The Goebel Site (41AU1)

An Archaic-Neo American Site in Austin County, Texas

A. R. Duke

Introduction

The Goebel site was first noted in July 1959 when a mound, rising 9-10 feet above the surrounding land, was tested and found to contain many clam shells, bones and flint chips. Several broken projectile points were present on the surface also.

In October 1959, the owner of the property sliced off a portion of the mound with a bulldozer blade to obtain fill dirt and it was established quickly that the "hill" was a burial mound. (1)

Permission was obtained from Alvin Goebel, after whom the site is named, and the salvage operation was started the following day. Over a period of several months a total of 42 burials were removed. These were buried in a variety of positions - extended, partly and completely flexed. Grave goods included conch shell columella beads (1-3" long), projectile points (dart and arrow), bone awls and sandstone abraders. Blocks of sandstone were found around the skull of every skeleton and the excavators felt that a burial custom was involved. Burial records, photographs and some skeletal materials were sent to the University of Texas for analysis.

Five hundred feet north of the burial mound and running east and west along Mill Creek lies an occupation area. This paper will be directed toward recording the work completed on this "living" area.

(1) See Houston Archeological Society Newsletter Number 1, November 1959. An Austin County Burial Site - Charles and Vivian Fleming.
Site Description

Site 41AU1 is located four miles south of Bellville along the south bank of Mill Creek. It is one of a number of sites along Mill Creek and originally was designated Mill Creek Site #3. The site extends east-west along the bank of Mill Creek for about 200 feet and extends south from the creek for about 150 feet. Elevation of the highest portion of the site was about 15-17 feet above the water while the work was in progress.

The site is located among rolling hills and was heavily wooded at the time excavations were carried out. Heavy underbrush had to be cleared to permit access to the site.

Midden soil ranges from a black sandy loam, high in organic material at the surface, down to the Beaumont clay with a gradual reduction in organic content as the clay level is approached. Sharply defined soil stratification was not evident.

Oak and cottonwood trees predominate. Palmettos abound and required removal before excavation of the pits. Fauna observed included white tail deer, cottontail and jack rabbits, armadillo, skunk, raccoon and fox. Copperheads were abundant along the creek.

41AU1 shows a long occupation sequence. A radiocarbon analysis by Shell Development Company on carbonized wood, including acorns, from a hearth at a depth of 106-108 inches showed a date of 4530±80 years or 2569±80 B.C. (2) Pottery and arrowpoints do not appear below approximately 36 inches.


Lay-Out and Excavation Techniques

The site was laid out using plane table and alidade and north-south and east-west zero grids established. The map of the site was contoured at 1 foot intervals with land elevation assumed arbitrarily (see Topo map). Five foot squares were used and their positions designated according to their coordinate direction and distance from the primary datum point.

Pits were excavated in 6 inch levels. After each level was excavated, the floor was cleaned and checked for features. All pertinent information was recorded and features photographed.

The topo-contour map designated Figure One shows the location of the site in relationship to Mill Creek, elevations across the site and the locations of the excavated pits.

Future installments of this report in the HAS Newsletter will cover provenience of cultural materials in the pits, descriptions of ceramic, lithic, and worked-bone artifacts and burials found in the occupation area.

An attempt will be made also to compare "common denominators" with the other Austin County sites reported - particularly those sites north of Wallis. (41AU36, 41AU37, 41AU38, etc.)
Discussion:

The Goebel site (41AU1), as indicated by the number assigned to it, was the first site in Austin County reported to the University of Texas. Little, if any, archeological work had been done in Austin County and as Mott Davis, who visited the site, stated in a letter sent to the writer in 1964, "that will be a pioneer job for that particular area, won't it?"

Indeed it was "pioneering" in the area and for a number of HAS members since the HAS was organized in 1959 and work was started on the site in July of the same year under the direction of experienced and capable members. Some of the participants spent over two years working at the site on week-ends and most planned objectives were accomplished. Several unfortunate events occurred which have delayed the writing of a final comprehensive report. Written reports have been published and are on file at UofT on various aspects of the site and include a brief review of the burial mound, radiocarbon date from the occupation site and comments on unusual artifacts from the site. Now, hopefully, this final report will satisfy the last objective - to convert all the field work to the written word.

Alvin Goebel, original owner of the property on which 41AU1 is located, passed away in 1967. His hospitality, understanding and cooperation made it possible to accomplish the work on the site. His daughter, Dorothy J. Meyer, is now owner of the property and is very interested in the report as are other members of her family.

As indicated previously, this report will be written in sections and will extend over several future Newsletters.

Shown below is a copy of the radiocarbon date report for 41AU1.

