prudden units to include a series of surface rooms with a kiva in front of the rooms and a midden nearby (Matheny 1962; Lipe and Varien 1999a) (Figure 3.8). Domiciliary function was transferred entirely to the above-ground house and house shapes became rectangular in double-rowed rooms. Pithouses cease and are replaced by circular kivas, which are fully subterranean. Another architectural characteristic of the Pueblo II period is the increase of high investment masonry construction. Kivas include masonry lining, with four to six pilasters set on the bench and a deep southern recess, usually key-hole shaped (Lipe and Varien 1999a; Baer 2003). While early Pueblo II settlement is usually characterized primarily as small, single-household sites there is also clustering into larger village settlements (Matheny 1962, 1971;
two new architectural forms are introduced during Pueblo II, the tower and the cliff granary (Matheny 1971). Both are above-grade masonry features. Cliff granaries were constructed solely for the storage of vegetal food stuffs (they are nearly always too small for habitation), whereas towers probably served a number of functions such as habitation, signaling, observation and, perhaps, defense. Another non-habitation architectural class added during Pueblo II is water control features (Nickens 1982; Haase 1985)” (Wintch 1990:40).

The late Pueblo II period still consisted of small habitation sites, with an increase in the number of sites and communities consistent to the increase in population during this period, probably due to immigration accompanied by the apparent expansion of the Chacoan system into the Northern San Juan. Most sites are located in areas with a reliable water supply and agricultural soils. Some of these dispersed communities “developed a nucleus composed of a village-sized aggregate of habitations” usually centered around a Chaco-related great house or great kiva, or some central structure (Lipe and Varien 1999a:256). These great houses were usually the center of Pueblo II communities and most likely served as major integrative features. The large community centers in the Mesa Verde region, including southeastern Utah and most of the buildings at Chaco Canyon, in the Southern San Juan region, were constructed in the late period. The rise in population at Aztec Ruins in northern New Mexico around AD 1100 may have coincided with the appearance and increase of these Chaco-style great houses and communities in the northern San Juan region (Lipe and Varien 1999a; Hurst and Till 2002). The end of the Pueblo II period saw a decrease in building activity and by the mid 1100s, construction at Chaco had ceased and the population appears to have decreased again (Baer 2003; Lipe and Varien 1999a).

New types of projectile points and ceramics also appeared in the Pueblo II period. The Pueblo II period is marked by the addition of entirely corrugated vessels for cooking. Cortez Black-on-white and Mancos Black-on-white are added to the white ware assemblage and Deadmans Black-on-red to the red ware assemblage (Breternitz et. al. 1974). During the late Pueblo II period Dolores
Corrugated (Lucius and Wilson 1981) is added and design styles on the white wares change from Black Mesa to Sosi and Dogoszhi. Vessel walls also become thinner (Wintch 1990:40-41; Wilson and Blinman 1991).

The Pueblo Period classification continues with the Pueblo III (A.D. 1150-1300), Pueblo IV (AD 1300-1450/1500) and Pueblo V periods, with changes in layout, architecture, and artifact assemblages (Figure 3.9). Population increased during the Pueblo III period, peaking in the early thirteenth century, and then declined with dramatic emigration that left sites abandoned and the region entirely depopulated by AD 1300 (Baer 2003; Kohler, Varien et al. 2008; Wilshusen 1996). Abandonment of the region most likely happened as a combination of environmental change, subsistence intensification and resource depletion, adaptive stress, socio-political conflict and violence (most likely due to loss of cohesion and breaking into small competing polities).
Figure 3.9. Typical pit structure plans, Basketmaker III to Pueblo V (adapted from Brisbin and Varien 1986; Kleidon 1988:Fig 4.22; Lancaster and Pinkley 1954:Plate 34; and Mindeleff 1891:Fig 22; Wilshusen 1989:Fig 1).
4 Absolute Dating at Monument Village and the Ceramic Re-analysis

While there are few secure absolute dates available for the roughly 880 sites documented by Matheny (1962) and DeHaan (1972) in Montezuma Canyon, 38% fall within the Basketmaker III-Pueblo I time span based on architecture and cultural material (Patterson 1975). The sequence of the canyon seems to parallel the sequence found at Alkali Ridge, Mesa Verde, and other surrounding areas. The site patterning, architectural features, dendrochronology, and artifact assemblages from Monument Village suggest it had a primary occupation in the Pueblo I period, followed by reoccupations in both the Pueblo II and Pueblo III periods. One of the primary objectives of this thesis is to establish Monument Village, at least in part, as an early Pueblo I village (A.D. 750-840). The main focus of this chapter will be to address the dendrochronology and ceramic data. Site patterning, architectural features and additional artifact assemblages will be discussed in Chapter 5.

ABSOLUTE DATES

Absolute dates for the site include date of A.D. 752v from a roof beam in Surface Structure 3, the Pueblo I component of 42SA971-N (Miller 1976: 8, 29), non-cutting dates of A.D. 557, 581, 745, and 749, and two cutting dates of A.D. 755. The latter dates were received from 23 wood samples taken from Component F, a series of surface rooms; Component N, a round pit structure; Component L, a large pit structure; and other samples whose intrasite provenience was unknown. These samples were sent to the Laboratory of Tree Ring Research at the University of Arizona for analysis, yielding 7 dates (Table 4.1 for results). Patterson (1975:96 reports a tree-ring date of
Table 4.1. Results of Dendrochronological Dating For Monument Village, 42SA971.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTRR Sample #</th>
<th>Field Sample #</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Inside Date</th>
<th>Outside Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UWM-589</td>
<td>71.43.1043</td>
<td>Comp L, Sq 69</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>749vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-590a,b</td>
<td>71.43.1045</td>
<td>Secondary Level</td>
<td>PNN</td>
<td>618p</td>
<td>745+vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-591a,b</td>
<td>71.43.1045</td>
<td>Secondary Level</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-592a,b</td>
<td>70.72.1535.1</td>
<td>Comp F, Rm 4, South Wall</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>648+-p</td>
<td>755rB comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-593a,b</td>
<td>70.72.1521.1</td>
<td>Comp F, Rm 4, South Wall</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>652+-p</td>
<td>755r comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-594</td>
<td>70.72.1529.1</td>
<td>Comp F, Rm 1, South Wall</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-595</td>
<td>70.72.1523.1</td>
<td>Comp F, Rm 1, South Wall</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-596</td>
<td>73.835.384.1</td>
<td>Comp N, directly above floor</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-597</td>
<td>73.85.390.1</td>
<td>Comp N, on floor</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-598</td>
<td>70.72.1520.1</td>
<td>Comp F, Rm 5, South Wall</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>581vv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-599</td>
<td>70.72.1537.1</td>
<td>JUN No Date</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-600</td>
<td>70.72.1524.1</td>
<td>Comp F, Rm 4, SW Corner</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-601</td>
<td>88.164.151</td>
<td>JUN 476</td>
<td>557+vv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-602</td>
<td>69.3.662</td>
<td>Comp A, FS#23</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-603</td>
<td>88.164.150</td>
<td>JUN 618+-p</td>
<td>745+vv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.D. 821, but provides no additional provenience information and no record of the date could be located. The majority of the tree-ring dates suggest construction during the early Pueblo I period.

