RESPONSE TO COMMENTS BY HARRISON

Carolyn E. Boyd, Amanda M. Castañeda, and Charles W. Koenig

In our article "A Reexamination of Red Linear Style in the Lower Pecos Canyonlands of Texas," we presented the results of an analysis of 444 Red Linear style pictographs from 12 sites in the region. Using this greatly expanded data set, we produced a list of diagnostic attributes for the style and documented stratigraphic relationships among pictographs through macro- and microscopic field analysis. We identified 38 examples of Red Linear under Pecos River style, a style previously assumed to be older than Red Linear. No Red Linear figures were identified superimposing Pecos River style. These results were verified by an independent group of archaeologists and chemists engaged in the analysis of Lower Pecos rock art. We concluded that Red Linear style is either older than or contemporaneous with Pecos River style. In Harrison's comments, he argues that our methods were faulty and the data inadequate to support our conclusions. We address a few of Harrison's critiques in our response; however, a more careful reading of the original article and supplemental materials is advised.

En nuestro articulo "A Reassessment of Red Linear Pictographs in the Lower Pecos Canyonlands of Texas" se presentaron los resultados de un análisis de 444 pictografías de estilo lineal rojo (Red Linear) de 12 yacimientos de la región. A partir de este gran conjunto de datos se preparó una lista de atributos caracterizadores del lineal rojo y se documentaron las relaciones estratigráficas por medio de análisis de campo microscópicos y macroscópicos. En 38 ocasiones se encuentran ejemplos de lineal rojo debajo de imágenes de estilo Río Pecos, un estilo supuestamente más antiguo que el estilo lineal rojo. No se encuentran imágenes de estilo Río Pecos debajo de imágenes de estilo lineal rojo. Estos resultados fueron verificados por un grupo independiente de arqueólogos y químicos que participan en el análisis del arte rupestre de los cañones en la desembocadura del río Pecos. Llegamos a la conclusión de que el estilo lineal rojo es o bien anterior o contemporáneo del estilo río Pecos. En los comentarios de Harrison se sostiene que nuestros métodos eran defectuosos y los datos insuficientes para apoyar nuestras conclusiones. Nos dirigimos a algunas de las críticas de Harrison en nuestra respuesta, sin embargo, se recomienda una lectura más cuidadosa del artículo original y los materiales complementarios.

Our article "A Reassessment of Red Linear Style in the Lower Pecos Canyonlands of Texas" (Boyd et al. 2013) is a reexamination of Red Linear pictographs incorporating a vast quantity of newly acquired data. As in any scientific field, dominant paradigms are often challenged through the acquisition and analysis of previously unexplored or unavailable data. This is just such a case, and we are pleased that it has generated healthy academic debate.

Most of Mr. Harrison's (2015) concerns were directly addressed in the original article and will not be readdressed here. However, a few of his critiques require a response.

Harrison (2015:201) states, "Some images within the range of Pecos River style paintings, if viewed in isolation, could be misconstrued as Red Linear by using the Boyd et al. method." Indeed, if viewed in "isolation," this could occur, but that is not our method. No classifications were made in isolation. As we stated in the article, Red Linear style is best described as a matrix of attributes, not a single color, size, body shape, and so forth. Figures classified as Red Linear exhibited *multiple* diagnostic attributes (Boyd et al. 2013:478). We also would like to clarify that we do not include "deer" as an attribute, as Harrison states in his critique. "Deer" is a zoomorphic

Carolyn E. Boyd ■ SHUMLA Archeological Research and Education Center, Comstock, TX 78837 and Department of Anthropology, Texas State University, San Marcos, TX 78666 (cboyd@shumla.org)
Amanda M. Castañeda and **Charles W. Koenig** ■ SHUMLA Archeological Research and Education Center, Comstock, TX 78837

American Antiquity 80(1), 2015, pp. 204–205
Copyright © 2015 by the Society for American Archaeology
DOI: 10.7183/0002-7316.79.4.204

https://doi.org/10.7183/0002-7316.79.4.204 Published online by Cambridge University Press

type. They are classified as such based on the presence or absence of specific attributes. Nor do we refer to wide-bodied anthropomorphs as "fat-bodied."

Harrison (2015:202) argues that our analysis should be rerun using what he maintains are more convincing diagnostic attributes, such as small "anthropomorphs with S-shaped postures, loop-line images, atl-atls with exaggerated mid-shaft circular elements, anthropomorphs with a phallus, anthropomorphs with round bisected heads, and stick figures with a wide leg stance." These are indeed among the attributes we used in our classification, although perhaps using different terminology (Boyd et al. 2013:464–466).

Harrison is correct that we did not discuss all published dates for Pecos River style. While the currently accepted published dates provided by Rowe (2004) range from 4200–2750 radiocarbon years before present, younger dates for the style have been obtained. Rowe (personal communication 2012) is concerned about possible contamination and has cautioned against using these dates until further radiocarbon studies have been conducted. The crux of our argument, however, does not rest on absolute dates for either style, but on relative dates. Out of the 444 Red Linear figures analyzed, 54 are in a stratigraphic relationship with Pecos River style. Thirty-eight of the Red Linear figures, all of which exhibit attributes Harrison identifies as diagnostic of the style, are overlain by presumed older Pecos River figures. The remaining 16 examples are indeterminate due to mineral accretion. No examples of Red Linear figures superimposing Pecos River style have, as yet, been identified (Boyd et al. 2013:472–477). Therefore, Red Linear is either older than or contemporaneous with Pecos River style, regardless of radiocarbon assays obtained for either style.

And, finally, as reported in our article, we invited a team of scholars who are knowledgeable in Red Linear and Pecos River pictographs to the Lower Pecos to verify our results. Each of these scholars, including Rowe (2004) and Mark and Billo (2009), among others, confirmed our findings. We stand by both our methods and our conclusions.

References Cited

Boyd, Carolyn E., Amanda M. Castañeda, and Charles W. Koenig
2013 A Reassessment of Red Linear Pictographs in the Lower Pecos Canyonlands of Texas. *American Antiquity* 78:456–482.

Harrison, James Burr, III
2015 A Comment on "Reassessment of Red Linear Pictographs in the Lower Pecos Canyonlands of Texas." *American Antiquity* 80:201–202.

Mark, Robert, and Evelyn Billo
2009 Pictographs at Hunters Shelter: Possible Extension of the Red Linear Style into the Guadalupe Mountains of Southern New Mexico. *Plains Anthropologist* 54:201–210.

Rowe, Marvin W.
2004 Radiocarbon Dating of Ancient Pictograms with Accelerator Mass Spectrometry. *Rock Art Research* 21:145–153.

Submitted September 16, 2014; Accepted September 17, 2014.

https://doi.org/10.7183/0002-7316.79.4.204 Published online by Cambridge University Press