ANALYTICAL REPORT

To D. R. Lewis  
Report Number 8205

Date June 12, 1961  
Book Number 1173

One sample: Charcoal from fire-pit, -106"  
Site 41AU1, Square N55, W25

Age, years  
(Radiocarbon)  
4530± 80

(To be continued)
INVESTIGATIONS AT 41B035

The Dow-Cleaver Site, Brazoria co., Texas

Ted D. Hollingsworth

INTRODUCTION

The Dow-Cleaver site, located inside Dow Chemical Company's "Plant B", just west of Freeport, was discovered by Pete Cleaver in the late 1960's. An investigation including excavations was conducted in 1971 by Lawrence E. Aten. Since that time, an artificial erosional situation has resulted in a remarkable exposure of the site, revealing its extensiveness and preserving many of the original occupational features. Since 1977, volunteers at the Brazosport Museum of Natural Science, led by Norm Loeffler and Johnny Pollan, have done extensive controlled surface collecting and mapping, working within guidelines established by the plant. The following is a brief description of the site, the work that has been done at the site, and some of the initial findings and possible interpretations of the site's unique features.

SITE DESCRIPTION

41B035 is located on the east bank of the Brazos river, approximately ten miles upstream from the Gulf of Mexico. The site extends from almost at the river's edge to about 400 yards "inland." Most of the vegetation is removed from the surface of the study area except for a number of live oak stumps which appear to be 150-250 years old and which may already have been sizeable trees during the last periods of site occupation. This is in keeping with the current vegetation patterns of the area. The flood plains of local waterways are covered with dense hardwood forest dominated by massive live oaks and other deciduous trees such as pecan and elm. Where the forest is undisturbed, the understory is often minimal. Edges are overgrown with a wide variety of grasses and sedges, young trees, and herbaceous and woody shrubs and vines such as yaupon, poison ivy, and blackberry. The neighboring marshes and prairies are home to many more species of grasses and other herbaceous plants. As the site lies within eight miles of fresh water marsh, salt water marsh, prairie, beach and the open Gulf, one of the site's advantages may have been its proximity to such a wide array of natural resources. The river would have provided convenient transportation to people who are recorded to have made extensive use of the canoe.
The site is a shell midden site covering approximately 30 acres at the confluence of the river and a small stream. The site extends several hundred yards along the stream and perhaps 400 to 500 yards upstream along the river. A more precise estimate of the shell midden boundaries has been difficult to make due to the nature of the vegetation and the limited access to this property. Aerial photographs make it clear that the site occupies much of the triangular delta of the smaller stream and that different channels of the stream may have been active during the occupation of the site. In addition, Larry Aten suggests that the river has moved relative to the site. Excavations by Aten's team and bulldozer cuts by the company reveal that much of the site consists of several (Aten identified six) non-contiguous unstratified zones marked by shell lenses and that levels below the occurrence of shell are relatively free of artifacts.

The predominant shell composing the midden is *Rangia cuneata*, and lenses of the oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) are common. The most abundant cultural artifacts are potsherds of a usually plain sandy paste variety, although incised sherds and shell and pottery grogged pieces are not rare. This assemblage is consistent with other shell midden sites in the area. More unusual is the occurrence of many unbroken and finely chipped perdiz and scallorn type projectile points. Faunal remains are abundant throughout the site. All of these artifacts will be discussed more thoroughly under results and conclusions.

**WORK BY THE BMNS**

After Larry Aten's work in 1971, trees were removed and a portion of the site was impounded and inundated with salt water. When this was drained in the mid-seventies, the lack of vegetation over this area allowed rapid erosion. Because this is a broad flat area however, much of the erosion has occurred in "sheets," exfoliating the site in roughly horizontal layers, and revealing the surfaces of shell lenses and artifacts over a large area. The vertical stratigraphy and associations of surface features are difficult to assess, but the unique erosion has revealed the morphology and relationship of many features that undoubtedly would have been overlooked by conventional trenching or test excavations. As the light sandy matrix has been removed, artifacts have remained on the surface little disturbed, so that the relative positions of thousands of artifacts are clearly visible. The area where these features are most clearly seen occupies about four acres and this has been
the area where the Museum's efforts have been concentrated.

When the significance of the site became apparent, along with the unstable condition of the site, it was decided that it would be appropriate to take immediate action to record data which would soon be lost. Permission was obtained from the company to map the site and recover artifacts under the supervision of Dow security and without excavating. A datum point was arbitrarily selected in the southwest corner of the above mentioned four acre area to serve as a reference point for subsequent gridding of the site prior to surface collecting. Stakes were driven into the ground every ten feet over an area oriented to magnetic north and extending roughly four hundred feet to the north and three hundred feet to the east of the datum marker. In all, over thirteen hundred stakes were planted.

