

Vol. 5 No. 4 1978

LA TIERRA

2 -

0.

0

Quarterly Journal of the Southern Texas Archaeological Association

Volume 5, Number 4	
October, 1978	Jimmy L. Mitchell Journal Editor
DEDICATION	1
CONTRIBUTED PAPERS	
A PREHISTORIC ROCKSHELTER IN KERR COUNTY (J. B. Sollberger)	, TEXAS
THREE SITES IN ATASCOSA COUNTY, TEXAS (J. B. Sollberger)	7
A NEW TYPE OF ARROW POINT WITH SPECULATI ITS ORIGIN (J. B. Sollberger)	ONS AS TO
NOTES ON THE EDWARDS ARROW POINT TYPE (Thomas R. Hester)	••••••
A SITE WITH EDWARDS POINTS IN BANDERA COUL (Tom S. Beasley)	NTY, TEXAS
THE TURTLE CREEK PHASE: AN INITIAL LATE F COMPONENT IN SOUTHERN TEXAS (J. L. Mit	PREHISTORIC chell) 32
BIBLIOGRAPHY	••••••

Officers of the Association

J. T. (Tom) Saunders, 502 Arcadia, San Antonio (Chairman) E. S. (Ned) Harris, 2158 W. Kings Highway, S. A. (Vice Chairman) Nancy E. Smith, 103 Canyon View, San Antonio (Secretary) Paul J. Cook, 5227 Fair Ridge, San Antonio (Treasurer)

La Tierra is distributed quarterly to members of the STAA. Single copies of past issues or special publications are available for sale at the quarterly meetings or by mail from: Shirley Van der Veer, 123 E. Crestline, San Antonio, 78201.

For membership information, contact: Elizabeth (Liz) Smith, 1607 W. Huisache, San Antonio, 78201 (735-2306).

For use of the STAA Lending Library, contact: Ned Harris (733-0498).

Contributions to this non-profit organization are tax deductible.

Manuscripts for the Journal should be sent to: Jimmy L. Mitchell, Route 1, Box 32A, Atascosa, Texas, 78002.



J. B. SOLLBERGER

This issue is dedicated to the honor of Mr. J. B. Sollberger of Dallas, in recognition of his pioneering work in the development of the archaeology of South Texas. Solly has been surveying, collecting, studying, thinking, and writing about South Texas artifacts since 1934 and has made major contributions to our understanding of the cultural developments of this area. Since his works have appeared in <u>The Record</u>, publication of the Dallas Archeological Society, they have not always received the readership in South Texas that they deserve. For this reason, this issue begins with reprints of three of the Sollberger papers which will sample his work across the years.

Our thanks to the Dallas Archeological Society and <u>The Record</u> (Toni Turner, Editor) for their permission to reprint articles and for their support in putting together this issue. Our thanks also to Dr. Tom Hester and the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory, Austin, for making copies of the earlier Sollberger papers available for use in this issue.

J. B. Sollberger

Goat Bluff is located in the southwestern part of Kerr County. The terrain is the rough Edwards Plateau region, known locally as the "Hill Country". In the bluff is a sheltered area, by virtue of an upper ledge of limestone protruding out some ten feet or more. The sheltered area is about forty feet long. Many large slabs of the overhang have fallen to the floor. This has prevented a continuous excavation of the floor.

The first test pit was dug after removing about 12 inches of goat manure. This pit was two feet wide by three feet long and was dug to a depth of thirty inches. The top eight inches contained many flint chips, fragments of bone, shattered mussel shells, bits of charcoal and ashes; all mixed in a reddish black soil. The lower twenty-two inches were almost pure ashes but contained limestone slabs from the roof of the shelter, fragments of charcoal, and a large number of flint flakes.

I next removed the goat droppings from an area three feet six inches by eight feet in the center of the shelter and sifted the top eight inches through a screen. Test holes showed mostly ashes and roof slabs to be continuous under the top eight inches of cultural material. No artifacts were found in the ash bed, but numerous large to small flint flakes were present.

In that no other sizeable area was exposed due to the litter of fallen ceiling, I decided to trench under one of the large fallen slabs to determine if it had fallen before or after Indian occupation. Artifacts were recovered from under the slab, but the ash bed did not appear. Therefore, the shelter was occupied before the overhang fell.

There was no indication of stratification. Artifacts were most numerous in the top three inches but types extended down to the top of the ash bed. A total of ninety-six items were recovered. Types are illustrated full size in Figures 1 through 3. Circled numbers indicate totals of types recovered.

The artifacts recovered from the Goat Bluff shelter people places them in an intermediate position in the local cultural sequence; they were a people who used the spear and atlatl as well as the bow. Directly above the shelter (on top of the bluff) is a burnt rock mound village area containing two burnt rock mounds. I have collected several hundred lithic artifacts from this open camp site; only one was a small arrow point (<u>Perdiz</u>). Considering this one <u>Perdiz</u> to be out of place, a people using only the atlatl seemed to have occupied the site above the shelter. The shelter people, in comparison, used 72 percent arrowpoints and only 28 percent dart or spear points. This strongly suggests that the atlatl had been nearly outmoded in the shelter people's time; or that users had adopted the cane arrow tipped with a foreshaft and small arrowpoint.

The basis of the intermediate position in time of these bow-using people is the total absence of the Perdiz arrowpoint type in the shelter remains.

4

* Reprinted from THE RECORD, Vol. 8, No. 3, December 1949, with the permission of the Dallas Archeological Society.



Figure 1. Goat Bluff Shelter - Bone & Antler Artifacts; Flint Knives. Scale = Full Size



Figure 2. Goat Bluff Shelter - Dart Points. Scale = Full Size.



Figure 3. Goat Bluff Shelter - Arrow Points. Scale = Full Size.

In that the Toyah Focus of the historic Jumano ((Ed. note: or Tonkawa see Suhm 1960)) has been established as the carriers of the <u>Perdiz</u> point and that this point is present in the upper levels of nearby burnt rock mounds sufficient in numbers to show only an early contact but not a focus, it seems reasonable that the latest burnt rock mounds of this area might date around 1450 AD (Kelley n. d.), that the Goat Bluff shelter people were pre-1400 AD, and that the burnt rock mounds of the area containing no small arrowpoints must antedate the occupation of the Goat Bluff shelter.

SUMMARY

The Goat Bluff shelter people seem to have been an extension, if not a continuous development, of the earlier ((Archaic)) burnt rock mound people because of the lack of influence exerted on their dart and arrowpoint forms. If the sequence of heavy lance, throwing spear, atlatl, bow with large solid arrow followed by a cane arrow with a small diameter wooden foreshaft tipped with a small arrowpoint is the order of weapon development, then each stage is here being accompanied by a stepping down in size of a similar, basically designed point. A continuity thereby seems to be reasonably established.

It further seems that the occupants left the Goat Bluff shelter in pre-Toyah Focus times because of the lack of <u>Perdiz</u> arrowpoints. It would also appear that the people continued living in the local area as burnt rock mound builders as evidenced by Lamb's Creek Mound (Sollberger 1948). Here the <u>Perdiz</u> point was found in the upper level of the mound in small numbers, associated with arrowpoints practically identical with points from Goat Bluff (illustrated in Figure 3). Further work in this vicinity is contemplated, especially in nearby shelter sites, for additional comparisons.

References*

* See consolidated bibliography at the end of this issue.

J. B. Sollberger

I have prepared four figures and one table of full size line tracings of artifacts collected from three sites in Atascosa County, Texas. Site I is located at the juncture of White Brush Creek and the Atascosa River. Site II is approximately one mile upstream of White Brush Creek. Site III is approximately one and one-half miles southwest of Site I.

This area of Texas being unfamiliar to most of us (I got lost afoot in the dense White Brush and mesquite on each of my two trips to this vicinity), I will attempt to describe the country. The soil adjacent to the water course is sandy. Light colored tight gravel-bearing soil is prevalent on the slopes and rounding hills, while the flatter topped mesa-like prominances have a more grey to dark dirt. The only apparent industry is ranching and beekeeping.

The lithic artifacts from Atascosa sites I and II contrast sharply with our East Fork of the Trinity grainy quartzites and cherty materials -- in Sites I and II the favored material of the vicinity being bar-like grained or laminated nodules of crusted or patinated quartz. The colors vary from translucent glass, pink amber, to glossy opaque brown. The better made arrow points and small darts of this material are gem like in beauty. The larger dart points and knives are made of good quality dark grey flint with some light, to white, and a few fine blue flints. Also, petrified palmetto, dull opaque, to agatized, was used. I failed to locate the source of the flint. It seems not of local origin.

These sites are all in virgin mesquite and White Brush timber. The total classifiable artifacts (154) are all surface finds. That is, surface on the higher ground and from the bottoms and sides of washes, sometimes 10 feet deep at the lower levels of the sites.

Site III offers a puzzle in that only triangular darts and flakes were found there. See Figures 1 and 2. (The bottom row of Figure 2 belongs to Sites I and II.) However, Site III types are present on Sites I and II, but only in scant quantity; additionally, in the quartz material, which was not found to be used in Site III.