An archaeomagnetic sample was also taken from a hearth in Room 3a of Component B and dated to c. 920 AD ± 20 years (Patterson 1975:26, 96), although this date seems too late for the ceramic assemblage that is found in Component B.

CERAMIC REANALYSIS AT MONUMENT VILLAGE

During the Pueblo I period in the northern San Juan, several temporally sensitive changes in the frequencies of key ceramic types allowing ceramics to be used as an alternate dating technique. Patterson (1975) provides ceramic counts for Monument Village but uses a typological system developed by Forsyth (1972) that is not fully compatible with current typologies. Reanalysis of Monument Village ceramic assemblage was therefore necessary to make the data consistent with current typological practices and make it possible to use ceramic dating for Monument Village. To date, Mark Bodily, Brett Friel, and myself have analyzed ceramics from Components A, B, C, D,
and F. In 2007 BYU Field School lab class students also analyzed ceramics from Components E, F, J, K, and N. There are still however, many ceramics that still need to be re-analyzed and many of the re-analyzed ceramics which need further examination.

The reanalysis of ceramics from Monument Village, 42SA971, was divided into two parts: a basic analysis and a detailed analysis. The basic analysis recorded attributes for each sherd and identified sherds for detailed analysis. Sherds selected for detailed analysis were given their own lot number and analyzed individually. Sherds targeted for detailed analysis include rim sherds, decorated white ware sherds with an identifiable design style, identifiable red wares, brown ware, PIII or later, unclassifiable sherds, sherds with post-firing modification, handles, and anything unusual. Additional studies such as oxidation, thin-section, and compositional analysis, are also performed as part of the detailed analysis. At the time of this thesis, much of the detailed analysis remains undone. This thesis will primarily use information collected in the basic analysis and will briefly discuss some information gathered from the detailed analysis. The basic analysis discussed the attributes of ware, style, vessel form and part, post-firing modification, interior and exterior surface treatments, surface deposits, paint type, count, and weight.

As part of the detailed analysis Dr. James Allison examined several hundred white wares and gave type names to 125 sherds. Dr. Allison and I examined an additional 515 white wares and corrugated/neckbanded gray ware sherds to determine the type name; primarily, so as to identify later types that don’t come from the early Pueblo I occupation. The remaining sherds were assigned a type name based on ware, style, paint, vessel part, exterior surface treatment, and interior surface treatment (Table 4.2).

**MONUMENT VILLAGE CERAMIC REANALYSIS DATA**

The re-analysis of the ceramics shows the presence of Pueblo I through Pueblo III ceramic sherds. By far, the vast majority (96%) of the sherds come from the Pueblo I period and most of
Table 4.2. Criteria used for Assigning Type Names to the Ceramic Analysis Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Type</th>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Paint</th>
<th>Vessel Part</th>
<th>Exterior Surface Treatment</th>
<th>Interior Surface Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Red Ware</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate White Ware</td>
<td>WH, WW</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>IN, MB, OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate White Ware Unpainted</td>
<td>WH, WW</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abajo Polychrome</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusayan Polychrome</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moccasin Gray</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancos Gray early</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancos Gray late</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated Mancos Gray</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated neck-banded</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early corrugated (exuberant)</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated Corrugated</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate White Ware</td>
<td>IW</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early White Unpainted</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>NO, N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early White Painted</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>IN, MB, MR, OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapin Black-on-white</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedra Black-on-white</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mesa Black-on-white</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez Black-on-white</td>
<td>WH</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Type</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Paint</td>
<td>Vessel Part</td>
<td>Exterior Surface Treatment</td>
<td>Interior Surface Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancos Black-on-white</td>
<td>WH</td>
<td>SO, DO, BL, P2, BM</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElmo Black-on-white</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>SB, SO, DO, BL, P2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Verde Black-on-white</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>MB, MA</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P III White Unpainted</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N, NO</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P III White Painted</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>IN, MB, MR, OR, NIN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate Red Ware</td>
<td>RD, RN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slipped Red Ware</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>SL, PS</td>
<td>SL, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abajo Red-on-orange</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadmans Black-on-red</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>SL, PS</td>
<td>SL, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Gray</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapin Gray</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>RI, HR, NK, R, RIM, RP</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
those date to the early Pueblo I period. Most of the ceramics recovered are gray wares but red
wares, white wares, and a few various other types have also been identified. Gray wares are the
most abundant making up 78 percent of the assemblage. Red wares make up 15.6 percent and
white wares make up 5.7 percent of the assemblage. Table 4.3 provides a comparison of the wares
by component.

Using the ceramic data from the re-analysis I was able to determine a mean ceramic date for each
component (Figure 4.1). Mean ceramic dating is a method that provides absolute date estimates
that are usually close to those obtained from independent absolute dating methods. Mean ceramic
dating was developed by Stanley South (1972) and has since been successfully used throughout the
southwest (Cline and Cline 1983; Kincaid et. al 1983; Lerner 1979; Linthicum 1980; Mills 1988;
Miskell 1985; Warburton and Graves 1992). Mean Ceramic dating is based on the assumptions that
“(a) ceramic types have unimodal frequency curves; (b) ceramic type frequency curves overlap, so
that at any point in time more than one type is in use; (c) the date of a type can be represented by
its midrange date calculated from its first and last dates of manufacture; and (d) the mean ceramic
date (MCD) of a collection of typed sherds can be calculated by taking the mean of the type dates
weighted by their frequency” (Christenson 1994:298). After determining the various types and
assigning median or midrange dates associated with those types I was able to establish a mean
ceramic date for each of the components (Tables 4.4 and 4.5). These mean ceramic dates were
achieved by multiplying the number of sherds for each specified type by the date associated with
that specific type, added together for each type found in the component and dividing that number
by the total number of sherds in the component for a mean ceramic date of the component. Sherds
that could not be assigned to a specific definable type were excluded from these calculations. Also a
few later sherds occur within what are predominantly Pueblo I assemblages associated with Pueblo
I architecture. These obviously intrusive sherds were left out of the calculations. This process was
then applied to each of the levels or rooms within the components (Figure 4.2). Ceramics from
Table 4.3. Ceramic data by Ware for each Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mud Ware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Ware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Ware</td>
<td>7523</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>5194</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>5653</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>26476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early White Ware</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate White Ware</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate White Ware</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late White Ware</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10069</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>2942</td>
<td>3472</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>6526</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>6844</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>33806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Components J, K, and N were not provenienced to stratigraphic levels and were therefore viewed only as a whole unit.

The mean ceramic dates by component reveal that while there is some variation in the mean ceramic date, all of the structures appear to fall within the early Pueblo I period (A.D. 750-840). All of the surface structures appear to be approximately contemporaneous and probably had occupations in the mid to late 700s. It appears that Component K and J are the earliest, followed by the remaining components, with Component A having the latest date.