Once this was done, volunteer crews from the Museum spent many weekends in 1979 and 1980 systematically removing all visible pottery and lithic artifacts from the surface. It was decided that faunal remains would be collected in random samples at a later date due to their volume. The locations of artifacts were recorded not only as to the ten foot by ten foot square from which they were removed but as to which one foot square within that unit. Artifacts from each one foot square were placed into carefully labeled bags. This was necessitated by the high density of artifacts in some areas and the desire to keep data as discretely organized as possible. A certain amount of emphasis was placed upon collecting pottery which might be reconstructed as this possibility seemed to be one of the promising features of the site. Where a pile of pottery was collected which seemed to represent a single vessel, an effort was made to scratch a few inches below the surface to recover as much of the vessel as possible. In some areas, sand washing away from other areas had re-covered parts of vessels, while in other areas, portions of the vessel still articulated and undisturbed were lying within centimeters of the surface.

In addition to the pottery, over three hundred lithics have been recovered. The bulk of these is in unbroken perdz and scallorn type projectile points, although accompanied by no preforms and almost no evidence of on-site tool manufacture. Each of these artifacts received an individual catalogue number to assist cataloguing and future statistical analyses.
Other artifacts which have been recovered include deer ulna awls, bone projectile points and fish hooks, and whelk shells from which rectangular sections have been cut. Other work done at the site includes mapping and making photographic records of the site's surface features.

Many hours have been spent in the BMNS archeology prep room washing artifacts and labeling them with the information recorded on the bag from which they came. In several cases, pottery vessels collected as a unit have been reconstructed to near completion. In more than a dozen other cases, reconstruction has proceeded to the point of yielding accurate information on vessel diameter, depth, decoration, shape and volume. At the time of this writing, cleaning and labeling of material is nearing completion, as work at the site was halted in June of 1981.

Thanks to the efforts of Norm Loeffler and Johnny Pollan and the understanding shown by the company; however, permission has been granted to augment this work with several sampling techniques intended to minimize required time on the site while yielding data which will best compliment that already collected by the Museum's efforts. These include cutting shallow profiles and making careful photographic records of the platforms which will be discussed later, intensive collecting of faunal material in randomly selected units, and excavating approximately six test pits within the study area to help establish some vertical stratigraphy for surface features. In addition, the plant has granted permission for small groups of Museum staff to visually monitor erosion of the site at approximately quarterly intervals.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Work to date at the Dow-Cleaver site has revealed several unusual features. First is the occurrence of a relatively large number of beautifully finished projectile points from non-native cherts, without comparable evidence of on-site tool manufacture. Second is the complete absence of human remains (one human milk tooth has been found). Thirdly is the presence of several dozen distinct platforms made clearly visible by the unique erosion and composed of small tightly compacted Rangia shells raised into flat surfaces three to six inches above the surrounding level. A visit to the site in October of 1980 by Dr. Harry Shafer of Texas A&M University strengthened our suspicions that these might be "house platforms." Evidence
that suggests these mound were used as living surfaces includes the fact that they are composed of very small shells, largely thumbnail size, some of which are still articulated, an obvious hearth in association with almost every platform, and that the shells are placed on top of clay built up to a thickness of a few inches. The shells are compacted into a very dense surface. The average size and shape of these platforms is oval and approximately five feet by ten feet. The need for a raised surface on which to live may be related to the high annual rainfall and slow runoff in the area. Although drainage patterns have been extensively altered, much of the area remains wet for several days after an average rain.

The large size of the site compared with other local shell midden sites and the abundance of finished lithics (again relative to other local sites) tempts one to suggest a possible function of the site as a center of trade. Evidence of shell goods manufacture and Cabeza de Vaca's notes that he traded coastal items inland for

...skins, red ochre which they rub on their faces, hard cane for arrows, flint for arrowheads, with sinews and cement to attach them, and tassels of deer hair which they dye red...

might also support this suggestion. Certainly future analyses will focus on explaining the platform features of the site and more accurately assessing the site's functions and relationship to other local sites.

Other features of the site are quite comparable to other sites in the area. Vertebrates represented at the site by their skeletal remains include fish, snakes, alligator, turtles, rodents, rabbits, deer, bison and bear, although faunal analysis should yield a more thorough list.

It should be evident that the Dow-Cleaver site presents a unique opportunity for single site interpretation through artifactual and spacial analyses. Furthermore, the late occupation of the site as concluded by Aten and verified by additional artifact typology makes the site suitable for comparison to the meager ethnographic record there is of the area's original inhabitants. These studies should go a long way towards reconstructing the
lifestyle of these people and providing a point from which other sites can be compared and perhaps form the basis of a regional synthesis of settlement patterns and resource exploitation, etc... The archeological efforts of the Museum are intended to compliment these possibilities.