Figures 3 and 4 are specimens from Sites I and II. Here, a very few quite small fragments of pottery were observed but not collected. In Figure 4 the larger corner-tang knife was found at the bottom of a wash about seven feet deep. The piece had been freshly broken by a cow's hoof. The imprint of the missing point was plain in the muddy caliche, but the broken point clung to the mud on the cow's hoof and I was unable to find it. The other cornertang piece, Figure 4, is worked from an older patinated piece. The newer I flaking is prominent and the piece has a bogus appearance. The stemmed scraper, Figure 4, Site I, is the only scraper from the three sites. This certainly must represent poor sampling on my part.

A bone awl, $3 \frac{1}{2}$ inches long (not shown) broken at the butt end was found at Site II. The bone is badly cracked longitudinally, but still smooth, white and intact.

^{*} Reprinted from THE RECORD, Vol. 9, No. 3, Jan.-Feb., 1951, with the permission of the Dallas Archeological Society.



Figure 1. Artifacts from Site III, Atascosa County, Texas.



Figure 2. Artifacts from Site III (Rows 1 and 2), and Sites I and II (Row 3). Atascosa County, Texas.



Figure 3. Artifacts from Sites I and II, Atascosa County, Texas.



Figure 4. Artifacts from Sites I and II, Atascosa County, Texas.

In Figure 3, lower left artifact, the number "10" indicates ten artifacts, whole and broken, of that type, were found. Other numbers on the figures indicate the number of artifacts of that type.

None of the artifacts seem to have sanded or smoothed stems or bases. None appear to have parallel, oblique or opposed chipping. The triangular darts with straight or nearly straight sides (Figure 2, center row) seem to have purposely thinned bases. On these, one or more long flakes from either side have been taken off the bases towards the points with the result that in some cases, the thickest part of the point is at, or forward of the midsection of the point. This does not, however, suggest Folsom, or give a fluted appearance. If there was any stratification or depth in occupation I failed to observe it in the deep washes. Artifacts found in such, appear to have washed in, or the soil washed away, leaving the artifacts at lower elevations. No evidence of white contact was indicated to me. The widely found dart type (Figure 4, lower left corner) is here as elsewhere, characterized by unusual thinness for combined length and breadth.

These Atascosa River artifacts, to me, seem to be more related in form, to the more westerly Early Recent types, than the later Eastern to North Texas examples. Also several features of "Early man" points as already mentioned, are seemingly absent. Therefore, relative age and identifications of these sites shall be left for the more qualified than I to estimate.

Bone awl	Site II	1	
Arrow points	Sites I and II	44	
Scrapers	Site I	1	
Corner Tang knives	Site I	2	
Drills	Site I	1	
Dart points Stemmed, barbed, etc.	Sites I and II	49	
Dart points, triangular [*] All styles including knives	Sites I, II, and III	56	
TOTAL CLASSIFIABLE ARTIFAC	CTS	154	

* Approximately eleven of this total are from Sites I and I, the remainder Site III

Table 1. Classifiable artifacts from Sites I, II and III, Atascosa County.

A NEW TYPE OF ARROW POINT WITH SPECULATIONS AS TO ITS ORIGIN *

J. B. Sollberger

ABSTRACT

An arrow point of bold and distinct form has been excavated from rockshelters and a single burnt rock mount from Kerr County, Texas. I assign the name, Type <u>Edwards</u> Arrow Point, because it is so similar to several of the late Edwards Plateau Aspect Archaic dart types. This <u>Edwards</u> Type Arrow Point is the dominant and, apparently, the initial type, in the Kerr County region of the Edwards Plateau of Texas.

THE EDWARDS TYPE ARROW POINT

The purpose of this paper is to present a type name to a definite type of arrow point, and to inquire of others where else it may be known.

Since 1934, I have done considerable archeological research in the southwestern corner of Kerr County, Texas principally, and to a lesser degree in other Central Texas areas. Among the several hundred artifacts recovered from the surface in Kerr County, arrow points number less than a half-dozen, and all are of the <u>Perdiz</u> Type. The burnt rock mounds of this vicinity and the immediate areas surrounding them as occupational zones, however, seemingly do not yield any arrow points. The single exception known to me is the Lamb's Creek Burnt Rock Mound (The Record, September 1948). The features of this mound consist of a rock mound partially overlying an older burnt rock mound. This late mound contains arrow points mixed with the expected types of Edwards Aspect dart forms. The arrow point types are <u>Edwards, Scallorn, and Perdiz</u>--in that order of frequency, with <u>Perdiz</u> being found solely on the surface. See Figure 1 for specimens of <u>Edwards</u> Type from this mound.

In this Kerr County area I have also excavated and sifted the occupational zones in the bluff shelters, where most arrow points are found. So far, all bluff or rockshelters excavated contain arrow points in the frequency ratio of <u>Edwards</u> and <u>Scallorn</u>; while only one among dozens of burnt rock mounds has any arrow points at all. This seems to definitely imply some kind of break or period of occupational change for this area. Stream terraces (now farmed) containing burnt rock mounds, which at one time were littered with dart points, are always adjacent or joining these shelters, yet no arrow points are in these fields except the "one in a thousand" Perdiz Type.

"Goat's Bluff" (The Record, December 1949), is a typical example of these shelters. The present floors are covered by goat and sheep manure beneath which (from the surface to about eight inches deep) is an occupational zone....hard packed, containing many arrow and dart points, knives, and bone

* Reprinted from THE RECORD, Vol. 23, No. 3, March, 1967, with the permission of the Dallas Archeological Society. and shell in small quantities. No perishables, pottery or historic materials have I found. The same is true of "August's Bluff," less than a mile from Goat's Bluff. See Figure 2 for Edwards Type arrow points from these two shelters. No stratigraphy is present. Arrow and dart forms occur mixed from top to bottom of the occupational zone.

In 1941, as a guest of a Mr. Ramsey, then of Uvalde, Texas, I accompanied him to a shelter north of Uvalde that his party was digging. The <u>Edwards</u> Type of arrow point was present in that shelter, but I do not know the frequency of its occurrence there.

These Kerr County shelters contain no <u>Perdiz</u> Type arrow points. Lamb's Creek burnt rock mound contained only four <u>Perdiz</u> points, and these are all of red flint not used in any of the <u>Edwards</u> Type arrow points found there. They also were found on the mound surface. These four points could easily have been left there by a later person using the spring that flows from beneath the mound.

Other areas containing the <u>Edwards</u> Type known to me appear in a different light. At an open site on the Pedernales River, just below Stonewall, Texas, the <u>Edwards</u> Type accompanied by a <u>Scallorn</u>-like point (long, narrow barbs with a narrow expanding stem) changes to a minority ratio of seven <u>Perdiz</u>, four "Scallorn," and four <u>Edwards</u>. Also, along the Atascosa River, in the vicinity of Whitsett and Three Rivers, Texas, the <u>Edwards</u> Type is present in open campsites accompanied by arrow point types of <u>Scallorn</u>, <u>Perdiz</u>, "Edwards" and "Shumla", in that order of frequency. See The Record, Jan. -Feb., 1951, for associated artifacts in this area of Texas.

DESCRIPTION

- Size: Among the largest of arrow points. Maximum width varies from 1.4 cm to 2.3 cm. Length ranges from 2 cm to 4.5 cm with a large ' percentage about 4 cm long.
- Blade: Triangular with straight to convex or slightly concave sides with frequent finely serrated edges, occasionally recurved; shoulders or barbs prominent and pointed, not squared.
- Stem: Deeply divided into two long barb-like projections, each pointed, rounded, or squared, and leaving the long axis of the point at approximately 45 degrees or more, down and outward. On the bolder examples, these basal projections are narrow and curve either up or down.

All specimens in Figures 1 and 2 are from the shelters or burnt rock mound as noted. The finely serrated edges of some of the blades are not adequately demonstrated.

2

PROJECTED RELATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Relations to other arrow point types I cannot see. The extremely long barb-like projections from the tang or stem do not occur on other arrow point types to my knowledge. I do see a very close relationship with, or development from, some of the Edwards Plateau Aspect dart forms which were in association in the excavations from which I recovered them. In using An Introductory Handbook of Texas Archeology (Suhm, Krieger, and Jelks, 1954) for comparing the stems and basal areas of <u>Edwards</u> to dart types <u>Frio</u>, <u>Martindale</u>, and <u>Uvalde</u>, one can clearly see the <u>Edwards</u> Type reproduced therein. Some of these dart types have wide stems. This also is a feature of the Edwards Type arrow point, as compared to other arrow points.

In Kerr County excavations, the Edwards Type is directly associated with the dart point types Fairland, Ensor, Frio, Uvalde, and Pedernales. A study of Figure 1, specimens 13, 14, 19, and 20, will show a very similar basal outline to Martindale, as well as the basal width of Ensor. Derivative similarities of deeply notched and bifurcated stem areas of the Uvalde type are seen in specimens 1, 4, 6, 7, and 25 in Figure 1. The Frio dart type is amply expressed in the stem and basal contours throughout Figures 1 and 2. Fairland is demonstrated in the stems with long pointed tangs having a down curve as in specimens 11 and 16, Figure 1.