Component (Pit Structure) A was excavated in 10” levels, however, these levels were not always consistently used throughout the pit structure as features were found or stratigraphic levels were discovered. Thus, in order to view what was occurring I ran mean ceramic dates for each of these levels and found that they were all fairly similar and thus, I combined those levels (i.e. surface to 40”) and re-ran the dates. In this process I also eliminated sherds whose location was unknown or did not fit into the combined levels. Component A, the oversized pit structure, presents

Figure 4.1. Mean ceramic dates for each component at Monument Village, 42SA971.
Table 4.4. Ceramic Types with Midrange or Median Dates used in the Mean Ceramic Dating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Type Name</th>
<th>Midrange or Median Date (A.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray Ware</td>
<td>Chapin Gray</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moccasin Gray</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mancos Gray Early</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mancos Gray Late</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undifferentiated Mancos Gray</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Corrugated (exuberant)</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ware</td>
<td>Chapin Black-on-white</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piedra Black-on-white</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Mesa Black-on-white</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cortez Black-on-white</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ware</td>
<td>Dolores Red Ware</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abajo Polychrome</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abajo Red-on-orange</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bluff Black-on-red</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Deadmans</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadmans Black-on-red</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Mean Ceramic Dates by Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Mean Ceramic Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component A</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component B</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component C</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component D</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component E</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component F</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component J</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component K</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component N</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some interesting results (Figure 4.3). The highest number of sherds came from the surface area to level 40 where there were 4932 sherds, 569 of which were used in the mean ceramic dating. Level 40-50 also had a significant number of sherds, followed by the primary floor with 1611, 475 of which were used in the mean ceramic dating. Figure 4.3 shows that the fill of Component A dates earlier than the primary floor, suggesting that some reverse stratigraphy is occurring at Component A. This is also probably occurring as there are several wares on the primary floor whose median or midrange date is in the late 800s-1000 including: Moccasin Gray (37), Mancos Gray (106), Early Corrugated (19), Piedra Black-on-white (43), White Mesa Black-on-white (9), Cortez Black-on-white (15), Bluff Black-on-red (92), and Deadmans Black-on-red (105). The architecture of Component A suggests an early Pueblo I construction with a remodel in the late Pueblo I period. The primary floor has a mixture of material from this late occupation plus some earlier sherds from the fill.
Component B is a series of seven slab lined rooms but ceramic re-analysis data is only available for four rooms. Figure 4.4 shows the mean ceramic dates by room from Component B. All of the rooms represented fall within a tight range. At Component C, a coursed masonry, nine room roomblock, I would have expected rooms 1 and 6; 2 and 7; 3, 4, and 8; and rooms 5 and 9 to have dates grouped together, and while the dating is tight, within 8 years, the rooms are not grouped as I expected (Figure 4.5).

Figure 4.6 exhibits the data from Component D, Rooms 1-3. There was no ceramic re-analysis data from Rooms 4-7 of Component D. Room 1 of Component D has a much later mean ceramic date than the other two rooms. This date is probably not reliable due to the small sample (only 37 sherds, 4 of which were used in the dating including 1 Moccasin Gray, 1 early Mancos Gray, and 2 Abajo Red-on-orange sherds) compared to the other rooms (Room 2 had 952 sherds, 130 of which were included in the dating and Room 3 had 2252 sherds, 628 of which were used in the dating). In Component F, a continuation of Component D forming a crescent-shaped roomblock
Figure 4.4. Mean ceramic dates by room in Component B.

Figure 4.5. Mean ceramic dates by room in Component C.
group, there were no ceramics analyzed for Rooms 7 and 8. Looking at the mean ceramic dates for Component F in Figure 4.7, Room 2 has a much later date than the other rooms. Most of the rooms in Component F had assemblages that were primarily Chapin gray and Abajo Red-on-orange. Room 2 also had high percentages of these types, with 30 percent Abajo red-on-orange and 22 percent Chapin Gray, but Room 2 was distinguished from the other rooms by 42 percent of the sherds used in the mean ceramic dating being early Mancos Gray, to which the relatively late date of A.D. 925 was assigned. It is also important to note that the tree-ring cutting dates coming from Component F Room 4 dated to A.D. 755 but the mean ceramic date for Room 4 is A.D. 802. This suggests that the mean ceramic date for this room is too late by several decades, at least. This is because the majority of the sherds from this room (72%) used in the mean ceramic dating are Abajo Red-on-orange, and the date used for Abajo Red-on-orange in the mean ceramic date formula was A.D. 803. Abajo Red-on-orange was common by the A.D. 750s or 760s and the abundance of Abajo Red-on-orange at Monument Village probably causes the assemblages from the mid or late 700s.

Figure 4.6. Mean ceramic dates by room in Component D.
to have mean ceramic dates that are consistently later than the actual occupation date. Looking at Components D and F together Rooms 6 and 7 of Component F have mean ceramic dates in the late A.D. 780s, Rooms 2 and 3 of Component D and Room 5 of Component F have dates in the 790s, Rooms 1, 3, and 4 of Component F have dates in the early 800s.

The mean ceramic dates by room for Component (Roomblock) E can be seen in Figure 4.8. Component E Room 6 appears as an outlier although, most of the rooms in Component E had primarily Chapin Gray and Abajo Red-on-orange, Room 6 included about 20 percent Mancos Gray, to which the relatively late date of A.D. 925 was assigned. The abundance of Mancos Gray in Rooms E6 and F2 may result from use of those rooms in the late 800s, significantly after most of the other surface rooms stopped being used. Provenience information is not precise enough however to rule out the possibilities that the Mancos Gray sherds were deposited after the rooms were abandoned.
CONCLUSION

With tree-ring cutting dates of A.D. 755 and most of the mean ceramic dates ranging from A.D. 783-825, it can be assumed that Monument Village had a significant occupation in the early Pueblo I period. The presence of Pueblo II and Pueblo III ceramics in the analysis are most likely a result of ceramics from the later, subsequent occupations that occurred at the site. Accounting for architecture and ceramic assemblages it appears that Component A had an early Pueblo I occupation that was contemporaneous with the surface structure roomblocks and which were probably inhabited over a period of about 30-50 years from about AD 750-800. A later re-occupation of Component A is evident and most likely occurred in the late Pueblo I period.