Once again, we appreciate the understanding of the Dow Chemical Company. The company has generously donated all artifacts to the Museum, and many of these, including several reconstructed pottery vessels are on display to the public. All materials are available for study to qualified individuals. The many volunteers at the BMNS who have helped with collecting, washing and labeling are now organized into the Brazosport Archaeological Society. For additional information on this group, the BMNS, or this report, feel free to contact the Museum at (713) 265-7831.
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The following reports are available from Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas 78285.

- Some Aspects of Late Prehistoric and Protohistoric Archaeology in Southern Texas - Hester and Hill $2.00 + $1.50 postage + 11 cents for Texas residents.
- Papers on the Archaeology of the Texas Coast - Highley and Hester. $6.00 + $1.50 postage + 33 cents tax for Texas residents.
- Papers on Paleo-Indian Archaeology in Texas - Hester and Birmingham. $2.00 + $1.50 postage + 11 cents tax.

Information on other reports available may be obtained by contacting the Center at the address shown above.
White Oak Bayou Sites

W. L. McClure

41 HR 284

This site was located by Caskey in 1960. It is on the north side of the present channel and was within a horseshoe bend in the natural stream. Erosion following channel work exposed a few artifacts along about 100 feet of the bank. Soils are the same as at 41 HR 282.

BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL:
A fossil upper molar of a horse, Equus sp., and a recent mandible of a cat, Felis catus, were collected. It is unlikely that either were associated with the prehistoric occupation.

CERAMICS:
The collection includes one sherd of a pottery vessel which is probably Tchefuncte ware. The paste is black throughout and contorted. The Type 1 rim sherd has incised lines and punctated circles, Fig. 50, A. Thickness is 5 mm.

OTHER FIRE-HARDENED MATERIAL:
Two lumps of fire-hardened clay were found. They may be clay daub or from a hearth. One has two sides that are nearly flat that meet at right angles and the other is wedge shaped. Weight is 32 grams. There is a possibility that they may be fragments of very poorly fired modern bricks.

LITHICS:

Pebbles:
The collection includes 7 unmodified pebbles that are from 10 to 25 mm. in size. No indication of use is evident. Weight is 30 grams. There are also 4 pebbles with one or more fracture faces. Size is from 15 to 35 mm. The largest pebble is heat fractured. Total weight is 170 grams.

Bifaces:
One Stage 'A' Biface of silicified wood weighs 19 gr. One Stage 'B' Biface of silicified wood weighs 27 gr. One oval shaped Stage 'C' Biface of silicified wood weighs 11 gr. A well worked flint biface is the base of a large Gary dart point or of another tool. The flint is heavily patinated. Weight is 3.7 grams.

Projectile Points:
The collection includes eight projectile points or parts thereof. One is an arrow point and 7 are dart points. Total weight is 29 grams.

Kent: (2) (Fig. 50, B., C.)
Item B. is silicified palm wood and weighs 5.5 grams. Item C. is flint and weighs 3.3 grams.

Gary: (1) (Fig. 50, D.)
This point was made from a secondary flake of silicified palm wood. Part of the bulb of percussion remains. Weight is 5.3 grams.

Lange: (1) (Fig. 50, E.)
This flint dart point has been resharpened. Weight is 8.4 grams.
Ellis: (2) (Fig. 50, F., G.)
These are stems of flint dart points that are probably Ellis. Weight is 2.4 and 1.5 gr.

Unidentified, Stemmed: (1)
One fragment of the shoulder of a flint dart point weighs 0.9 gr.

Rockwall: (1) (Fig. 50, H.)
This well made flint arrow point weighs 1.1 grams.

Figure 50

Flakes and Chips:
The collection includes 132 flakes and chips that weigh 150 grams. One is quartzite, 32 are silicified wood and the others are flint. Some are heavily patinated and some have calcium carbonate deposits. Two are lipped flakes and one may be a microblade. Four are fire-popped. Some indication of use is found on 60 (46%). Sixteen have been used as scrapers and 44 as cutting tools. Retouched edges are straight on 2 and convex on one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Utilized</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Unutilized</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10 mm.</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sil.wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 mm.</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sil.wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 20 mm.</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sil.wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartzite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 25 mm.</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27  Flakes and Chips

DISCUSSION:
The principal occupation of this site was during the Archaic period with only casual indications from the Late Prehistoric period. There probably was no Woodlands occupation.