I think all these features of the <u>Edwards</u> Type show a direct continuation of adopted form from the dart points into the arrow point transition. This does strongly imply that "Edwards" was the first development of arrow points in this part of the Edwards Plateau; and that <u>Scallorn</u> derived from or with "Edwards". <u>Perdiz</u> was most probably a type introduced from elsewhere as the last type for this area, but by a later people who did not use the Shelters.

RECAP AND CONJECTURE

It seems obvious that the first arrow points of the Kerr County region of the Edwards Plateau were direct copies of the dart forms in use at the advent of the bow. That is why I have chosen the type name <u>Edwards</u>, rather than a town name in order to imply a base, or original arrow form for this vicinity of the Edwards Plateau region.

A close study of arrow point shapes reveals a progression of form from the complex to the simple. The latest types being generally a simple triangle with or without slight modifications such as <u>Harrell</u> and <u>Fresno</u>, or a simple stemmed point such as <u>Perdiz</u>. I suggest that the <u>Scallorn</u> Type arrow point may have derived from the initial "Edwards" Type soon after the advent of the bow. <u>Scallorn</u> is essentially a simple triangle, corner-notched upwards and having a base already formed by the original triangle. "Edwards" has a too-complicated basal and stem area.

Figures 1 and 2 of this report, which present the arrow point "Edwards" as a type, are presented in the sense that "Edwards" is a master type that could be sub-divided as variations in form warrant, once professional archeologists become familiar with this sector of the Edwards Plateau Aspect. I have limited the illustrations of both arrow and dart forms in this report to those occurring in rockshelters and one burnt rock mound, all located on one ranch.

Figures 3 and 4 are intended to show by direct comparison that dart points <u>Martindale</u>, <u>Fairland</u>, <u>Ensor</u>, <u>Frio</u>, <u>Pedernales</u>, <u>Uvalde</u>, and to a limited extent, <u>Montell</u>, ((Ed.: last two points not illustrated)) were actually copied in shape and scaled down to arrow point size and weight at the time of transition from atlatl use to adoption of the bow. The literature does not report a comparable arrow point in Texas . . .



Figure 1. Artifacts from Lamb's Creek Burnt Rock Mound.



Figure 2. Artifacts from August Bluff and Goat Bluff sites.





Figure 3. Kerr County Dart and Arrow Point Forms Compared



Figure 4. Kerr County Dart and Arrowpoint Forms Compared

In retrogression, we have the Toyah Focus characterized by the <u>Perdiz</u> arrow point. Extension to historic times is likely. The preceding Austin Focus is characterized by a predominance of Type <u>Scallorn</u> arrow points. On the absence of Toyah Focus arrow points, and a minority representation of Austin Focus arrow points from within the sites of this report, I propose a new type or series of arrow points to be named the type "Edwards" Arrow Point. I further propose that the "Edwards" arrow point may be the principal basis for recognizing a new focus: The <u>Turtle Creek Focus</u> of the late Edwards Plateau Aspect, which may have evolved into the Austin Focus of the Central Texas Aspect. It is characterized by almost no grinding implements, mortars, or seed slabs. Large, medium, and small dart points are directly mixed with arrow points in shelter occupation zone midden. They were primarily a rockshelter dwelling people but also were responsible for burnt rock mound accumulations. Their economy was based primarily on hunting with very little emphasis on gathering that required grinding or milling.

References *

Thomas R. Hester

ABSTRACT

This brief paper presents new data on the <u>Edwards</u> arrow point type defined by Sollberger in 1967. The type seems to have been the earliest arrow point form to appear in the southwestern Edwards Plateau. Radiocarbon dates obtained at the La Jita site in Uvalde County indicate that the type appeared sometime between 900 and 1000 A. D.

INTRODUCTION

Sollberger (1967:12-22) has presented a detailed description of the <u>Edwards</u> arrow point type. Distributional data and illustrations of a number of specimens were also presented. Sollberger's research had indicated to him that the type was the earliest arrow point type in the Edwards Plateau region. In addition, he lists the type as a major trait of the "Turtle Creek Focus"; the other traits of that cultural unit are listed in his paper (p. 16). He felt that the peoples responsible for the <u>Edwards</u> type lived primarily in rockshelters and were also responsible for "burnt rock mound accumulations" (p. 16).

RECENT DATA

In 1967, I conducted archeological investigations at the La Jita site in northeastern Uvalde County (Hester, MS). Both Archaic and Late Prehistoric (or Neo-American) components were found in terrace deposits surrounding three burned rock middens. The Late Prehistoric materials were characterized by arrow points and bone-tempered pottery. Arrow point types included <u>Perdiz</u>, <u>Scallorn</u>, <u>Cliffton</u>, <u>Edwards</u>, and a local type termed <u>Sabinal</u>. Triangular arrow points were also represented. Though the Late Prehistoric materials were somewhat mixed, it was clear that the <u>Edwards</u> type was the earliest arrow point form at the site. Most of the 19 specimens were found stratigraphically below the other arrow point types mentioned above, and often seemed to be in loose association with Late Archaic dart points, such as <u>Ensor</u> and <u>Frio</u>; (however, due to the slightly mixed nature of the Late Prehistoric deposits, these associations should not be considered as definite.)

Three radiocarbon dates applicable to the <u>Edwards</u> type were obtained from the La Jita site (Valastro and Davis, MS). They indicate that the type was introduced at the site sometime between 900 and 1000 A. D. These dates are: A. D. 1040 (Tx-665), A. D. 960 (Tx-691), and A. D. 930 (Tx-685).

Other examples of <u>Edwards</u> have been noted in the southwestern Edwards Plateau. A few are present at Montell Rockshelter in western Uvalde County (Texas Archeological Research Laboratory Collections). In addition, members of the Hill Country Archeological Society have found a number of

^{*} Reprinted from THE RECORD, Vol. 26, No. 2, 1970, with the permission of the Dallas Archeological Society.

Edwards specimens at a site near Kerrville. Though analysis is incomplete, the type seems to be the earliest arrow point form there. A full report is planned by the investigators (Murray Beadles, personal communication).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

With the data from the La Jita site and the site in the Kerrville area, it would appear that Sollberger's hypothesis of an early origin for the <u>Edwards</u> type is tenable; it may have appeared as early as 900 A. D. These new data also suggest that the peoples who used this arrow point form lived in open campsites, as well as in rockshelters. There is no evidence at La Jita that any of the Late Prehistoric peoples were responsible for the burned rock middens there. They (the burned rock middens) are conclusively linked to the Middle Archaic occupations at the site. A similar situation seems to exist at the site near Kerrville.

I feel that Mr. Sollberger's proposed "Turtle Creek Focus" is somewhat premature. The peoples using the Edwards type did not dwell exclusively in rockshelters, as he suggests, nor are there any data which would suggest that they are responsible for any of the burned rock accumulations in the southwestern Edwards Plateau. The only distinctive trait of his proposed focus is the Edwards point; the other listed characterists including the rarity of grinding tools and a hunting economy (see Sollberger, 1967:16) can be applied to any of the prehistoric peoples in that region. Much additional research is required if this proposed cultural unit is to be substantiated.

References #



Figure 1. Typical Edwards arrow points. Full size.

^{*} See Bibliography at end of this issue.

Tom S. Beasley

This paper presents the results of surface and sub-surface investigation of a small site in northeastern Bandera County, Texas, containing numerous <u>Edwards</u> arrow points (Sollberger 1967) and other Late Prehistoric artifacts.

SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site is situated in a valley ranging up to four miles in width, bordered to the east by Mason Creek, a perennial tributary of the Medina River. Bandera Creek flows down the westerly edge of this valley. Rugged limestone hills rising some 1,900 feet in elevation form the valley's boundaries, with cedar and live oak covering most of these hills. Larger live oak and other trees are found in the flats and terraces along creek bottoms, and cactus, agarita, agave and a variety of small plants and grasses are also present.

The site itself is located on a small, flat knoll at the easterly end of an expansive wooded meadow, with a dry tributary of Mason Creek some two hundred yards to the northeast. Because of the narrow width of this tributary's creek bed and its sharp angle of descent, it appears unlikely that this was ever a perennial stream, or that it even flowed irregularly. However, a large rock outcrop jutting out into the dry creek bed may represent an old spring gone dry.

Flint chips and flakes, burned rock and snails are scattered across the surface of the site, and initial surface investigation yielded nine arrow points or arrow point fragments, one small <u>Frio</u> dart point (Suhm and Jelks 1962), and a variety of bifaces and biface fragments. Subsequent surface investigation also resulted in the finding of similar artifacts.

Routhly oval in shape, the approximate site boundaries run eightyfour feet north to south, while the western edge is sixty-one feet from the eastern perimeter. The northeastern portion of the site is covered by a white, sandy soil, apparently the result of burrowing by ants or other insects.

EXCAVATION AND INTERNAL SITE STRUCTURE

Grids three feet by four feet in dimension were arbitrarily staked (Fig. 1), and then excavated in three-inch levels with all materials being passed through 1/4" hardware cloth screens. Most of the flint debitage has been salvaged for future analysis, and samples of the distribution of flint, snails and other cultural materials were bagged from each three-inch level in Grids A and B (Fig. 1).