Figure 4.8. Mean ceramic dates by room in Component E.
5  Putting Monument Village in Context

A village has been defined here as a group of 10 or more households or more than fifty people who live close to one another, have regular face-to-face interaction, and share the use of local natural resources and social resources. Village settings provide a means to socially integrate ethnically or historically diverse populations through a variety of types of political and social organizations through the use of integrative structures, particularly high-level, ritually specialized integrative facilities. The first purpose of this chapter is to establish that Monument Village meets the definition of a village. As such, this chapter will examine the architecture, population, and socially integrative features of Monument Village. The second purpose of this chapter is to compare Monument Village to other early Pueblo I villages. Wilshusen and Ortman (1999) argued that cultural diversity was represented in architecture, settlement history, ceramics, and demographic patterns in eight late Pueblo I villages in the Dolores River Valley in southwestern Colorado that were excavated as part of the Dolores Archaeological Project resulting in an eastern and western pattern. Chuipka (2008a) expanded Wilshusen and Ortman’s four fields into 15 comparable attributes in order to see how well the data conforms to an eastern and western division among villages in the early Pueblo I period. Chuipka compares site size, number of contemporary pit structures, pit structure architecture, roomblock architecture, the number of contemporary habitations per midden, and the presence of earlier and later components. Chuipka also examines enclosures, community structures, Basketmaker III components, post-Pueblo I components, evidence of violence, and ceramic ware types (Chuipka 2008:12). Not all of this data is available at Monument Village but the data that is available will be compared with information from other Pueblo I sites, particularly
Chuipka’s (2008a) results. The Pueblo I sites used in this comparison are Morris 23, Martin Site 2, Alkali Ridge Site 13, McPhee Village, Grass Mesa, Sacred Ridge, and Blue Mesa (Figure 5.1).

**MONUMENT VILLAGE**

Monument Village appears to have occupations in the Pueblo I, Pueblo II, and a Pueblo III periods. The settlement pattern, architecture, artifact assemblages, and tree-ring dates all indicate
Figure 5.2. Plan Map of Monument Village. Created by Scott Ure.

Monument Village is a village with a significant occupation in the early Pueblo I period (A.D. 750-840). The southern portion of Monument Village includes a small pit structure, an oversized pit structure, four associated roomblocks, and a midden area. The small pit structure, Component K, is 4 m in diameter containing a hearth and a four-post superstructure (Figure 5.2). Component A is a circular oversized pit structure that is 10.7 m in diameter with a floor area that is about 90 m² and exhibits a six-post superstructure. The roomblocks display a double row configuration. In looking at site layout, Monument Village follows the pattern typified by the early Pueblo I period of above ground, long roomblocks, which are two rooms wide, to the southeast of one or more pit structures, and a midden. Turning to the architecture, the domestic pit structure, Component K, is similar in style to other early Pueblo I domestic pit structures. The possible community
structure, or oversized pit structure, Component A also appears to be very similar to other early Pueblo I oversized pit structures in the region. It is the initial occupation of the primary floor with the numerous post holes around the peripheries and 6 post superstructure which closely resembles the oversize pit structures at other sites, particularly Alkali Ridge (Figure 5.3). Excavations in the northern most part of the site also revealed a slab-lined habitation structure with a ramada dating to the early Pueblo I period.

The excavated southern portion of Monument Village, 42SA971, appears to consist of 8-10 households and 45-50 people. This excavated portion of Monument Village just meets the minimum number of households/people to be considered a village and would therefore represent the smaller end of village sizes but none the less, would qualify as a village. These household and occupant estimates only account for the excavated portion of Monument Village. There are known structures that are still unexcavated and probably associated with the early Pueblo I occupation which would increase those numbers. If the Pueblo I structure from 42SA971-N are part of the village then the unexcavated areas between the north and south parts of the village most likely contain additional houses and the village is much larger than what is currently known and therefore, under the criteria of households/people, would easily qualify as a village.

Monument Village appears to have both domestic and community architecture as seen by the presence of the oversized pit structure, with its inferred use for community integration through ritual, in association with the surface structures, whose inferred use is most likely for habitation and storage. The need for a socially integrative facility suggests that the group of people inhabiting this site were not all closely related and needed a way to manage differences that came about on a daily basis through close face to face interaction as well as a means to manage shared resources. The early occupation of the oversized pit structure probably included both domestic and ritual activities. It is possible with the remodeling and later occupation of the structure that it became even more specialized.
Figure 5.3. Example of oversize pit structures compared to contemporary domestic pit structures at Alkali Site 13, Monument Village, and Sacred Ridge (adapted Brew 1946:Fig 30 and 34; Chuipka 2005: Fig 9.8 and 9.16; and Figures created by Brigham Young University Anthropology Graduate Students).
Chapter 4 of this thesis discussed the dendrochronology and mean ceramic dates which suggest a substantial occupation of Monument Village occurred in the early Pueblo I period. Further evidence for this occupation in the early Pueblo I can been seen in the other artifact assemblages found in excavation as well as a comparative analysis of Monument Village attributes with other early Pueblo I villages in the Northern San Juan region. As for the other artifact assemblages, a recent examination of the faunal assemblage in comparison to other faunal assemblages from dated sites also supports the idea that 42SA971 was occupied during the Pueblo I period (Bodily 2008; Calleja 2007). In both Patterson’s (1975) thesis and the excavation field notes there is discussion of Pueblo I projectile points being recovered and an overall lithic and stone assemblage representative of the Pueblo I period. Taking all of this arguments into consideration it is very probable that Monument Village is an early Pueblo I village.

EARLY PUEBLO I VILLAGES OF THE NORTHERN SAN JUAN REGION

Morris 23

Morris 23 was first investigated by Earl H. Morris in 1927 as a joint program between the American Museum of Natural History and the University of Colorado (Morris 1939). Morris 23 is one of the largest known sites that dates to the A.D. 760-840 period. While Morris collected a large and important body of data from his excavations, he never completed a map of the site. Morris 23 was mapped, ceramics examined in the field, and pit structures were located and auger tested in the summer of 2007 as part of Chuipka’s (2008a) thesis research. Chuipka (2008a) believed Morris 23 showes elements of both the eastern and western settlement organization types. Morris 23 consisted of 51 pit structures and one great kiva (Figure 5.4). The pit structures were organized into 28 habitation units, each comprising one or more pit structures that are accompanied by surface architecture, and discrete middens (Chuipka 2008a). Pit structures that appear to have been burned at the time of site abandonment and which lack trash fill were the most common. Auger testing
suggested that not all of the pit structures were occupied at the same time. Chuipka (2008a) states that the tree-ring samples yielded dates that cluster in the middle to late A.D. 700s, with three samples that yielded outside (near-cutting) dates of A.D. 765 and 761. Chuipka (2008a) also notes that the surface ceramic assemblage is consistent with an occupation ending before A.D. 850, suggesting the site was occupied in the late A.D. 700s and early A.D. 800s.
Martin Site 2

Martin’s excavations at what he called Site 2 revealed six pit structures, sixty-one surface rooms, and a large cist. Another small pit structure discovered during the end of the season was only partially excavated. The surface roomblocks were in three separate sections (Figure 5.5). The roomblocks were built in two contiguous rows with a pit house in front of the rooms. The pit structures at Martin Site 2 were mainly rectangular in shape although some were slightly circular and one pit structure, F, was completely circular. Martin’s Site 2 yielded 104 tree-ring dates (Robinson and Harrill 1974:14-15), including 15 cutting dates from the A.D. 760s, along with a noncutting date of A.D. 771. Allison (2008) suggested that Martin Site 2 consists of 15-18 households. Martin (1939) reports around 13,000 sherds from Site 2, of which 12 percent are red ware and about one percent white.