WOB-114
APPENDIX B

Location of the Dobie Homestead and Other Structures

Introduction. A major function of the archival research is to complement the archaeological field work and analysis. A principal goal in this regard is to document and help locate old structures such as buildings and roads. Of prime interest is the location of the homestead(s) of Sterling and Robert Dobie.

Buildings. As noted earlier, Sterling Dobie was living on the William Dobie Survey by 1843, so there must have been a house on the property by that time. In 1846, George R. Read of Montgomery County advertised:

"LAND FOR SALE A LABOR of Land, situated on Middle Bayou, 5 miles from New Washington [Morgan's Point], with a tolerable house, good smoke [house] and stable, never failing well and running water, with small improvements. For further information, apply to S. N. Dobie or R. N. Dobie, near the premises."  

At that time, Read owned both the labor of land along the northern edge of the William Dobie Survey, later called lot 10, and the adjacent labor of land to the north in the James Lindsey Survey. There is no record of sale at that time for either piece of land, so it is uncertain whether the house was on the Dobie Survey. Certainly it was not the Dobie homestead.

The next indication of buildings is in the 1877 map, shown in Figure 5, made when the Survey was subdivided. This map is from the original Volume 17 of Deeds. The version shown in Figure 4 (HASN 70:15) is from transcribed Volume 17; note the slight differences. Of particular interest are the two small dark squares at the eastern end of lot 3, enclosed by a roughly triangular "fence." Presumably these squares represent buildings, and perhaps the rectangular "fence" to the south, in lot 1, was a large corral or a fenced field. Recall that the Dobies raised corn (HASN 69:7), and would have had to protect it from the livestock. This map, we believe, presents the best archival evidence for the location of the Dobie homestead(s). It should be noted, of course, that Sterling Dobie moved away in 1858 and Robert Dobie's widow Amanda remarried and moved away in 1863.

The map in Figure 6 shows a 50 acre portion of lots 3-5 which was sold by T. J. Markey and wife Elizabeth to John A. Caplen in 1892. The accompanying deed states that this land "has been used and occupied by us as a homestead for fifteen years." No house is directly mentioned in the deed nor shown on the map.

The earliest map with accurate building locations is the 1916 USGS Topographic Map.

---

90 "Telegraph and Texas Register," March 4, 18, 25 and April 1, 1846
91 Harris Co. Deeds G:253,506,526; 12:638
92 Harris Co. Deeds 17:463 (original volume)
93 Harris Co. Deeds 61:321
shown in Figure 7. Five buildings are indicated, four on the east, along the edge of the wooded area that flanks Middle Bayou, and one out in the prairie. They have been numbered for easy reference. Buildings 1 and 2 are at the same location as the small squares in the 1877 map (Figure 5); however, there is a 90 degree rotation in orientation. Buildings 3 and 4 are located in lots 8 and 9, respectively. Building 5, in the prairie, falls within the 50-acre Markey homestead of Figure 6.

None of the five 1916 buildings appear on the modern (1955) topographic map,95 shown in Figure 8. Indeed, a small tank farm sits at the location of buildings 1 and 2. To aid in locating the remains of the five buildings and other structures, we have drawn in the lot lines and the 1916 roads and buildings on the 1955 map. The resulting map, shown in Figure 9, is rather complicated, but useful for field work.

Roads, Bridges and Other Structures. The earliest documentation of a road through the Dobie Survey is in the Harris County Record of Roads. In November 1888, the County Commissioners granted a petition to "lay out and establish a road from Red Bluff by way of Middle Bayou Bridge to Genoa." By November 1889 the route had been surveyed. The road was to run through the William Dobie Survey along the line between lots 1 and 2. The right-of-way was to be 40 feet wide, and would require 5.2 acres each from lots 1 and 2 (5.2% of each lot!). The bridge over Middle Bayou was to be 130 feet long.96

Three similar maps, published in 1895, 1899 and 1903, show this road, but the approach from Genoa differed, as can be seen from Figures 10 and 11. In a 1908 map, shown in Figure 12, both approaches are present, with the name Genoa Red Bluff Road applied to the southern approach.97

Also in 1908, work commenced on an irrigation ditch, 16 feet wide and 6 feet deep, along the southern edge of lot 2. A map of the ditch in 1914, shown in Figure 13, gives no indication of a road there, and the 1916 topographic map (Figure 7) shows, too, only a ditch.98

Other roads or lanes are shown on the 1916 map, with a bridge across the Bayou near the junction of lots 6 and 7. Other ditches are indicated at the southern edge of lot 1 and through the middle of lot 8. But, by 1955, the 1916 roads had been supplanted by oil field roads. Only in a few places do the new roads coincide with the old.