A relatively shallow midden deposit, averaging 10"-12" in depth generally overlies a culturally sterile caliche gravel, which in turn rests upon a limestone bedrock base. Within the single occupation zone the accumulation of burned rock varies widely as some areas consist of tightly packed burned rock and ash, while other locations contain almost no burned rock. These accumulations probably represent discarded hearth stones or perhaps in some cases, undisturbed hearths. Although several arrow points have been



Figure 1. Excavation and Feature record, <u>Edwards</u> point site, Bandera County, Texas.

found in direct contact with ashy soil and apparent hearth areas, most artifacts are uniformly distributed, both horizontally and vertically, throughout the site.

The most striking site feature is a circular cooking pit approximately three feet in diameter, carved into the limestone bedrock to a depth of 12" (Fig. 1). The walls of the cooking pit have been shaped and smoothed, indicating more than casual utilization, and a finely worked <u>Edwards</u> arrow point (Fig. 2, a) was recovered 8" from the bottom of the pit, or some 18" below the surface. Large, angular chunks of burned limestone and a loose, ashstained soil filled the pit. At the bottom of this site feature were two large, ash-encrusted limestone slabs and numerous snails.

By way of illustration, the excavation results of Grid A are shown in Fig. 3. Artifacts a. and b. were found on the surface, while c-l came from the 0-3" level; m-w came from the 3-6" level, and x-z came from 6-9" in depth. Not illustrated are two fist-sized cores and a large utilized flake.

THE ARTIFACTS

Some 637 artifacts have been recovered, including some 277 arrow points, arrow point fragments and preforms. <u>Edwards</u>, <u>Scallorn</u> and triangular (<u>Fresno</u>?) arrow points dominate. A grouping designated as <u>Edwards</u>-<u>Scallorn</u> was established for those arrow points which could have reasonably been identified in either category. Dart points are represented by 17 specimens, with five of those being <u>Pedernales</u> (Fig. 4, a, b). Other dart point types are <u>Montell</u> (Fig. 4, c), <u>Ensor</u> (Fig. 4, d), <u>Frio</u> (Fig. 4, e), <u>La Jita</u> (Fig. 4, f), <u>Abasolo-like</u> (Fig. 4, g), and <u>Nolan</u> (not illustrated), indicating a generally Late Archaic to early Late Prehistoric occupation. No <u>Perdiz</u> arrow points, pottery, end scrapers or other artifacts usually associated with the latter stages of the Late Prehistoric (Hester 1971) have been found at this site, and only two <u>Perdiz</u> arrow points are included among the total artifact assemblage from the various neighboring sites.

A chart of the artifacts recovered to date is provided in Table 1. Edwards arrow points (Fig. 2, a-e) are the single most common point type, although in some cases it is difficult to distinguish Edwards points from Scallorn points (Fig. 2, f-g). For this reason, 16 arrow points have been assigned to the Edwards-Scallorn classification, although no such points are illustrated. These two point types have been found mixed together, and there are significant morphological similarities. By way of comparison, the artifacts described as Scallorn in Fig. 8, a', b' from the La Jita site (Hester 1971) closely resemble the Edwards point illustrated in Fig. 8, h from that site. Likewise, the Scallorn point identified in Fig. 3, j from Scorpion Cave (Graves and Highley 1978), is virtually indistinguishable from the Edwards point shown in Fig. 3, g from that site. Several papers describe the Edwards arrow point as the earliest arrow point type in the Edwards Plateau (Sollberger 1967, Hester 1970, and Graves and Highley 1978), and the presence of dart points, combined with the absence of Perdiz arrow points, suggests the same conclusion at the subject site. However, the morphological similarities between Edwards and Scallorn, and the vertical mixing of these two points at the Bandera County site indicate that they were contemporaries there, and that Edwards may be a variant of Scallorn in southwestern central Texas.



Figure 2. Arrow points and fragments, Edwards point site, Bandera County, Texas.





Ъ









f.

k.



1.



m.









p.

u.





n



· ·

w.

у.

















e.



f.



Figure 4. Dart points, bifaces and perforator, <u>Edwards</u> point site, Bandera County, Texas.

DART POINTS 17 Pedernales (5) Frio (2) Ensor (2) Montell (1) Abasolo-like (2) Unidentified stemmed dart point basal fragments (2) La Jita (1) Unidentified stemmed dart point fragment (1) Nolan basal fragment (1) ARROW POINTS 277 Edwards (77) Scallorn (32) Edwards-Scallorn (16) Triangular (Fresno?) (29) Single-notched (9) Young (8) Sabinal (1) Miscellaneous arrow points (24) Fragmentary arrow points (50) Arrow point pre-forms (31) Thinned Triangular Bifaces 10 Thinned Ovate Bifaces 18 Thick Triangular Bifaces 10 Thick Ovate Bifaces 16 Thinned Biface Fragments 88 Basal Fragments (13) Medial Fragments (21) Distal Fragments (28) Lateral Fragments (17) Corner Fragments (9) 5 Thick Biface Fragments 2 Large Biface Lateral Fragments with Rechipped Edge Small, Miscellaneous Biface Fragments 30 Misc. Frags. (apparently broken during manufacture) 25 2 Perforators Cores 17 15 Core-choppers Trimmed/Utilized Interior Flakes 39 Trimmed/Utilized Cortex Flakes 27 2 Gravers Spokeshaves 2 Altered/Utilized Stream Pebbles 2 Unifacial Scrapers 15 Thinned, Serrated Unifacial Knife 1 Mano Fragments 2 Mussel Shell Fragments 15 TOTAL 637 Triangular (Fresno?) arrow points (Fig. 2, i, j) are also present, and some 29 specimens have been found. Again, these arrow points are vertically spaced throughout the site, and it would appear that they are contemporaneous with the Edwards and Scallorn types. Other arrow points include single-notched triangular (Fig. 2, k-m), Young (Fig. 2, n, o), Sabinal (Fig. 2, p) and various miscellaneous points (Fig. 2, q-v). Arrow point preforms are common, and frequently take the shape of notched or slightly altered flakes (Fig. 2, w-y).

• Other significant artifacts include a thin, finely-worked, unifacial knife with serrated edges (Fig. 4, h), a parallel-flaked perforator (Fig. 4, i) and a thinned triangular biface (Fig. 4, j). The 28 thinned triangular and ovate bifaces from this site may represent small knives, dart points or in some cases, dart point preforms.

Thousands of snails are scattered through the site, and 15 fragments of mussel shells have been found. One puzzling aspect of this site is the fact that not a single piece of bone has been excavated. This would suggest that butchering activities were not conducted at the site, and that faunal remains were disposed of away from the site. It should also be noted that only isolated cobbles of good quality flint or chert are available near the site, and this undoubtedly accounts for the relatively small amount of flint deposited in the occupational zone.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Unlike the La Jita and Scorpion Cave sites which contained materials ranging from the Pre-Archaic or Early Archaic through the latter stages of the Late Prehistoric, the site under discussion here apparently was occupied during a short period of time, i.e., from the Late Archaic to the early Late Prehistoric. This conclusion is based on both the artifact assemblage described above and the shallow nature of the culturally fertile deposits. These factors, taken together with the finding that large numbers of artifacts, particularly arrow points, are concentrated in a small area, suggest that this site was rather intensively exploited for perhaps no more than a few hundred years.

Another feature of this site which distinguishes it from La Jita and Scorpion Cave is that it is not situated on a major stream or river. The nearest perennial water source is Mason Creek, over one mile in distance. If the limestone rock formation to the east of this site was at one time a spring, one would expect to find other sites nearby. However, the nearest site is at least onehalf mile away, and it is not located on the same tributary. If this rock formation was not a spring, then there are no other special geographical or structural characteristics to recommend the site as an occupational area. Numerous other knolls and terraces much like the one on which the site is located occur along all of the ravines and dry tributaries of upper Mason creek, with only scant archaeological debris present on those near the site. Presently available evidence does not indicate why this one particular knoll was selected for occupation, while other nearby locations were virtually ignored.

At both La Jita and Scorpion Cave large amounts of bone and other faunal remains were encountered, thus permitting an analysis of certain food resources. Unfortunately, this is not the case at the Bandera County site,

and it could only be inferred from the site's artifact assemblage that the occupants were primarily oriented towards hunting. Snails were apparently a major food item, while mussels had a limited impact. This corresponds to the findings at La Jita and Scorpion Cave. No inventory of floral resources was undertaken as no such materials have been preserved. It could be assumed, however, that the inhabitants did exploit a variety of roots, seeds, berries, etc.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the subject site is the presence of the numerous <u>Edwards</u> arrow points as outlined above. La Jita is located approximately 35 miles to the west-southwest of this site, while Scorpion Cave is about 25 miles to the south-southeast. Several sites along upper Mason Creek have also yielded <u>Edwards</u> arrow points, and Hester (1970) has documented the presence of <u>Edwards</u> arrow points at sites in Uvalde County and near Kerrville, Texas. One view of the <u>Edwards</u> arrow point would be that it and <u>Scallorn</u> arrow points are both corner-notched type points sharing many morphological characteristics, and that <u>Edwards</u> may simply be a variant of the Scallorn type.

