

### SUPPLEMENT 3. THE LODGES

Brad Logan

The interpretation of lodges at the Wallace site by Huffman and Earley (2014) is flawed in several respects beginning with this *a priori* assumption: “[the] amalgamation of [Upper Republican] hamlets into larger villages may well have caused changes in socioeconomic organization, such as dispute resolution, status differentiation, and economic diversification. Even in large Historic villages, however, the main production unit was the semiautonomous lodge; this aspect of the domestic economy was most likely a continuation from the past” (Huffman and Earley 2014:660). It is more reasonable to entertain the possibility that change in the socioeconomic organization of members of a larger settlement entailed change in the spatial organization of individual lodges and the kind of productivity that occurred in them. In either case, comparison of lodge space in the two settlement types is required and the authors fail to do this. They assume continuity in lodge organization to justify their assertions that “changes brought about by village amalgamation are not significant to our study” (Huffman and Earley 2014:660) and that Upper Republican settlements were smaller versions of Pawnee villages differing only in lodge form but not household organization. On this faulty base they create a model of an Upper Republican lodge with cosmological and gender-based attributes like those of Pawnee houses and impose four such houses on structural remains at the Wallace site described by the excavators as having different forms. They create a model with no archaeological foundation and distort data from the Wallace site to fit it.

In three places the authors cite Kivett and Metcalf (1997), who describe 47 house floors at twelve Upper Republican sites in the Medicine Creek valley, Nebraska. Rather than seek

support for the validity of altars or sacred space in Upper Republican lodges in that source, however, they fail to note that it makes no reference to these in *any* of the lodges. Concerning the cosmologically related orientation of lodge entryways, they neglect Kivett and Metcalf's (1997:167) data: of 44 floors with definable entryways, 17 (39 percent) were oriented southward, 13 (30 percent) southeastward, 11 (25 percent) eastward, two southwestward, and one possibly westward. Given this variation, how can Huffman and Earley (2014) justify the model of an Upper Republican lodge with an entryway of cosmological orientation? The variation evident at Medicine Creek suggests that entryways were aligned pragmatically, probably to benefit ventilation and avoid seasonally cold drafts.

The weak foundation of their model is sufficient grounds for dismissing its application to any Upper Republican site. More egregious is its application to the Wallace site, which lacks any evidence of subrectangular lodges. In this regard it must be noted that while Olson et al. (1968:38) considered Wallace (and two other sites in the same locality) "well within the defined limits of the Upper Republican Aspect of the Central Plains Phase or Tradition," they emphasized that "notable exceptions to the original definition are...the earthlodge size, outline, and structure, particularly the lack of four central support posts..." While they observed similarities in material culture, they noted that "the major variation is architecture" (Olson et al. 1968:43). Ireland (1968:4-39) identified Wallace as Apishapa and others have agreed with this more recently (Cassells 1997; Kalasz et al. 1999).

Nonetheless, Huffman and Earley imagine subrectangular lodges at Wallace and rely on a non sequitur to do so. "Upper Republican settlements elsewhere show that our circular features were actually portions of much larger rectangular lodges" (Huffman and Earley 2014:660). It does not follow that because undescribed or referenced "settlements elsewhere" were

rectangular, those at Wallace must have been similar, especially since they were described otherwise by the excavators.

Furthermore, they do not present sufficient evidence to justify replacement of the original site interpretation with their own. In the original report Olson et al. (1968:3-16) defined seven houses after telling readers to disregard what had been designated House 2 in the field and to recognize the original House 4 as two separate structures (4A and 4B), one "cut into the other." Olsen and others describe three structures with regard to form. House 1 (excavated in 1965; all others were dug in 1966) and House 7 are "circular," while House 3 is "conoidal" (see below). No others are described with regard to outline. These inferences are based on field observations of postmolds, stone slabs, and house floor depressions.

Huffman and Earley (2014:662-666) draw four rectangular house outlines (their Figures 4a, 5, 7, and 8) that do not conform to any features or floors described by the excavators. While the captions (except for that of the composite Figure 8) state they are adapted from Olson and others, they do not note the omission of cross-sections of house floors provided in the original report. The reader is left to assume that the walls follow something seen in 1965 and 1966 when that is not the case. Supplemental Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 contrast the house outlines of Huffman and Earley (2014) with the distributions of postmolds, of rock slabs, and of hearths and other features.

Huffman and Earley (2014:666) draw rectangular house outlines with dashed and solid lines that the reader must assume reflect conjecture and certitude respectively. In two houses the latter are limited to portions of entryways (Huffman and Earley: Figure 8). With regard to one, House 3, Olson et al. (1968:7) state: "it would appear that the roof and wall were a single unit, either conoidal (most likely) or dome shaped. The post-hole pattern is roughly circular, but with

a great deal of variation both in the placement of posts in the general outline and in relationship to one another.” They do not include the two post holes adopted by Huffman and Earley (2014:666-667) as part of an entryway for House 3 because they are three meters distant from the circular pattern formed by others. As envisioned by Huffman and Earley, House 3 embraces a much greater area than recognized by the excavators and is entirely free of peripheral support features. For reasons unstated, the western part of this structure is not shown and its southern wall is at one point a mere two meters from the edge of the bluff. Regarding the latter attribute it is worth noting that almost the entire southern wall of their House 2 parallels this edge at the same distance and abuts it for about three meters (Huffman and Earley: Figure 8). Though Olson et al. (1968:16) consider the houses “located fairly close to the edge of the scarp, with the exception of House 4”, the closest feature of any house to the bluff edge as originally described is three meters, with others lying five meters or more distant. These are more practical distances that would have allowed construction, maintenance, and other extramural activities.