Conclusions. The most likely location for the Dobie homestead(s) is the area of the two small squares on the 1877 map (Figure 5). This is bolstered by the September 6, 1857, letter (HASN 69:8) which says the Dobies bathed near their home. Two buildings existed in that location in 1916, but a tank farm occupied the area by 1955. Building 5 on the 1916 map is likely at the site of the 1877-1892 Markey homestead. It, too, had vanished by 1955. The 1889 road must have been important, in view of the paucity of roads on the 1895-1908 maps. By 1916, however, it was gone.

95USGS Topographic Map, 7.5' Series, League City (Texas) Quadrangle, 1955, photorevised 1969. The William Dobie Survey extends into three adjoining quadrangles: Friendswood (west), LaPorte (north), Pasadena (north-west).
96Record of Roads, 1:80, Harris Co. Commissioners' Office
97Three maps, Harris County 1895, 1899, 1903, P. Whitly, Surveyor, items 161A, 167B, 309B, Rosenberg Library, Galveston; map of Harris County 1908, in map file, Houston Public Library. The present Genoa Red Bluff Road runs directly east from Genoa, and passes just to the north of the William Dobie Survey.
98Harris Co. Deeds 327:309
Fig. 5. Map of the William Dobie Survey, 1877, from the original Volume 17 of Deeds. Note that north-south distances are exaggerated by a factor of 1.6 times east-west distances.
Fig. 6. Map of T. J. Markey 50 acre homestead, 1892

Fig. 7. USGS Topographic Map, Seabrook Quadrangle, Preliminary Edition, surveyed 191
The buildings are numbered 1-5; X denotes the southern edge of the Dobie Survey
Fig. 8. USGS Topographic Map, League City Quadrangle, 1955, photorevised 1969

Fig. 9. Same as Fig. 8, but with addition of lot lines and 1916 buildings and roads
Fig. 10. Map of Harris County, 1895

Fig. 11. Map of Harris County, 1903
Fig. 12. Map of Harris County, 1908

Fig. 13. Irrigation ditch, William Dobie Survey, 1914
ADDENDUM, INCLUDING ERRATA

Several additional records concerning William Dobie, alias William Dobie Dunlap, have been found since publication of the previous installments of this report. These records are given below, along with other additions and corrections to the text.

1. 66:23 line 8 change 1813 to 1811/12
   line 9 change 1816/17 to 1816

2. 66:25 line 3 change William Dobie to William Dunlap

3. [cf. 66:25] On October 6, 1828, William Dobie Dunlap personally wrote a petition for Tabitha Iiams, who wanted to sell, from her late husband's estate, some land near Cedar Bayou on Galveston Bay. The name Dunlap does not appear on the document, but the handwriting has the distinctive numeral 8's and flourishes on final d's.99

4. Similarly, the original March 2, 1829, title bond of Lewis, mentioned in footnote 16, was for land in the same area, and was written, as well as witnessed, by "Wm D. Dunlap."

5. The name of William Dunlap occurs several times in the probate ("succession") records for the estate of John R. Harris,100 for whom Dunlap had clerked:
   a. Inventory of estate: "Wm. D. Dunlap a/c [account] 31.50½"
   b. Sale of real and personal property, held May 5, 1830, in San Felipe de Austin:
      William D. Dunlap purchased 4 small jars $1.12½
      4 bottles 1.00
      6 pair shoe brushes 16¢ .96
      8 flasks .66 2/3
   c. Wm D. Dunlap had a claim of $270 against the estate. The records do not specify the nature of the claim; perhaps it was for back pay. It is not clear that the claim was allowed.

6. In December 1829, William Dobie Dunlap was one of a committee of six (in one case, five) which certified election returns for the offices of alcalde, regidor and sindico procurador for the municipality of San Felipe de Austin.101


8. In the Day Book of Nicholas Labadie, who was then living on Lake Charlotte, about seven miles north-north-west of Anahuac, is the following entry, dated March 2, 1833:
   "pd Dunlap for 2 Sacks Salt [$]6."102

9. The William Dobie estate appeared in the legal records even later than the 1902 date given in 66:27. In 1920 a damage suit was filed in District Court against the William

99Austin Co. Probate and Succession Records, File 25(17)
100Austin Co. Succession, A:226-238
102Day Book of Nicholas Labadie, p.6, Accession No. 8016, San Jacinto Museum Library
Dobie heirs. It remained on the books but inactive until dismissed for lack of prosecution in 1929, fully 94 years after William Dobie's death. 103

10. [cf. "loose ends," 66:27-28] In his will, dated November 5, 1829, Sterling Neblett of Lunenburg County, Virginia, gave certain property to his daughter Dolly Dobie, and included a stipulation in case "she marry again." This implies that she was no longer or intended not to remain married to William Dobie. The will was proved October 8, 1832. 104

11. According to J. H. Harry, 105 a "Doctor Dunlay" (suppose Dunlap) was one of the signers of the Turtle Bayou Resolution of June 13, 1832. However, the sources cited by Harry do not substantiate this. In fact, the only names in all the sources we could find on the subject were a list of seven who presented the Resolution at a meeting in Brazoria on July 18, 1832. 106 Only one of Harry's eight signers (R. W. Williamson) is listed there.