However, if the Edwards arrow point distribution is primarily confined to a small area of Central Texas encompassing only a few counties, and present evidence suggests this conclusion, then Edwards may represent a distinct cultural unit. Surface collected materials from various sites along upper Mason Creek show a continuous occupational sequence dating from Paleo-Indian to early Late Prehistoric. Only scant data (two Perdiz arrow points) is available from other sites to show occupation subsequent to the early Late Prehistoric, and it appears that exploitation of the upper Mason Creek area virtually ceased after the early Late Prehistoric. Either the peoples using Edwards and Scallorn did not also use Perdiz, or if there was a transition from corner-notched arrow points to contracting stem type points, then the upper Mason Creek area ceased to be favored for occupation during the latter stages of the Late Prehistoric. The determination of whether the Edwards arrow point represents a localized variant of the Scallorn arrow point or is instead evidence of a distinct cultural unit in the Bandera, Kerr, Medina and Uvalde County vicinity will depend upon additional data from that area. While tenable arguments can be made for both positions, it is the author's belief that subsequent research will support the theory of a distinct cultural unit.

References

THE TURTLE CREEK PHASE: AN INITIAL LATE PREHISTORIC COMPONENT IN SOUTHERN TEXAS

J. L. Mitchell

ABSTRACT

Sollberger (1967) hypothesized an early Late Prehistoric focus in the Hill Country of South Texas which could be distinguished by <u>Edwards</u> arrowpoints. Data which have become available since that time tend to support his construct. Radiocarbon dates from two sites in Uvalde and Bexar counties suggest that the Turtle Creek Phase dates between AD 860 and 1130; Pueblo II and III trade pottery from sites with <u>Edwards</u> points support this dating. Members of this phase appear to have been transhumant Hunters & Gatherers who seasonally migrated from the Edwards Plateau to the streams and rivers along the Balcones escarpment and out onto the South Texas plain. In the Hill Country, they often camped on or near Archaic burned rock middens and there is some evidence which suggests they may have been responsible for at least the upper levels of some of these middens. At some sites, trade pottery was introduced during this phase. The return of bison to the region, increased use of locally-made pottery, and the introduction of <u>Perdiz</u> arrowpoints probably signalled the end of this phase at about AD 1150.

INTRODUCTION

Sollberger (1948, 1949, 1951) reported several sites in South Texas where a unique and very well made arrowpoint style was found, often mixed with Archaic dart points. Suhm, commenting on Goat Bluff rockshelter in Kerr County where such arrowpoints were found, wrote that this "component cannot be identified as either Toyah or Austin Focus, and may constitute a distinct focus" (Suhm 1960:95). Sollberger (1967) named the type <u>Edwards</u> based on its presence along the southeastern margin of the Edwards Plateau and the probability that it represented smaller versions of earlier Edwards Plateau Archaic dart point styles. He believed that the distribution of these arrowpoints defined a unique cultural group who introduced the bow and arrow to this region, who camped in rockshelters and on burned rock middens, and who used few manos and metates. Hester (1970) questioned some of these suggestions and felt that there was not yet sufficient data to establish a separate focus. This article will review data which has become available in recent years to evaluate Sollberger's hypothesized construct.

RELEVANT STUDIES

A review of archaeological data published prior to Sollberger naming the Edwards type in 1967 suggests its presence at the Granberg site in Bexar County (Schuetz 1966) and at the Oblate shelter in Comal County (Tunnell 1962). In more recent years, a variety of reports have noted Edwards points and have extended its known distribution in Kerr County (Fawcett 1972, Briggs 1972, Skinner 1974), Bexar County (Fawcett 1972, Kelly 1974, Fox 1975), Comal County (Fawcett 1972), Uvalde County (Hester 1971), Medina County (Graves and Highley 1978), and Bandera County (Beasley 1978). At the La Jita site in Uvalde County, Hester recovered <u>Edwards</u> and other Late Prehistoric points from the upper levels of the site. Radiocarbon dates associated with the <u>Edwards</u> type were AD 930 \pm 70 (TX 685), 960 \pm 60 (TX681), and 1040 \pm 80 (TX665) from Levels 2 and 3 (Hester 1971). <u>Perdiz</u> arrowpoints in Level 1 were associated with a date of 1240 \pm 70. Dart points, particularly <u>Pedernales</u> were found in all levels but were most frequent in lower levels.

La Jita and other Uvalde County sites (41 UV 25, 41 UV 29) extend the known distribution of the <u>Edwards</u> point type to more open sites on a major streamcourse. La Jita appears to be a major base camp site which was occupied over a considerable span of time (at least intermittently). One major finding was the relatively early dates for the <u>Edwards</u> point which led Hester to confirm Sollberger's supposition that this point was probably the earliest type of arrowpoint in this region.

Skinner selected the Paris site in Kerr County for the 1971 and 1972 Texas Archeological Society field school in part because of the number of <u>Edwards</u> points which had been found on the site. Four hundred and fifty TAS members worked one week in 1971 and again in 1972 surveying various areas of the Turtle Creek drainage, mapping sites, and excavating at least three sites. The Paris site (41 KR 1) excavation involved a burned rock midden and an adjacent living floor with a number of slab-lined hearths. Arrowpoints were concentrated at the northern end of the site and occur with dart points at the southern end of the site. Both dart points and arrowpoints occurred in the mound fill and Skinner concluded that there was no significant horizontal or vertical separation between dart and arrow points within the midden (Skinner 1974:166).

Edwards and Scallorn points were also reported from the Bushwhack shelter (41 KR 116), located on the south side of Bushwhack Creek in the southwestern corner of the Turtle Creek drainage system. This shelter extends for 145 feet along the base of a limestone outcrop, is 19 feet deep and the ceiling is 14 1/2 feet high. The fill of burned rock, ash, bone, and lithic debris was more than four feet deep. Edwards points were recovered from Levels 1 and 2, and undetermined arrowpoints were found in three top levels. Dart points (Frio, undetermined) were also found in these levels. Skinner observed that this may reflect mixing but could also be interpreted that dart and arrow points "were used by the same prehistoric groups but for separate activities" (Skinner 1974:145).

Skinner's overall objective in studying sites in the Turtle Creek watershed was to demonstrate that this was a natural area within which all the activities of a prehistoric society were carried out. He hypothesized a "central based wanderer community settlement pattern" (Ibid:177). After all the data were analyzed, however, he was to conclude that "the Turtle Creek watershed is too small an area for the adequate maintenance of the hunting/gathering economy and technology" of the prehistoric people who occupied sites within the area (Ibid:182). He felt that it would be necessary to study a larger area "by first determining the limits of the maximum subsistence/settlement area (i. e., a cultural area) and then assuming that this area coincides with a natural area. Once the limits of both the natural and cultural areas have been defined, then it will be possible to test them..." (Ibid:182). One way to determine a "cultural area" is, of course, (as Sollberger suggested in 1967) through the distribution of projectile points which appear unique to a cultural group and which have limited spatial and temporal distribution. While this approach has some limitations, in the absence of widespread, detailed subsistence pattern studies, it appears the only realistic method to define a cultural area.

DISTRIBUTION OF EDWARDS POINTS

The present known distribution of <u>Edwards</u> arrowpoints is illustrated in Figure 1. This figure is based on a review of published reports as well as specific negative reports from surrounding areas, informal reports of sites, and a review of private collections. The formal reports reviewed are cited in the figure and in the reference section of this issue.

This distribution of Edwards points tends to support Sollberger's idea that it occurs primarily along the Balcones escarpment on the southeastern edge of the Edwards Plateau. Thus, its presence at the Oblate shelter in Comal County, Timmeron rockshelter in Hays County, and at an open site in eastern Kinney County lends strong support to Sollberger's concept. Just how much further to the northeast beyo d central Hays County this type occurs or how much further west into Kinney County or beyond are problems which have yet to be resolved.

To the southwest, T. C. Hill, Jr. (personal communication 1978) has not seen Edwards points in either Dimmit or Zavala counties. Likewise, Ed Mokry (personal communication 1978) reports no such points for McMullen County nor in the Corpus Christi area. Tom Beasley (personal communication 1978) has not found any in Bee and Webb counties, and Tom Kelly (personal communication 1978) did not see any Edwards points in his recent Karnes County survey. While such negative evidence is not completely conclusive, such contact with knowledgeable area specialists strongly suggests that the Edwards arrowpoint is generally restricted to the north central portion of South Texas and for the most part coincides with the Balcones escarpment with some scattered sites along some of the river drainages out on the coastal plain.

This expanded distribution reflects that Turtle Creek and Kerr County are only the north central concentration of a much more widely dispersed cultural area. Interestingly, this area involves the headwaters area of all the major river systems of South Texas: the Nueces (Kinney County), Frio (Uvalde County), Medina (Bandera and Medina counties), San Antonio (Bexar), Atascosa (Medina and Atascosa counties), Guadalupe (Kerr and Comal counties), and the Pedernales (Kerr and Gillespie counties). However, the distribution does not extend very far down these rivercourses toward the coast -- the southeasternmost sites are those near Whitsett and Three Rivers reported by Sollberger (1951, 1967).