Alkali Ridge Site 13

Brew excavated 13 sites on Alkali Ridge west of Montezuma Canyon during the early 1930s which had occupations ranging from Basketmaker III to the Pueblo III period. Site number 13
was identified by Brew as dating to the Basketmaker III-Pueblo I period (Brew 1946). Associated ceramics and tree-ring dates the sites main occupation occurred between about A.D. 760 and 780 (Brew 1946; Chuipka 2008a). Site 13 was not completely excavated, but the portion exposed consisted of pit structures within four plazas bound by four constructed curvilinear contiguous roomblocks (Figure 5.6). A site map completed by Abajo Archaeology in 1984 illustrates two additional unexcavated plaza groups to the south of the four investigated and mapped by Brew in 1933. There are approximately 40 to 65 household suites of 25 living rooms and 130 associated storage rooms, as estimated by Brew. An additional 6 to 10 living rooms and at least 20 to 25 storage rooms appear to be present in the two smaller unexcavated roomblocks at the south end of the site (Brown and Davis 1984). Thus, there appears to be 45 to 75 habitation rooms and 150 to 160 storage rooms bordering the six plazas. The surface rooms at Alkali Ridge Site 13 were two rooms deep and arranged end-to-end to form arcs around the six plazas. The front row of rooms had the tools or features commonly associated with domestic activities and were interpreted as living rooms. The living rooms were backed by smaller rooms which stored maize, beans, and pinyon nuts supporting the notion that back rooms had primarily a storage function. 14 pit structures were found within four plazas bound by the large curvilinear roomblocks. Three of the pit structures (Structures H, I, and K) are similar to the shallow Basketmaker III type and may represent an initial occupation of the site as they were found beneath the roomblock separating Plazas 2 and 3. Eight of the pit structures (Structures A, C, D, F, G, J, L, and N) excavated by Brew are similar to the small deep Pueblo I pit structures elsewhere in the Northern San Juan region. Three of the pit structures (Structures B, E, and M) are large and deep and suggested to be oversized pit structures whose function was analogous to great kivas thus, having a function different than the associated domestic pit structures. The largest of these is more than nine meters in diameter. The majority of the village was burned at abandonment and some rooms were abandoned with items associated with their use left in place. (Wilshusen 1991)
Brew (1946) does not report sherd counts from Site 13 but states that the ratio of red to white ware “is better than 1,000 to 1.” Allison (2008) says that this probably should not be taken literally, although Brew’s excavations did recover large numbers of red wares and a few white wares. Spielmann’s (2004) study of the Abajo Red-on-Orange bowl distribution at Alkali Ridge found

Figure 5.6. Plan map of Alkali Ridge Site 13 showing the excavated and unexcavated deposits (Brew 1946; Brown and Davis 1984; Chuipka 2008a:Fig 6-3).
a tendency for concentrations to occur in the oversized pit structures or in the surface rooms associated with them. These surface rooms also contained a large quantity of milling equipment, possibly for the purpose of preparing large amounts of maize. It is therefore suggested that the oversized pit structures were associated with feasting (Blinman 1989; Porter 2000).

**McPhee Village and Grass Mesa**

The Dolores Archaeological Program (DAP) recorded seven Pueblo I villages. Two of these villages, McPhee Village and Grass Mesa Village, were intensively excavated and best exemplified an eastern and western pattern (Kane and Robinson 1988; Lipe et al. 1988).

**McPhee Village**

Between 1979 and 1982 portions of nine roomblocks and associated pit structures were excavated. The most extensive occupation dates to the late Pueblo I period (A.D. 840-900) but evidence was found to suggest the presence of earlier Pueblo I deposits implying an occupation that began in the middle to late eighth century. Unfortunately, the extensive later occupation obliterated many of the earlier materials so less is known about the earliest configuration of the site. McPhee Village consists of 31 individual household units, each with their own site numbers, but all viewed as a single settlement. Thirteen of the household units exhibited occupations that began in the seventh and eighth centuries. The two largest units dating to this period were McPhee Pueblo and Pueblo de las Golondrinas. The earlier occupation of McPhee Pueblo, designated as Element 1, indicated a 40 to 45 m long roomblock that was possibly fronted by three pit structures. The roomblock contained from 20-25 rooms, which were grouped in 8 to 10 two- and three- room suites (Kane and Robinson 1988) (Figure 5.7). Pueblo de las Golondrinas, or 5MT5107, contained two earlier occupations designated as Element 1 (A.D. 760-780) and Element 2 (A.D. 780-825). Element 1 had at least one pit structure with a floor area of 30 m² associated with non-contiguous
surface architecture. Element 2 was more extensive and consisted of four pit structures, a crescent-shaped roomblock with 35 to 40 rooms, and a midden. The rooms associated with Element 2 exhibited a front (living) and back (storage) room arrangement. Among the sites within McPhee Village within the early Pueblo I occupation there are conservatively between 4 and 11 additional pit structures present. The early Pueblo I period occupation of McPhee Village may thus have comprised as many as 20 households. Evidence suggests that households were clustered together in groups of 1 to 4 pit structures, each backed by common surface rooms that had functionally distinct rooms. It does not appear that oversized pit structures or other types of community structures were present prior to the late Pueblo I occupation (Chuipka 2008a).

Figure 5.7. Plan map of McPhee Village (from Kane 1989: Fig 11.7; Wilshusen and Ortman 1999:Fig 5).
Grass Mesa Village