For House 5 ‘confident’ inference of form is limited to one side of a northeast-oriented entryway inferred from a cluster of post holes that the original excavators considered “very suggestive of a rack” (Olson et al. 1968:14, Figure 9). The other side of the entryway parallels the first beside a single post hole. The eastward oriented entryways of Houses 1 and 2 (Figures 10 and 11) are entirely conjectural as neither is associated with any features. Only small portions of the walls of those structures are drawn with confidence, in both cases unwarranted. The circular arrangement of posts that had embraced all of House 1 in 1965 morphs, according to Huffman and Earley (2014:666), into the central supports of a much larger structure (Huffman and Earley: Figure 8). It incorporates much, but not all, of what Olson et al. (1968:8-12) defined as two separate structures, Houses 4A and 4B. The arbitrarily revised wall of House 1 makes

extramural a concentration of stone and two pits that the excavators in 1965 considered part of House 4B. Apparently it was easier to discern this portion of a wall decades after the excavation.

Huffman and Earley (2014:660-663) create a complicated relationship between Houses 1 and 2 not supported by the original descriptions of Houses 4A, 4B and 6. Olson et al. (1968) make no reference to the stratigraphic relationship necessitated by the structures of the revisionists, who suggest that House 1 post-dates and embraces much of the eastern part of House 2, including its central hearth and an eastward entryway (the latter not seen in 1966). One would think that the hearth, evident to the excavators, would have been cleared or obliterated by the occupants of House 1. But Huffman and Earley (2014:668) state that it “had been covered with clay,” an attribute not described in the original report. Instead, Olson et al. (1968:14) write:

the floor [of House 6] appears to have been cleared to native and then leveled by the addition of clay. While this surface can hardly be called smooth, it is more regular than the floors in either House 3 or 5. The floor area is concave and there is a secondary depression nearly 6in deep in the center of the floor. Other than a fire area in the middle of the floor, approximately 3 ft in diameter, there were no special floor features.

Olson and others did not see the overlapping structures defined by Huffman and Earley (2014) as Houses 1 and 2. Rather, they describe two discrete complexes of stone and post holes that they assigned to Houses 4A and 4B and, at least three meters to their southwest, a concentration of stone and posts designated House 6. House 1 of Huffman and Earley (2014) overlaps House 2 because of the former’s inferred symmetry. To achieve this they mirrored the

northern wall of their House 1, extrapolated from a “rounded corner and two walls” not seen by the excavators, to create its southern half (Huffman and Earley 2014:660) . The northwestern corner of their House 2 conforms to no supportive features and extends to an area suggested to have been an altar, a feature not seen by the excavators. Moreover, Olson et al. (1968:6) include two cross-sections of House 6 not shown by Huffman and Earley (2014), one of which shows a sub-surface floor whose southern terminus would be *within* the revised House 2 and less than a meter east of the putative altar. The original report (Olson et al. 1968:6, 14) clearly describes a much smaller structure.

Finally, despite the original description of House 7 as circular, Huffman and Earley (2014: 665) eliminate it from consideration as “a lack of data made it impossible to reconstruct [its] shape ..., including where it intersected with House 5.” Perhaps four subrectangular structures were sufficient for their aims. In fact, no series of posts or post holes at Wallace allows inference of one lodge of that form let alone four. Huffman and Earley (2014) have created illusory structures in order to support a misconceived idea.

## REFERENCES CITED

Cassells, Steve.

1997 *The Archeology of Colorado*. Johnson Books, Boulder, Colorado.

Huffman, Thomas N., and Frank Lee Earley

2014 Caddoan Archaeology on the High Plains: A Conceptual Nexus of Bison, Lodges, Maize, and Rock Art. *American Antiquity* 79(4): 655-678.

Ireland, Stephen K.

1968 Five Apishapa Sites in the Arkansas Valley, Colorado. Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Denver.

Kalasz, Stephen M., Mark Mitchell, and Christian J. Zier

1999 Late Prehistoric Stage. In *Colorado Prehistory: A Context for the Arkansas River Basin*, edited by Christian J. Zier and Stephen M. Kalasz, pp. 141-264. Colorado Council of Professional Archaeologists, Denver.

Kivett, Marvin F. and George S. Metcalf

1997 The Prehistoric People of the Medicine Creek Reservoir, Frontier County, Nebraska: An Experiment in Mechanized Archaeology (1946-1948). *Plains Anthropologist* 42:1-218.

Olson, Alan P., Arnold M. Withers, and Stephen Ireland

1968 Archaeological Salvage for the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, 1966. Contract No. 14-10-0232-1561. Report submitted to the National Park Service by the University of Denver, Department of Anthropology.

### FIGURE CAPTIONS FOR SUPPLEMENT 3

Supplemental Figure 1. Huffman and Earley's House 3 compared to the excavated features of Olson et al. (1968:Figure 6) and Ireland (1968:Figure 5).

Supplemental Figure 2. Huffman and Earley's House 5 compared to the excavated features of Olson et al. (1968:Figure 4) and Ireland (1968:Figure 7).

Supplemental Figure 3. Huffman and Earley's House 1 compared to the excavated features of Olson et al. (1968:Figure 3) and Ireland (1968:Figures 4, 6).

Supplemental Figure 4. Huffman and Earley's House 2 compared to the excavated features of Olson et al. (1968:Figure 2) and Ireland (1968:Figure 8).