While the lack of <u>Edwards</u> points toward the coast is apparently real, the limited distribution along major rivers near the Balcones escarpment may be due to a lack of sampling. For example, in Fawcett's (1972) review of Bexar County archaeclogy, <u>Edwards</u> points were found primarily in the northern and transitional environmental zones -- none were reported from the southern zone. Yet Sollberger's report of Edwards from Atascosa County would suggest



that they do occur south of the Balcones escarpment. Thus, we would predict that they should be found in southern Bexar County, along the San Antonio and Medina rivers.

To test this prediction, private collections in the southern part of the county were screened. Mr. Earl Bly has an extensive collection from 41 BX 226, a major base camp site extending for more than a mile alo g the south side of the Medina River at its confluence with the San Antonio. Manos and bed rock mortars, extensive pecan groves, and a variety of concentrations of lithic artifacts and debris suggest a major base camp area. Of the 30 Late Prehistoric points in the Bly collection, two are <u>Edwards</u>, two are Perdiz, five are Scallorn, and eight are triangular.

Further west along the south side of the Medina, the Donica collection from a site on Live Oak Creek, and the De La Cruz collection from along Polecat Creek were also examined. Both collections contained <u>Edwards</u>, Perdiz, and Scallorn points, as well as a variety of Archaic materials.

Thus, Edwards points were found in all three of the collections examined which seems to substantiate Fawcett's comments on sampling. It is reasonable to assume, then, that this initial distribution will be much more completely "filled in" when further sites are studied and private collections examined.

To further illustrate this point, I noted a lack of reports of <u>Edwards</u> points from Bandera County in my review of the literature. Yet it is located in the center of the distribution pattern which was being unfolded. It was reasonable to predict that there should be sites with <u>Edwards</u> points in Bandera County. Fortuitously, I happened to mention this prediction in a phone conversation with Tom Beasley of Beeville, who has recently excavated a site near Mason Creek. The results of his work are included in a separate report elsewhere in this issue.

The currently available data lends very strong support to Sollberger's hypothesis of a restricted distribution. It was his view that this limited distribution implied a separate cultural entity, which he named the Turtle Creek Focus. The work of Skinner demonstrated that the Turtle Creek drainage was too limited an area to completely support a prehistoric cultural group. An examination of the distribution of <u>Edwards</u>, as suggested by Sollberger, has defined a larger cultural area which appears to be centered on the Balcones escarpment but which extends some fifty miles north into Kerr County and fifty miles south to southern Atascosa and northern Live Oak counties. This expanded area includes a variety of biotic and geographic zones ranging from the Edwards Plateau across the Balcones and blacklands to the South Texas coastal plain. This expanded area appears large and diverse enough to fully support a prehistoric people and yet is sufficiently restricted so as to exclude other known cultural areas (such as the Aransas-Rockport sequence of the prehistoric Karankawa for the coastal bend area; Corbin 1974).

DATING OF SITES

Sollberger felt that the <u>Edwards</u> was the initial arrowpoint i this region and thus that it must date at the beginning of the Late Prehistoric. A number of authors have accepted this assertion (Perino 1968; Hester 1970, 1971; Fawcett 1972; Fox 1975; Graves and Highley 1978: Beasley 1978). Radiocarbon dates which could be associated with <u>Edwards</u> points were reported by Hester (1970, 1971) for the La Jita site, Uvalde County. Hester estimated <u>Edwards</u> to date between A D 930 and 1040, which is an extremely limited range. Commenting on TX665 (AD 1040 \pm 80; Level 2), Hester wrote that "The level contained mixed Late Archaic materials (Montell dart point) and early Late Prehistoric artifacts, especially <u>Edwards</u> arrowpoints. This date, along with TX681 and TX685 are fairly consistent and apparently represent the transition from Late Archaic to Late Prehistoric at La Jita" (Hester 1971:114).

The radiocarbon dates are shown graphically in Figure 2. In the top six levels at La Jita, there were four distinct clusters or components of artifacts (see left panel of Table 1). If we assume four components or occupations, then the associated radiocarbon dates can also be grouped into four components based on the least difference between dates. Thus, four different groups are illustrated in Figure 2.

Based on this clustering of radiocarbon dates and on Hester's comments, we may conclude that, at least in the region of South Texas where <u>Edwards</u> points occur, the Late Prehistoric began by at least AD 930. If the range of probable dates is considered (plus and minus one standard deviation) this Initial Late Prehistoric component would date from possibly as early as AD 860 to as late as AD 1120 (see Figure 2).

An independent confirmation of this dating was recently reported by Kelly in his Camp Bullis survey (reported at the January 1978 STAA meeting). At 41 BX 377, in the 10 to 15 cm level of square W3, a charcoal sample was recovered which was dated at AD 1060 \pm 70 (TX2771) which was associated primarily with Edwards points. Of 220 points recovered, Edwards was the predominate type constituting 18.6% of the total. In the upper levels of this site were <u>Perdiz</u>, <u>Scallorn</u>, and a <u>Fresno</u> point, as well as a number of <u>Pedernales</u> dart points (Kelly, personal communication 1978). These data represent a strong independent confirmation of Hester's findings at La Jita.

вС	0 AD	500 + + +	1000	1500
I	(Late Prehistorio	:)	<u>لمح</u> ــــــ	ΛΔ_Δ
п	(Early Late Preh	istoric)		AD 1234
Ш	(Late Archaic)			
IV	(Middle Archaic)	AD 490	AD 990	•
			$\Delta = C_{-1} d_{0} d_{0} d_{0}$	
	AD 100		$\vdash \dashv = \text{Plus/Min}$ $\stackrel{\frown}{\frown} = \text{Mean of } ($	us 1 S.D. Group
			🟧 = Data from	n 41 BX 377

(41 BX 377).

* Data adapted from Hester 1971.

****** Data provided by Kelly, personal communication, 1978.

							TABL	। ਜ												
	Con	nparat	ive	umn	nary	Dat	a from th	e La	Jita	Bai	mme	1 ² , a	nd C	blate	3 Sites					
		La Jita	a (41	٦V	21)*				Bamı	nel	(41	KR 10	**		Oblate	Shelt	er (4	1 CN	[])*:	\$< 3;<
	Surf.	-	8	e N	4	2	6 7+	-	2	m	4	5 6	2	±	surf. or Unkn	-	2	6	2	Ĩ
Pottery	2	(5)	Ŋ	1				1	1						10	173	11			
Perdiz Cliffton	4					Γ		13 (5)	4	2	1			11 1	1	3			
Sabinal Triangular ⁴ Scallorn		4) (1) (2) (4) (2) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4	- @@	0 0 0	1 1	1		1	(4)(4)	3 2	ŝ	2	-	~	1	1 8	- (<u>-</u>)	e		
Edwards ⁵		ŝ	8	9	2	Г		9	(]	4	2	1 1			2	9	6	2		
<u>Frio</u> <u>Mont</u> ell <u>Marsha</u> ll		0 0	3 1		1 4 1	Г		6 2 3	12 7 4	4 8 8	5 4 A		2 L C	2 ⁶ 6	1	1	л С			\frown
Pedernales	:LO	e	2	16	(J)	22	18 è	З	4	L L	.6	3 (10)	0	6	2			1	(\neg)	
	* le	vel = 6	incl	hes				, , , , ,	level evel	= 10 1 = p	c m olow	zone			*** 10	evel	= 6 i	nches		1
l. Data summari	zed ac	ross	all a	reas	(He	ster	1971)													

At Oblate, titled Scallorn Variety B (Tunnell 1962; prior to naming of Edwards as a type, Sollberger 1967) Triangular = Grandbury at Oblate shelter

Data adapted from Tables 3 and 4 and text (Tunnell 1962)

Data extracted from Table 1 (Beadles 1971)

Circled entries = Mode of Distribution

RELATIONSHIP OF EDWARDS, SCALLORN, AND PERDIZ

At La Jita, <u>Edwards</u> and <u>Scallorn</u> distributions peak in Level 2, while <u>Perdiz</u> arrowpoints and ceramics peak in Level 1, along with <u>Sabinal</u> and triangular points. Sollberger (1967) had postulated that <u>Edwards</u> was probably earlier than <u>Scallorn</u> or that they developed at the same time. Data cited earlier from the Bushwhack shelter indicated <u>Edwards</u> in Levels 1 and 2 with <u>Scallorn</u> only in Level 2; however, only four specimens (three of them <u>Edwards</u>) were involved. In an effort to resolve this issue, data from three other controlled excavations was examined and is displayed in Table 1.

Data from the Bammel site (41 KR 10) was obtained from Murray Beadles and the Hill Country Archaeological Society. The excavation of the Bammel site was very carefully controlled by 10 cm levels using a general vertical reference point (Beadles 1971). Data from the site is given in summary form in the central panel of Table 1. Surprisingly, all of the arrowpoints peak in Level 2 at the site.

At the Oblate shelter (41 CM 1), the pattern seen at La Jita is repeated with <u>Perdiz</u> and pottery peaking in Level 1 and <u>Scallorn</u> and <u>Edwards</u> (Tunnell's <u>Scallorn</u> Variety B) having their maximum distribution in Level 2. Thus, this issue cannot be resolved by examing modal distribution of point types by site levels.