Grass Mesa Village was also excavated between 1979 and 1983 (Lipe et al. 1988). Like McPhee Village the most extensive occupation occurred in the late Pueblo I period but evidence of an occupation that formed in the eighth century was found. The site had at least 28 pit structures prior to A.D. 850, not all of which were occupied at the same time; 2 were assigned to a broader phase dating between A.D. 600-840 while 12 were assigned to a phase between A.D. 700-780 and 12 were assigned to a phase between A.D. 760-850. In the phase dating between A.D. 700-780, there were 11 domestic pit structures and an oversized pit structure. The domestic pit structures averaged 19 m² while the oversized pit structure had a floor area of 50 m². The oversized pit structure was interpreted as an integrative community structure (Lipe et al. 1988). No roomblocks or groups of contiguous rooms were identified for this time period and little is known about the surface structures associated with this occupation due to disturbance by later elements. The phase between A.D. 760 and 825 consisted of twelve domestic pit structures, five of which had single pit structures with several associated rooms. The surface rooms were roughly contiguous but only comprise two or three rooms in a single row. The domestic pit structures averaged 25 m² while the oversized pit structure had a floor area of 49 m². There is also a great kiva during this occupation with a floor area that is approximately 400 m² (Figure 5.8). In the ceramic assemblage from the early Pueblo I great kiva, decorated wares were more frequent than elsewhere at the site, as were non-local gray wares. However, San Juan Red Ware sherds, commonly associated with early Pueblo I feasting, were not present in particularly high frequency within the great kiva (Allison 2008; Wilson and Blinman 1988). The early Pueblo I occupations of Grass Mesa therefore comprised 10 or more contemporary pit structures and at least one oversized pit structure and one great kiva in the later subphase. Surface architecture at Grass Mesa consisted of only two or three rooms in a single row and was less formally arranged than the early Pueblo I roomblocks at McPhee Village.
The examination of the 15 attributes found for the early Pueblo I configuration of both McPhee Village and Grass Mesa Village differed from the A.D. 840-880 configuration presented by Wilshusen and Ortman (Chuipka 2008a). During the A.D. 750-840 period Grass Mesa was more complex in terms of settlement organization. There were domestic pit structures, oversized pit structures, and a great kiva. By contrast, at McPhee Village all of the pit structures identified in the early Pueblo I configuration were domestic pit structures. Both villages had similar surface architecture in that they were straight or slightly arced and fronted by more than one pit structure. However, roomblocks at Grass Mesa were only a single room wide while roomblocks at McPhee Village were two rooms wide. Ceramic assemblages at both villages contained large amounts of San Juan red ware and relatively little glaze painted white ware. In the Late Pueblo I period Wilshusen and Ortman saw a marked division between red ware and glaze painted white ware. Unlike the other villages discussed here, McPhee Village and Grass Mesa Village were not abandoned in the A.D. 840s, but instead became more intensively occupied. “While there are differences between the early

Figure 5.8. Plan map of Grass Mesa Village between A.D. 700 and 840 (Lipe et al. 1988:Fig 18.1; Chuipka 2008a:Fig 6-9).
and late configurations of each village, it is evident that these settlements were structured differently from one another from their founding in the middle A.D. 700s” (Chuipka 2008:201-211).

Blue Mesa

Excavations on Blue Mesa have been conducted since the 1920s but the largest number of sites on the mesa were excavated as part of the Animas-La Plata Archaeological Project (ALP) near Durango, Colorado in 2002 and 2003. Blue Mesa is regarded as a single site even though the habitation units have been grouped and assigned individual site numbers. Prior to the ALP six sites had been excavated on Blue Mesa but only two were well documented and reported. A survey conducted in 1988 (Fuller 1988a) covered 366 acres and identified 46 sites, all of which appear to have been occupied during the early Pueblo I period. As part of the ALP, SWCA excavated seven sites on Blue Mesa. It is estimated that the early Pueblo I period occupation of Blue Mesa comprised 74 pit structures all of which had associated midden deposits and all but one had associated surface architecture. Wilshusen describes Blue Mesa as including 63 roomblocks and estimates a population of more than 600 people, although Chuipka and Potter (2007) suggest 200-300 people is more reasonable. While it appears that Blue Mesa had a major building episode between A.D. 790 and 810, with a primary occupation beginning in the middle to late eighth century and ending around A.D. 820, data suggests that Blue Mesa had at least three stages of occupation. The first stage consisted of widely scattered small pit structures, with floor areas less than 25 m², very ephemeral surface architecture and little to no associated midden deposits. The second stage, between A.D. 780 and 800, is marked by an increase in population with larger, more closely spaced pit structures, surface architecture, and more extensive midden deposits. The pit structure floor areas during this period are greater than 30 m² and the surface structures are contiguous rooms in arcs greater then 10 m in length and are one-room wide. The third stage of
occupation is a limited reoccupation in the A.D. 830s after a hiatus of more than a decade (Chuipka 2008a). To date, no oversized pit structures or great kivas are known to exist on Blue Mesa.

**Ridges Basin - Sacred Ridge**

Ridges Basin includes numerous small habitations that form several small, discrete clusters, and the Sacred Ridge site, which includes 22 pit structures within a 200 x 100 m area (Figure 5.9). Potter and Yoder (2008) provide more detail on the Ridges Basin sites, emphasizing architectural variation that indicates households within Ridges Basin maintained diverse social identities while sharing a local tradition distinct from their contemporaries to the west.

Figure 5.9. Map of Sacred Ridge showing the distribution of features and structures.
For the purposes of this thesis I will only compare the Sacred Ridge site from Ridges Basin. Sacred Ridge was also excavated as part of the Animas-La Plate Archaeological Project. SWCA conducted excavation at Sacred Ridge in 2003, 2004, and 2005 (Potter and Chuipka 2007; Chuipka 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008b). Investigations revealed 178 cultural features, 22 of which were pit structures. The site was divided into ten loci based on the distribution of cultural debris concentration. Nine of the loci contained at least one pit structure, remnants of surface architecture, and midden deposits. At Sacred Ridge, habitations are more dispersed, than the other sites discussed in this thesis, and in some cases, stockades allowed households to control access to rooms and outdoor work areas, making unintentional encounters with each other less likely (Potter and Chuipka 2007). It is worth noting how different the layout of Sacred Ridge is from Alkali Ridge Site 13 and the other western villages. The dendrochronological dates from Sacred Ridge reflect an occupation that occurred some time after A.D. 673 and continued to at least A.D. 803 although the data suggests that the site was intensively occupied around A.D. 740 and abandoned in the first or second decade of the ninth century. The ceramic assemblage was consistent with an early Pueblo I period occupation. Chuipka (2008) notes that three building phases of occupation were evident at the site. The early occupation appears to have occurred in the A.D. 600s or early 700s and lasted until about 750. The middle phase occurred in the mid to late A.D. 700s and involved multiple smaller pit structures and an oversized pit structure. Sometime between A.D. 780 and 800, the middle phase pit structures were abandoned, salvaged, and used as trash receptacle or left to fill naturally. During the last phase, large pit structures were built, often immediately adjacent to structures that had been dismantled. The Ridge Top Complex was also constructed on top of the knoll and consisted of a remodeled Feature 23 (a domestic pit structure) and the addition of Features 2 (a domed circular structure), 16 (a tower structure), 17 (an enclosure of vertical posts), and Feature 19 (a fourth pit structure). All of the in-use structures, including those of the ridge top, were burned and entirely abandoned by about A.D. 810.
If there was communal feasting in Ridges Basin during the early Pueblo I, Sacred Ridges’ four oversized pit structures with floor areas of more than 30 m² and its abundance of bowl sherds provide some circumstantial evidence. At Sacred Ridge, the assemblage with the highest proportion of bowl sherds is Locus 6, the largest pit structure at the site. Locus 6 is also associated with red ware ceramics. Red wares from Locus 6 comprised 2.6% of the entire assemblage while red wares accounted for less than 1% of the assemblages from other loci. The oversized pit structure from Locus 6 also contained a high frequency of painted white ware bowls that accounted for 27% of the assemblage while white ware frequencies in other loci comprised less than 15% of their respective assemblages. A variety of fauna that occur infrequently elsewhere at the site were also contained in the oversized pit structure at Locus 6. The other Sacred Ridge loci with oversized pit structures also have higher than expected percentages of bowl sherds but red wares do not seem to have been consistently important to the events in these locations. In Locus 1, there is a structure that could have stockpiled foods for communal feast, and, red ware is also unusually common (Allison 2008; Potter and Yoder 2008; Potter and Chuipka 2007).