12. 67:13 After the obituary of Nathaniel James Dobie, add the following paragraph (footnote 58 already cites the source):

W. Y. Allen, in his diary, states, "Wednesday, April 18th. Attended the funeral of Mr. Doby, late of Virginia, a merchant of this city. Funeral at Harrisburg: Chaplain Fowler preached. I followed with a few remarks. Mr. D. was a young man much respected."

13. 67:13 footnote 57 change Spanish Archives to Spanish Records

14. 69:6 line 7 change Dobie's to Dobies'

15. 70:15 figure caption change vertical to north-south and horizontal to east-west

103 John Baker vs. William Dobie, etal., Case 91794, Records of the 80th District Court, Harris Co., Texas
104 Lunenburg Co., Va., Wills 10:199-200
105 J. H. Harry, "History of Chambers County, Texas," unpublished Master's thesis, U. of Texas, 1940, p.17. A number of copies have been distributed by the Chambers County Historical Commission.
106 F. H. Turner, "The Mejia Expedition," Texas Historical Association Quarterly, 7:16-17; Lamar Papers, I:142-143; Nacogdoches Archives, Box 1, no. 10, translated copy in the Barker Texas History Library, Austin
POST-CERAMIC SITE 41HR6, HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

L. W. Patterson

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the results of surface collecting on prehistoric site 41HR6 in Harris County, Texas. This work was in the nature of a salvage operation, as extensive pothunting for over 20 years has destroyed most of the integrity of this site.

Site 41HR6 is located on a low knoll at the edge of a creek in inland Harris County. Because of the relatively deep stratification of this site, it appears that this knoll was formed during the period of human occupation. This is similar to pimple mound formation in Jefferson County, which is also on the upper Texas coast, as described by Aten and Bollich (1981). There are a number of pimple mounds in the general area of site 41HR6. This is a wooded area of mixed coniferous and deciduous nature. A wide variety of faunal and floral food resources would have been available to prehistoric occupants of this site. The utilization of this site was probably on a seasonal basis by nomadic hunter-gathers. This site is approximately 100 feet in diameter, and has a sandy fill. Much of the exposed fill contains dark organic materials. Bone preservation here is good, unlike most sites in inland Harris County.

Test pits were made at this site in the early 1950's by Joe Ben Wheat. It was demonstrated that the site was occupied only in post-ceramic time. Later, a prehistoric human crania has been reported from here by Aten (1964). Materials found at this site are typical of the post-ceramic Woodland (early ceramic) and Late Prehistoric periods for the inland portion of the upper Texas coast. Collections of lithic, ceramic, and faunal materials are all of significant size for this site. While no stratigraphic information is available for the surface collection described here, much information can still be obtained, especially if Wheat's (1953) previous data is also used, along with more recent excavation data from this general area (Patterson 1980a).

Occupations at this site cover the general time range of AD 100 to 1500. Aten, et al (1976:Fig. 16) show the start of pottery in this area at approximately AD 100. This is the start of the Woodland (early ceramic) period. This period ends at approximately AD 600 with the start of predominance of small bifacial arrow points (Aten 1971:Fig. 10), at the beginning of the Late Prehistoric period. The Late Prehistoric continues until European contact, sometime after AD 1500.

PROJECTILE POINTS

Several types of arrow points were found on this site, as shown in Figure 1. Specimens include 8 Perdiz, 2 Catahoula, 1 Fresno, 1 Edwards, and 1 Alba. One Perdiz point has a deeply inset tip, as illustrated by Suhm and Jelks (1961:Pl. 139) for Hayes type points. This seems to be the farthest east that an Edwards point has been found. This point type is normally
associated with the Edwards Plateau (Hester 1970, Sollberger 1967). While this Edwards point specimen (Figure 1K) is not quite typical, it is within the range of variation of this point type (McReynolds and Grunewald 1981:Fig. 3). Three unifacial arrow points were also found, and there are four retouched flakes that may have served as inset blades for compound arrow points.

Dart point types from this site include 1 Gary, 1 Kent, and 1 Darl. The Darl point weighs 2.4 grams and represents a possible transitional arrow point, using a dart point form. Eleven unclassified projectile point fragments were recovered.

Wheat (1953:Tables 3,4) found Perdiz arrow points and Gary dart points at this site.