An alternative methodology is to examine the mean depth (average depth of all points of a given type) from controlled excavations. This is only possible where the exact depth of each specimen is recorded, such as was the case at the Bammel site. Unfortunately, published data for La Jita and Oblate are presented only by level so that an accurate overall mean depth cannot be computed. However, such data are available from both Bammel and from the site near Mason Creek in Bandera County (Personal communication, Murray Beadles and Tom Beasley 1978). These data are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Mean Depth of Arrowpoints from Sites in Kerr

	F	
	and Bandera Counties	
Туре	Bammel	Mason Creek
Perdiz	4.35 cm	
Scallorn	6.38 cm	10.71 cm
Edwards	9.59 cm	14.65 cm
Triangular	25.27 cm	12.25 cm

The relationships between <u>Scallorn</u> and <u>Edwards</u> are remarkably similar in these two sites. However, Murray Beadles reports that the difference in mean depth of these two types is not a statistically significant difference, due in part to the large standard deviations in both distributions at 41 KR 10. For the present, then, we must assume that these two point

types are contemporaneous since they do, in fact, appear in the same level at a number of sites and since a statistical test of the difference in their mean depths could not reject the null hypothesis (of no difference) at the Bammel site.

A similar problem has been evident in the archaeological literature of central and southern Texas concerning the possible time enuivalence of <u>Perdiz</u> and <u>Scallorn</u> points. Again, the data from the Bammel site would suggest no statistically significant difference (although the difference between <u>Perdiz</u> and <u>Edwards</u> is probably a significant one). However, for the issue of <u>Perdiz</u> versus <u>Edwards</u>, the data from Beasley's Bandera County site is very relevant. At this site, no <u>Perdiz</u> occur. Thus, this site was apparently used only prior to the time when <u>Perdiz</u> was introduced in this area. This clearly illustrates that <u>Edwards</u> and <u>Scallorn</u> belong to the same component, where Perdiz probably belongs to a later component. The absence of <u>Perdiz</u> points at this site replicates the situation at Goat Bluff (Sollberger 1949) and greatly strengthens the case for an Initial Late Prehistoric component as a distinct cultural entity.

CERAMICS

The Granburg site (Schuetz 1966) is another location where <u>Scallorn</u> and <u>Edwards</u> points were recovered but no <u>Perdiz</u> were reported. Interestingly, the only other obviously Late Prehistoric artifacts at Granburg was pottery. A corrugated potsherd was recovered which was identified as "Pilares Banded" from west central New Mexico which dates from early Pueblo III with a time range of 1050 to 1150 or 1200 (Schuetz 1966:53). A small "incised, gray sherd" was also found which was identified as Caddoan (Ibid:56). The dating of the Pueblo III sherd fits fairly well with the proposed dating of our Initial Late Prehistoric component and suggests some contact with groups to the west. The Caddoan sherd would imply similar contacts with East Texas.

Fawcett (1972) has summarized reports of southwestern pottery in this area and notes that most have been found in the Olmos Basin and San Pedro Park areas of Bexar County (C. D. Orchard collection, now in the Witte Museum). He also reported sherds from Dripping Springs in Bandera County (along with Leon Plain pottery) and at Cano Verde in Wilson County. Fawcett concluded that "all of these sherds date from Pueblo II and III (AD 950-1200)" (Ibid:38).

As previously shown in Table 1, at most sites with Edwards points, local pottery has its maximum distribution on the surface or in the topmost levels and thus is associated by most authors with <u>Perdiz</u> points and the later phases of the Late Prehistoric. The data summarized above, however, suggests that at least at some sites, trade pottery from the southwest (and from the Caddoan area) does occur at sites where <u>Perdiz</u> are absent or rare. Dates for such trade pottery overlap with the later half of postulated range of <u>Edwards</u> dates. This seems to indicate that pottery was not introduced until at least AD 950 or 1050.

Fawcett (1972) also reported a red-orange, limestone-tempered pottery at 41 BX 52 on Leon Creek in western Bexar County. Point types recovered included Edwards, Fairland, Darl, and possibly one Perdiz. Hester and Kelly (1976) reported bone-tempered pottery along with Perdiz arrowpoints and bone fragments of white-tailed deer and bison at 41 ME 19 in southeastern Medina County. They date the site as after AD 1300.

Thus, within the geographic area defined by the <u>Edwards</u> arrowpoint distribution, there are some sites where <u>Edwards</u> and <u>Scallorn</u> points occur (Beasley's Bandera County site; Granburg) some without pottery and some with trade pottery; there are multicomponent sites where all arrowpoint styles occur but in different levels with <u>Edwards</u> below <u>Perdiz</u> (La Jita, Oblate, 41 BX 36 and 377); other sites where all three types appear in the same level (Bammel); sites where <u>Scallorn</u> and <u>Perdiz</u> occur with no <u>Edwards</u> (Somerset site; Fawcett 1972); and finally sites such as 41 ME 19 where <u>Perdiz</u> points occur alone and which dates after our postulated Initial Late Prehistoric component. This strongly suggests an evolutionary sequence representing changing point type preferences over time rather than a concrete set of exclusive cultural units.

When this series of different types of sites is considered in the context of the radiocarbon dates illustrated in Figure 2, it is clear that establishing the Turtle Creek Focus as a distinct cultural unit with a fixed beginning and end dates and strict geographical limits is not an adequate conceptualization. Traditionally, a focus has been dealt with as a very static entity with definite boundaries and a strict chronology; dealing with the Turtle Creek entity in such a fashion would not be productive. Rather, we need to view it as a dynamic cultural unit with boundaries which may have fluctuated over time and where there was a continuous progression of new ideas and new influences which brought about cultural change.

TURTLE CREEK AS THE INITIAL PHASE OF THE LATE PREHISTORIC

Apparently, the bow and arrow concept was introduced fairly early; certainly by AD 930 and possibly as early as AD 860. Local people appear to have accepted the idea while continuing to use the atlatl (dart points) as has been suggested by Hester (1971) and Skinner (1974). As Sollberger has demonstrated, <u>Edwards</u> arrowpoints were made in miniature form of earlier (or contemporaneous) dart point styles (Sollberger 1967). The <u>Scallorn</u> form, widely used in Central Texas and across the Southern Plains, was also adopted. Campsites created middens; at some sites (such as Beasley's Bandera County site) the midden was discrete to this phase while at other sites the middens added to existing Archaic burned-rock middens and nearby areas (Bammel site, Bushwhack shelter, Paris site; Skinner 1974). Pottery is absent from early sites (Beasley's site) but trade pottery from the Pueblo area appears to have been introduced sometime between AD 950 and 1150.

Faunal analysis from La Jita and Scorpion Cave suggests that these people hunted white-tailed deer and possibly antelope. They also subsisted on rabbits, raccoons, turtles, fish, mussels, birds, and snails, as well as on many varieties of local plants, including pecans. Skinner (1974) has demonstrated that this group probably did not meet all their needs in the relatively small area of the Turtle Creek drainage. This infers periodic migration across the Balcones escarpment to the major river valleys (such as at La Jita or 41 BX 226). Hunting parties ventured out onto the coastal plain. This type of seasonal migration is seen in the ethnographic literature. As Campbell (1975) has pointed out, Coahuiltecan groups camped along the Medina at certain times of the year to harvest the pecans as well as to exploit game drawn to available water. Campbell felt that these groups probably spent part of the year to the north in Kerr County since they were not always found along the San Antonio and Medina rivers.

Wedel (1975) has noted an analogous archaeological situation at Chalk Hollow in Randall County, at the eastern edge of the Llano Estacado. Wedel postulated a "transhumance" which involved residence on the uplands during some seasons and living in the canyons at the eastern edge of the caprock during other times of the year in order to maximize use of various types of floral and faunal resources, each at the appropriate season. This type of seasonal movement fits well with our South Texas data, both archaeological and ethnographic.

Bison reappeared in the region in increasing numbers (Hester 1975; Hester & Kelly 1976). Possibly with the bison, hunters from Central Texas also came introducing a new point form, the <u>Perdiz</u>. New localized forms, such as the <u>Sabinal</u> were also developed (dated at La Jita at AD 1140 or 1150) and at some sites (such as the Sparks site in Real County, occur in the absence of <u>Edwards</u> but with <u>Scallorn</u> and <u>Perdiz</u>. Local ceramics become common (as in Level 1 at La Jita, Level 1 at Oblate, etc.). Older point forms were discarded so that eventually (certainly by AD 1300), only <u>Perdiz</u> (and perhaps triangular and side-notched) points were in use.

This type of dynamic cultural continuum seems to be a more realistic way to view the evolving cultures of this part of Southern Texas. Certainly this type of construct is more in line with recent archaeological thinking about Texas archaeology (Wier 1976; Prewitt 1976; Patterson 1977). This type of concept is analogous to recent ideas in Oklahoma, where Custer Phase and Washita River Phase sites on the Southern Plains are now considered to be one cultural continuum evolving over time from about AD 800 to approximately AD 1450 (Bell 1973; Lintz 1974). It may also be analogous to the Fourche Maline phase of eastern Oklahoma which included both preceramic and ceramic developments.