At Sacred Ridge a unique type of community architecture was defined on the ridge top. Feature 16, the tower structure of the Ridgetop Complex was interpreted by Chuipka (2008a) as more than a single story in height. Chuipka (2008a) also notes that a GIS viewshed analysis of the tower demonstrated that it would have been visible to most other contemporary early Pueblo I settlements in Ridges Basin but is believed not to be related to defense, as a lookout, but as something to be viewed Feature 2, a circular surface structure that had a well-prepared plastered floor and appears to have had a domed, pole and mud roof, lacked domestic features and artifacts such as hearths and mutates and is therefore thought to have functioned as a storage facility, possibly for foodstuffs. “The inference derived from such an oversize storage facility is that Feature 2 functioned as a communal storage facility where large amounts of maize were cached, possibly for ritual feasting.” Chuipka 2008a: 162). Feature 23 was initially a shallow square pit structure with a four-post roof
support system, ventilator tunnel, hearth, and deflector which was extensively altered as part of the construction of the Ridgetop Complex. The alteration of Feature 23 consisted of disassembling the superstructure and flooring over the four primary support postholes. The ventilator tunnel was extended into the middle of the structure and appears to have been transformed into a passageway that connected the de-roofed Feature 23 and the interior of the Feature 2 domed storage structure. Feature 17, a C-shaped post-and-brush enclosure, partially enclosed the Feature 23 floor area that was exposed by the removal of the roof. The Ridgetop Complex has been interpreted as structures that were designed to be impressive to those within the village as well as to those outside of it. The ceramic assemblage red ware frequency of 2.3% at the Ridgetop Complex is similar to that of Locus 6. The Ridgetop Complex also contained a large amount of ground stone. With a pattern of artifact distribution very similar to Alkali Ridge Site 13s, which has been interpreted as evidence of feasting (Spielmann 2004), the Ridgetop Complex appears to have operated as a ritual facility. The construction of the Ridgetop Complex appears to post-date the abandonment of the oversized pit structure in Locus 6, which had fallen into disuse and was used as a refuse area by the early ninth century. This may reflect that changes in community ritual were occurring at Sacred Ridge with the possibility of exclusionary versus inclusive ritual (Chuipka 2008a).

**COMPARISON OF EARLY PUEBLO I VILLAGES**

The early Pueblo I villages discussed here exhibit some generalized similarities pertaining to several attributes including settlement patterns, architecture, ceramic assemblages, and socially integrative facilities. See Table 5.1 for a comparison of several attributes.

Pueblo I settlement patterns across the northern San Juan region include both small sites inhabited by one or a few households and more nucleated village. In most cases, the small sites probably were part of dispersed, multi-site communities (Wilshusen 1999:225). Five sites with tree-ring dates in the late 700s were investigated by the Dolores Archaeological Program (DAP)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Monument Village</th>
<th>Alkali 13</th>
<th>Martin 2</th>
<th>McPhee Village</th>
<th>Grass Mesa Village</th>
<th>Morris 23</th>
<th>Sacred Ridge</th>
<th>Blue Mesa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated # of households</td>
<td>8–10</td>
<td>40–45</td>
<td>15–18</td>
<td>20–31</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of pit structures</td>
<td>4-Mar</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit structure shape</td>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Rectilinear</td>
<td>Rectilinear</td>
<td>Rectilinear</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit structure vent type</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Single Opening</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Single Opening</td>
<td>Single Opening</td>
<td>Single Opening Single Opening Bifurcated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomblock Type</td>
<td>Double Row</td>
<td>Double Row</td>
<td>Double Row</td>
<td>Double Row</td>
<td>Single Row</td>
<td>Double Row</td>
<td>Single Row</td>
<td>Single Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Room-blocks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Middens</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosures around pit structures</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Monument Village</td>
<td>Alkali 13</td>
<td>Martin 2</td>
<td>McPhee Village</td>
<td>Grass Mesa Village</td>
<td>Morris 23</td>
<td>Sacred Ridge</td>
<td>Blue Mesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Architecturally distinct community structures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Oversized pit structure size</td>
<td>90 m²</td>
<td>64 m²</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>50 m²</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>~30 m²</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Great Kiva Size</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>400 m²</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Violence and perimortem processing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Earlier components</td>
<td>No?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Later components</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 San Juan red-ware</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including Dos Casas Hamlet, Windy Wheat Hamlet, Hamlet de la Olla, Rusty Ridge Hamlet, and Pit Structure 1 at Rio Vista Village (Brisbin 1986; Bridbin et al. 1986; Etzkorn 1986; Fields and Nelson 1986; Hewitt 1986) (Figure 5.10). While small hamlet sites did exist in the area at this time, it is the nucleated village pattern which is the primary focus of this thesis. Early Pueblo I villages of the Northern San Juan generally follow the pattern described for the single-unit habitations in that they comprise surface rooms, pit structures, and middens. However, the western-type villages are characterized by long roomblocks that are shared by multiple pit structures. Alkali Ridge Site 13 in southeastern Utah is the quintessential of the western mode of Early Pueblo I period village organization. Monument Village, Martin 2, McPhee Village, and Morris 23 also share many similarities, although none share exactly the same layout. The early Pueblo I occupation at Grass Mesa is obscured by the later occupation and is laid out quite differently than the other villages as it is much more spread out and lacks the long rows of contiguous aboveground rooms that typify the western pattern. In the eastern region, particularly in the Durango, Colorado area, early Pueblo I villages comprise clustered habitation units, each consisting of a pit structure, surface rooms, and midden. Unlike villages of the western region, multiple pit structures often do not share a single roomblock. Instead, multiple discrete habitation units are found in aggregations. Blue Mesa is often modeled as the eastern mode of village organization in the Northern San Juan (Figure 5.11). Sacred Ridge has been thought of as a classic eastern-type of organization, although it does not duplicate the layout of Blue Mesa (Chuipka 2008a; Potter and Yoder 2008).

While general comparisons of these early Pueblo I sites can be made, it is also important to acknowledge the variations within and among these sites and what those variations may imply. Chuipka (2008a:208-210) notes that variations in the villages in the northern San Juan are representative of ethnic identity at both the household and community level. At the household level, people were expressing ethnic identity in a manner that was private and public within the larger settlement through variation in pit structure architecture (i.e. circular and sub-rectangular
Figure 5.10. Plan map of Dos Casas Hamlet (adapted from Wilshusen 1991:Fig 6.1).
pit structures) or enclosures that defined the households. Cultural identity can also be seen at the community level as households were clustered differently within villages across the region in an eastern-type and western-type pattern.

