CADDOAN ARCHAEOLOGY ON THE HIGH PLAINS: A REPLY

Thomas N. Huffman and Frank Lee Earley

The co-existence of Apishapa and Upper Republican-derived sites in the Pinyon Canyon area provides new support for our identification of the Wallace and Hobson settlements as Upper Republican.

La coexistencia de ambas sitios-Apishapa y derivados de Upper Republican en el área del Cañón Pinyon provee nuevo apoyo para nuestra identificación de los asentamientos de Wallace y Hobson como Upper Republican.

Our ethnohistoric approach may be contentious because it goes beyond physical data, but it is not full of false logic or errors. First, despite assertions to the contrary, we originally considered the Wallace (and Hobson) sites as Upper Republican. Withers (1965:7) and Withers and Huffman (1966:5) clearly state that identity. We were therefore surprised when Ireland's (1968) thesis changed the affiliation to Apishapa. Subsequent reviews that simply repeat an Apishapa identity at face value are irrelevant. Until our project, no one had reexamined the original field notes, plans, measurements, photos, and artifacts.

We thus welcome Krause's new ceramic analysis. The presence of Apishapa pottery, however, does not make the Wallace site Apishapa. On this logic, the Cramer site must be considered Upper Republican, rather than Apishapa, because it yielded several classic S-shaped collared rims (Gunnerson 1989:139). Moreover, the ceramic assemblage at the related Hobson site (3 km upstream from Wallace) includes mass modeled vessels, at least one with a red interior slip. These are Upper Republican features (Lindsey and Krause 2007), and we have no doubt that other pottery at Wallace is Upper Republican. Apishapa pottery there can be attributed to interaction.

Likewise, it is worth noting that Gunnerson (1989:130) thought House B at the Cramer site was a Plains-style lodge placed inside a circular stone foundation. This unusually large structure contained internal posts and a central fireplace not found in most Apishapa structures. The location of the fireplace is significant because it relates to the organization of people: central fireplaces facilitate the division of space into different social categories. In the case of historic Pawnee, different families occupied north and south sides separated by the kitchen (Weltfish 1965:76). Since Apishapa structures are usually smaller, and usually lack central fireplaces, they probably housed a single family. The Cramer site may therefore represent intermarriage.

Significantly, every house at the Wallace hamlet had central fireplaces. Our overall reconstructions, furthermore, are based on original field data: the House 1 complex unquestionably had a wall and rounded corner 3 m away from the central kitchen. This is a real physical relationship that remains true despite other criticisms. In addition, burnt daub lay inside the kitchen area, while more daub lay inside the north wall. Unless a round house is intentionally pushed over, it collapses inwardly along weak zones, such as the roof-wall junction. The daub inside the kitchen, therefore, fell from the roof around the central smoke hole, while the daub to the north fell from

Thomas N. Huffman ■ University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa (Thomas.huffman@wits.ac.za)
Frank Lee Earley ■ Arapahoe Community College (retired), Littleton, CO, 80107.

American Antiquity 80(4), 2015, pp. 779–780
Copyright © 2015 by the Society for American Archaeology
DOI: 10.7183/0002-7316.80.4.779

https://doi.org/10.7183/0002-7316.80.4.779 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the sides or roof of a semi-rectangular structure. This is not the size, shape, or layout of a typical Apishapa house. The daub outside the kitchen of House 7 shows that this structure too had to have been larger and more substantial: this is another conclusion based on field data and physical principles. House 5, incidentally, faces east of true north (magnetic north is not the relevant datum). Our forthcoming geophysical survey should determine the shapes and orientations of the Wallace structures.

We emphasize spatial organization more than artifacts because it is a window into worldview (following Rapoport 1969). Because worldview is a cultural phenomenon, it must first be defined in cultural terms, not artifacts. We accept the reasonable proposition that Upper Republican people were some of the ancestors of historic Pawnee. This is why we extracted general principles from their ethnography and then applied the principles to the Wallace hamlet. This is normal scientific practice, not circular reasoning.

Artifacts are nevertheless important. CRM work in the Pinyon Canyon area provides an important example. Here, local raw material, such as grey quartzites, argillite (hornfels) and fine-grained basalts, dominate Apishapa lithic assemblages, and these sites typically occupy canyon rims overlooking arable alluvium (Mark Owens, Stell Environmental, personal communication 2015). Barnes sites, on the other hand, are located in an open upland zone in the same landscape, while exotics, such as colored quartzites, colored cherts, and Black Forest silicified wood (BWSF), dominate the lithics. It is significant that this same range of raw material characterizes the Wallace and Hobson assemblages (BWSF outcrops in the Palmer Divide just north of Colorado Springs). Moreover, according to Krause's analysis (Lindsey and Krause 2007), Barnes ceramic types represent a local development from an Upper Republican base. This is a critical conclusion. Upper Republican-derived types and exotic lithics presuppose an association with Upper Republican settlements to the north. From this perspective, Barnes sites were probably summer hunting camps attached to more permanent settlements, such as those in the Arkansas Valley.

The Wallace and Hobson sites, we argue, represent a wedge of Upper Republican people into an otherwise Apishapa area. Regardless of the distance, this interpretation explains the Wallace complex better than an Apishapa affiliation. It also provides a framework to interpret different types of interaction, as well as new data about special purpose sites. These are the relevant criteria for judging new interpretations.

Supplemental Materials. Supplemental materials are linked to the online version of the paper, accessible via the SAA member login at www.saa.org/members-login.

Supplemental Comments.

References Cited

Gunnerson, James H.
1989 Apishapa Canyon Archaeology: Excavations at the Cramer, Snake Blakeslee and Nearby Sites. *Reprints in Anthropology* 41:1–290.

Ireland, Stephen K.
1968 Five Apishapa Focus Sites in the Arkansas Valley, Colorado. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Denver.

Lindsey, Roche M., and Richard A. Krause
2007 Assessing Plains Village Mobility Patterns on the Central High Plains. In *Plains Village Archaeology: Bison-Hunting Farmers in the Central and Northern Plains*, edited by Stanley A. Ahler and Marvin Kay, pp. 96-104. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Rapoport, Amos
1969 *House Form and Culture*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Weltfish, Gene
1965 *The Lost Universe*. Ballantine Books, New York.

Withers, Arnold M.
1965 *Archaeological Survey of the Sugarloaf, Twin Lakes and Pueblo Reservoirs, Colorado, 1964*. Anthropology Department, University of Denver. Submitted to National Park Service. Copies available from the Colorado Preservation Office, Denver.

Withers, Arnold M., and Thomas Huffman
1966 *Archaeological Survey of the Pueblo Reservoir, Colorado, 1965*. Anthropology Department, University of Denver. Submitted to National Park Service. Copies available from the Colorado Preservation Office, Denver.

Submitted June 12, 2015; Accepted June 26, 2015.

https://doi.org/10.7183/0002-7316.80.4.779 Published online by Cambridge University Press