For our area, the main value of viewing the Turtle Creek Phase as a cultural continuum, as just the initial component of the Late Prehistoric stage, lies in its power to explain variation in artifact inventories over time. When viewed as an evolutionary sequence of developments (as opposed to a static culture), this construct permits us to accept that early Turtle Creek Phase sites may have no pottery where later sites, even some without <u>Perdiz</u> points, may include Pueblo or Caddoan trade pottery or even locally made ceramics.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has reviewed the more recent evidence relevant to Sollberger's hypothesized Turtle Creek Phase. For the most part, the newer evidence supports his construct, and radiocarbon dates from two sites suggest a dating of about AD 860 to AD 1130. This dating is supported by dates for Pueblo II and III pottery which was recovered from Turtle Creek Phase sites. This strongly supports the idea that the Turtle Creek Phase represents the Initial Late Prehistoric in this area.

The Turtle Creek Phase is an important construct in that it permits, for the first time, a differentiation of cultural developments in this area of South Texas from those in adjacent areas of Central Texas. For too long, workers in South Texas have been dependent on the more completely developed chronology and hypothesized cultural sequences of Central Texas; this has been the result mainly of the lack of systematic work in South Texas prior to 1973 and also in part from the aversion to name local types which could be used to differentiate separate developments in our area. With the pioneering work of Sollberger and with the massive increase in basic archaeological data which has been developed in this area in the last ten years, it is now possible to begin to recognize the unique and complex cultural evolution of the Late Prehistoric in this region.

While we can now accept the validity of the Turtle Creek Phase, we must resist the temptation to view it as a static, rigid construct. For this reason, the term Phase rather than Focus is recommended. Current data suggests that there is considerable variation over time and at various localities within the area we have defined for the Phase; this requires that the Turtle Creek Phase must be a more dynamic construct and implies that it represents only the initial component of what must have been a continuing series of cultural developments in the South Texas Late Prehistoric.

Such an evolutionary construct carries with it, in the absence of any evidence of a wholesale invasion and population replacement, the implication that the cultural sequence represented in early Late Prehistoric times by the Turtle Creek Phase probably continued into the Historic period. Thus, the Turtle Creek Phase people may be the ancestors of those Coahuiltecan bands seen in this area by the first Spanish explorers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals and organizations provided assistance in the preparation of this report; however, the conclusions and speculations are my own. The Texas Archaeological Research Laboratory, Austin, provided a copy of the 1949 Sollberger paper and information on the Sparks site in Real County; Dr. Tom Hester, Center for Archaeological Research, UTSA, provided a copy of the 1951 Sollberger paper and of his own 1971 article; Mr. J. B. Sollberger loaned me his copy of his 1967 report; Dr. Alan Skinner loaned a copy of his 1974 dissertation; Tom Kelly provided dates from his forthcoming Camp Bullis report; Murray Beadles and the Hill Country Archeological Society sent extensive data from the Bammel Site; Tom Beasley provided additional data from the Bandera County site. The help provided by all these individuals and organizations is greatly appreciated.

Consolidated References

Beadles, Murray

1971 Interim Report Bammel Site (41KR10). The Arti-facts, Hill Country Archeological Society, Volume 2, No. 2:3-6.

Beasley, Tom S. 1978 A Site Hith <u>Edwards</u> Points in Bandera County, Texas. L<u>a Tierra</u>, Journal of the Southern Texas Archaeological Association (This Issue).

Bell, Robert E.

1973 The Washita River Focus of the Southern Plains. In Variations In Anthropology, Lathrap and Douglas (Ed), Illinois Archaeological Survey.

Briggs, A. K.

1971 An Archeological Survey of Ingram Reservoir. Texas Historical Survey Committee and Texas Water Development Board, ARcheological Survey Report No. 9.

.

Campbell, T. N. 1975 The Payaya Indians of Southern Texas. Southern Texas Archaeological Association, Special Fuolication No.).

Corbin, James E. 1974 A Nodel for Cultural Succession for the Coastal Bend Area of Texas. <u>Bulletin of the Texas</u> <u>Archeological Society</u> (BTAS), Volume 45:29-54.

Fawcett, William B. Jr. 1972 The Prehistory of Boxar County: A Study of Previous Nork in South Central Texas. Lower Plains

Fox, Anne A.

1975 An Arcnaeological Assessment of the Southern Portion of the Olmos Basin, Bexar County, Texas. The Center for Archaeological Research (CAR), The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA), Archaeological Survey Report No. 9.

Graves, Carol, and Lynn Highley 1973 41NE7: A Cave Site in Medina County, Texas. La Tierra, Vol. 5, No. 2:10-19.

Hester, Thomas R.

- 1970 Notes on the Edwards Arrow Point Type. The Record, Publication of the Dallas Archeological Society, Vol. 26, No. 2:17-18.
- 1971 Archeological Investigations at the La Jita Site, Uvalde County, Texas. BTAS, Vol. 42:51-138.
- 1975 Late Prehistoric Cultural Patterns Along the Lover Rio Grande of Texas., BTAS, Vol. 46:107-125.

Hester, T. R., and T. C. Kelly

1976 Archaeological Investigations at Sites Hear Hatalia, Medina County, Texas. UTSA-CAR, Archaeological Survey Report No. 20.

Kelley, J. C.

N.D. Manuscript on Jumano and Patarabueye Relations at La Junta Los Rios (Cited in Sollberger 1967)

Kelly, T. C.

1974 Notes on Test Excavations at Site 41BX228 (Panther Springs Site). Appendix II in Hester, T. R., Archaeological Survey of Areas Proposed for Modification in the Salado Creek Watershed, Bexar County, Texas. UTSA-CAR, Archaeological Survey Report No. 3.

Lintz, Christopher

1974 An Analysis of the Custer Focus and Its Relationship to the Plains Village Horizon in Oklahoma. In Papers In Anthropology, Vol. 15, Ho. 2, Department of Anthropology, University of Oklahoma. horman.

Patterson, Patience E.

1977 A Lithic Reduction Sequence: A Test Case in the North Fork Reservoir Area, Uilliamson County, Texas. <u>BTAS</u>, Vol. 43:53-32.

Perino, Gregory 1963 <u>Guide to the Identification of Certain American Indian Projectile Points</u>. Oklahoma Anthropological Society Special Bulletin Ho. 3.

Prewitt, Elton R.

1976 Late Archaic Occupations at the Loeve-Fox Site: The San Marcos and Twin Sisters Phases. In T. R. Hester (Ed), The Texas Archaic: A Symposium. UTSA-GAR Special Report No. 2.

Schuetz, Mardith K.

1966 The Gram berg Site: An Archaic Indian Habitation in Bezar County, Texas. Hitte Museum Studies ito. 1.

Skinner, S. A.

1974 Prehistoric Settlement of a "Matural Area." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Southern Methodist University.

Smith, Harvey Jr.

- 1975 Dig That Square: A Lesson from Timmeron Rockshelter (41HY95). La Tierra, Vol. 2, No. 4:9-10. Sollberger, J. R.
- Soliberger, J.
 - 1948 Lamb's Creek Mound, The Record, Dallas Archeological Society, Vol. 3, No. 1.
 - 1949 A Prehistoric Rock Shelter in Kerr County, Texas, The Record, Vol. 8, No. 3.
 - 1951 Three Sites in Atascosa County, Texas, The Record, Vol. 9, No. 3.
 - 1967 A New Type of Arrow Point Hith Speculations As To Its Origin, The Record, Vol. 23, No. 3.
- Suhm, D. A.
 - 1960 A Review of Central Texas Archeology. 5TAS, Vol. 27:63-107.

Suhm, D. A., and E. B. Jelks

1962 Handbook of Texas Archeology: Type Descriptions. Special Bulletin No. 4, Texas Memorial iluseum, Austin.

Suhm, D. A., A. D. Krieger, and E. B. Jelks

- 1954 An Introductory Handbook of Texas Archeology, <u>CTAS</u>, Vol. 25.
- Tunnell, Curtis D.
 - 1962 Oblate: A Rockshelter Site. In Johnson, Suhm, and Tunnell, Salvage Archeology of Canyon Reservoir: The Nunderlich, Footbridge, and Oblate Sites. Texas Memorial Museum, Bulletin No. 5.
- Valastro, S. Jr., and E. Nott Davis MS University of Texas at Austin Radiocarbon Dates VIII.
- Wedel, Waldo R.
- 1975 Chalk Hollow: Culture Sequence and Chronology in the Texas Panhandle. Actas del XLI Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, Vol. 1, Mexico City. Wier, Frank A.
- 1976 The Central Texas Archaic Reconsidered. In T. R. Hester (Ed), The Texas Archaic: A Symposium. UTSA-CAR, Special Report No. 2.

Recommended Citation Style - Articles republished in this issue are somewhat edited versions of the originals. For this reason, any reference to these articles should distinguish the original and the reprinted versions. Recommended citation style would be as in the example given below:

Sollberger, J. B.

1978 A New Type of Arrow Point With Speculations as to Its Origin. <u>The Record</u>, publication of the Dallas Archeological Society, Vol. 23, No. 3, March 1967 (as republished in <u>La Tierra</u>, Journal of the Southern Texas Archaeological Association, Vol. 5, No. 4:13-20.

_

\$4 5

40 25

r