Surface structure was also related to community level identity and would have been visible to anyone in or nearing the villages. Rows of shared surface rooms were found at Monument Village, Alkali Ridge Site 13, Martin Site 2, and to a lesser degree at McPhee Village and Morris 23. This suggests that a highly visible reminder of group identity was present within these villages while the individual units of surface architecture at Grass Mesa, Blue Mesa, and Sacred Ridge provided a less consistent signal of community identity (Chuipka 2008a).

Community structures appear to have acted as a means to unite differing cultural identities at the community level through rituals in oversized pit structures, and at the inter-community or regional level through great kivas. Oversized pit structures were found at early Pueblo I villages.
in both the eastern and western portions of the Northern San Juan region at Monument Village, Alkali Ridge 13, and the larger pit structures of Sacred Ridge. McPhee Village, Martin Site 2, and Blue Mesa all lacked oversized pit structures during the early Pueblo I period. Great kivas were less common and were only present at Morris 23 and Grass Mesa toward the center of the region.

One of the defining characteristics of the early Pueblo I ceramic assemblage is the appearance of San Juan Red Ware. It is clear that San Juan Red ware was important to communal feasts at Alkali Ridge Site 13 as well as at McPhee Village (at least by the late A.D. 800s). It also appears to have been widely used throughout Monument Village but particularly in Component (Pit Structure) A and Component (Roomblock) F at Monument Village. At Sacred Ridge, the association of elevated frequencies of bowls with oversized pit structures suggests the possibility of feasting there. The association of red ware with communal events is not consistent through the Northern San Juan region. Red ware does, however, appear to link people across the region.

CONCLUSION

This thesis reviewed the characteristics of the Pueblo I period in relation to village formation in the Northern San Juan region during that period and particularly at one site in southeastern Utah, Monument Village. A description of Monument Village was provided along with data to support the research questions: 1) Is Monument Village really, at least in part, an early Pueblo I village (A.D. 750-840)? and 2) If Monument Village is an early Pueblo I village, how does it compare to other early Pueblo I villages?

The first research question was addressed by describing and establishing a chronology for the Pueblo I structures excavated at the site. The site layout, architecture, ceramic assemblage, and tree-ring dates all indicate that the primary occupation of Monument Village is in the early Pueblo I period (A.D. 750-840). Most of the excavated rooms appear to have been occupied within a very short period of time in the second half of the A.D. 700s, and most or all were probably
contemporaneous. The excavated portion of Monument Village appears to consist of at least 8-10 households and 45-50 people.

As it appears the peoples of this village were mainly sedentary, having regular face to face interaction and presumably sharing both natural and social resources, an integrative facility would have helped to reaffirm social ties and integrate the community as a whole. This probably would have been accomplished through rituals in the oversized pit structure, Component A.
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### SITE 42Sa971 - FEATURE INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Recorder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Post Hole Depression</td>
<td>76&quot; x 1&quot; x 9 1/2&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>12H 3E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot; x 4&quot; x 5 1/2&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>12H 9E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sinuous or Post Hole</td>
<td>77&quot; x 9&quot; x 4 1/2&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>12H 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pit Depression</td>
<td>72&quot; x 9&quot; x 4 1/2&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>12H 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sherd-lined Clump of Clay</td>
<td>56&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>12H 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Circular Stone Arrangement</td>
<td>42&quot;</td>
<td>12H 3E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charcoal Lens</td>
<td>39 1/2&quot; x 11 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>4H 10E, 8H 11E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clay Lens</td>
<td>39 1/2&quot; x 13&quot;</td>
<td>4H 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lens of Charcoal</td>
<td>37&quot; x 9&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>12H 10E, 11H 12E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pit House Bench</td>
<td>60-62&quot; x 30&quot; x 13&quot; x 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>Entire Site</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>78&quot; x 2&quot; x 7&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>12H 8E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>78&quot; x 2&quot; x 7&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>12H 8E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 Post Holes</td>
<td>78&quot; x 2&quot; x 7&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>12H 8E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Storage Unit</td>
<td>73&quot; x 11&quot; x 15&quot;</td>
<td>12H 9E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Irregular Pit</td>
<td>72&quot; x 5&quot; x 9&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>Entire Site</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>72&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 9E</td>
<td>T. Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cache Pit</td>
<td>77&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 9E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>77&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 9E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lined Post Hole</td>
<td>77&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 9E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>77&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 9E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Post Depressions</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cache Pit</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lined Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>T. Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lined Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>T. Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cache Pit</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot; x 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>12H 11E</td>
<td>S. Young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Feature Record Form*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Recorder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floor 80</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lidless Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>11&quot;</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Cache Pit</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fire Pit and Deflector Stone</td>
<td>88&quot;</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>60&quot; x 87&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>77&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rodent Hole</td>
<td>77&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>5 1/2&quot; x 2 1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>77&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot; x 3 1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>10&quot; &amp; 6&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Twin Post Holes</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot; x 7&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>8&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Oval-shaped Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Miniature Deflector Stone &amp; Firepit</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>Rock 5&quot; high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot; x 9&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Large Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>20&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Shallow dish-shaped depression</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>32&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Shallow dish-shaped depression</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>10&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Rodent Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Small Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot; x 7&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Oval-shaped Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Small Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Small Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Small Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Feature Record Form
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Floor Ed</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Recorder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Small Post Hole</td>
<td>77&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>13H 9E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>78&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>12N 9E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>12N 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>12N 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>12N 7E, 11N 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>11N 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>11N 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>11N 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>10N 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>10N 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Post Hole - 79*</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>9H 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>9H 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>9H 7E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>8H 8E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>8H 8E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>7H 9E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>7H 11E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>7H 12E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>9H 13E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>10H 14E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>10H 13E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>10H 14E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>11H 13E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>11H 14E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>73&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>11H 14E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>11N 14E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Post Hole (Projectile Point)</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>12H 13E</td>
<td>D. Farry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>8&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>12H 13E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Enlarged Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>21&quot; x 19&quot;</td>
<td>13H 12E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>13H 12E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Floor BD</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>Provenience</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Enlarged Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>9&quot;</td>
<td>31&quot; x 19&quot;</td>
<td>13N 11E, 13N 12E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>14N 11E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>14N 11E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Post Hole (Pottery &amp; Flakes) - 79°</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>14N 11E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>14N 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Post Hole (Wood) - 79°</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>14N 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>14N 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>74&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>14N 9E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>14N 9E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>75&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>14N 9E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>14N 9E, 13N 9E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>13N 8E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>13N 8E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>13N 8E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Post Hole - 79° above horizon</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>9&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>13N 8E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Post Hole inside Large Depression</td>
<td>87&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>11N 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Post Hole inside Large Depression</td>
<td>87&quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>9&quot;</td>
<td>12N 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Small Post Hole</td>
<td>79&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>12N 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Oval-shaped Post Hole</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot; x 9&quot;</td>
<td>9N 3E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Small Post Hole inside Depression</td>
<td>80&quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>13N 10E</td>
<td>L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Post Hole high in Wall</td>
<td>51&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>