CERAMICS

All potsherds recovered of sizes over 15 mm square were counted. There were 6 Conway Plain sherds with coarse sand tempering (Aten, et al 1976:16). A total of 206 Goose Creek sandy paste sherds were found, including 198 body sherds and 8 rim sherds. Incising was not common, as also noted in previous work here. One incised sherd had a horizontal ladder pattern (Figure 15), and four sherds had single line incising. Four sherds had lacing holes, and two sherds were conical bottom pieces.

Pottery colors ranged from reddish grey (Munsell 10R5/4) to very dark grey (Munsell 10YR3/1). The most common color was dark greyish brown (Munsell 10YR4/2). Diameters of sherds were obtained by a method previously given (Patterson 1980b:8). These diameters ranged from 7.2 inches (18.3cm) to 20.1 inches (51.1cm). Sherd thicknesses ranged from 4 to 9 mm, with most sherds having thicknesses of 6 to 7 mm.

One Goose Creek Stamped sherd (Figure 1T) was found, identified by L. E. Aten (personal communication). This demonstrates that this site started in the earliest ceramic period for this region (Aten, et al:Fig. 16).

GENERAL LITHIC MATERIALS

This site yielded a few formal types of unifacial stone tools, including 3 perforators, 2 scrapers, and 13 gravers. Some abrading tools were found, including 9 made of sandstone, and 1 of quartzite. Most stone tools from this site were simply utilized flakes, with examples present of cutting and scraping types of edge damage (Tringham, et al 1974).

A summary of lithic flakes recovered is shown in Table 1. The flake size distribution is typical of debitage from biface manufacturing, with percentages skewed toward higher amounts of smaller flakes (Patterson and Sollberger 1978:111). The relatively small amounts of remaining cortex on flakes probably demonstrates that trimmed pieces of raw material were being imported to this site. Only flakes larger than 15 mm square were counted.

An industry to manufacture small prismatic blades is present. Three blade core trim flakes were found, with multiple parallel flake scars. A total of
49 prismatic blades were found, with widths summarized in Table 2. Prismatic blades represent 9.4% of all flakes over 15 mm square. Segments of small prismatic blades were probably used as inset blades, for barbs on compound arrow points and possibly for other types of tools.

Another indication that only trimmed pieces of raw material were being imported to this site is the lack of residual cores. Raw materials brought here were mainly in the form of flakes. Only 1 small residual core was found. Miscellaneous lithic materials recovered included 3 thick chert chips and 1 piece of petrified wood. Heat treating of siliceous minerals was practiced extensively here. This is shown by reddish coloration, waxy luster, and potlid surface fractures of many specimens.

FAUNAL REMAINS

Even though this report covers only a surface collection, a fairly large collection of faunal materials has been obtained. It is obvious that deer and turtle were important food sources. A few freshwater clam shells were found, but this does not seem to be an important dietary item at this site. Wheat (1953:Table 8) recovered remains of deer, bison, turtle, snail, clam, and mink in previous test excavations here. W. L. McClure will make a more detailed analysis of this collection of faunal materials.

Twenty-one specimens have been identified as possible bone tools. These are animal long bones that have been cut diagonally to form a point on one end. The exact function of these bone tools has not been determined.

Two small fragments of turtle shell have a light blue coloration. It is not known if this represents purposeful use of pigments for decoration, but this type of item has been noted previously by Wheat (1953:231).

MISCELLANEOUS MATERIALS

Twenty-one fired clay balls and 15 caliche balls were recovered, which probably represent cooking activities at this site. Seven small, smooth pebbles were found, that may have been used in rattles. Both of these types of items are common at sites in this general area, although fired clay balls are not commonly found in Late Prehistoric context.

SUMMARY

This report has described a surface collection from prehistoric site 41HR6 in Harris County, which represents only post-ceramic period occupations. Many investigators tend to ignore surface collections, but this type of data represents a valuable portion of the overall archeological data base. In this case, data on technology, settlement patterns and subsistence patterns can be obtained from surface collected materials that are associated with this specific location. A number of significant items were found by surface collecting that were not found by the original test excavations.
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**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE, MM SQUARE</th>
<th>remaining cortex</th>
<th>total flakes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>width, mm</th>
<th>no.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE I
SITE 41HR6 ARTIFACTS

A to F - Perdiz Points; G, H - Catahoula Points; I - Fresno Point; J - Perdiz with Inset Tip; K - Edwards Point; L - Alba Point; M - Arrow Point Preform; N - Unifacial Arrow Point; O - Kent Point; P - Darl Point; Q - Gary Point; R - Dart Point Preform; S - Incised Sherd; T - Goose Creek Stamped Sherd