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SUMMARY

Shoofly Village Ruins (AZ 0:11:6 (ASU)), a large 13th century masonry compound site, is located approximately five miles north of Payson, Arizona, just south of the Mogollon Rim, at an elevation of 5240 feet (ca. 1598 meters) above sea level, within the boundaries of the Tonto National Forest (Figure 1). The site represents a valuable resource in that it is the only known large prehistoric community preserved and accessible in the Payson region. A long-term research project is currently being conducted at the site in conjunction with plans to develop it for recreational use, probably in the form of an archaeological park.

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

Shoofly Village consists of 79 rooms visible on the surface, of which 26 are relatively large rectangular spaces (averaging 37.4 square meters) arranged in a single roomblock at the center of the site. These rooms appear to have been constructed of stone (sandstone, limestone, and basalt) masonry to their full height and some possibly to two stories (Figure 2). Thirty-nine are substantially smaller rectangular rooms (averaging 23.4 square meters) scattered in clusters around the periphery of the site, while 14 rooms are characterized by at least one curved wall and are dispersed around the periphery, often free-standing (Figure 3). These smaller rooms appear to have been of more ephemeral construction, probably jacial (mud and sticks) built on a two- to three-course masonry foundation. A compound wall encloses the site, encompassing approximately 1.5 hectares (3.75 acres) (Figure 4); 61% of the enclosed space consists of plazas, courtyards, and other open areas, while 39% of the space is accounted for by the rooms described above.

Approximately 107 square meters of surface area have been dug in a controlled manner (usually in natural levels) to depths of generally less than 50 centimeters during testing conducted to locate features and determine the depth of cultural deposits both within and outside the compound wall. These test units were placed both randomly and judgmentally to include all expected features (rooms, plazas, activity areas, terraces, midden, and burial areas). Additionally, portions of eight rooms (rectangular core rooms, curvilinear rooms, and peripheral rooms) have been dug to floor level; three rooms have been completely dug. Floor features encountered include hearths, postholes, and floor pits (Figure 3), possible paving stones, burned roof beams, artifact caches (especially stone tools), grinding implements (Figure 5), and pot busts. Excavations to date have impacted less than 2% of the area bounded by the compound wall.

A 100% survey of the area within 120 meters outside the compound wall has been completed (Lindauer 1984). Artifactual and architectural patterns have been recorded and mapped and are included in this nomination (Figure 6). Specifically, this surrounding area contains trash deposits (especially dense to the north and east), artifact scatters and rock alignments which may delineate prehistoric trails, and
agricultural features (check dams and terraces). Additionally, human burials have been recovered from the area north of the compound wall by the Arizona State University Fieldschool and have been reported in that area by non-professional collectors. Formal cemetery areas have not been defined, but it is believed they do not extend beyond the area delimited by this survey.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Shoofly Village is geographically located near the northern edge of Houston Mesa, on the divide between Walnut Flat and Sunflower Mesa, in open grasslands which slope gently from east to west (Figure 1). While vegetation cover varies significantly throughout the immediate area, the site occupies an ecotone bordered by Juniper-pinyon Woodlands, Chaparral, and Grasslands (after Lowe 1972) providing easy access to diverse plant resources. Additionally, this ecotone supports an abundant and diverse faunal population. An intermittent stream, Shoofly Wash, is approximately one kilometer to the north/northwest, just off the mesa edge. Petroglyphs and bedrock mortars (plant processing loci) are evidence of prehistoric use of the drainage. Further, one of the trails recorded during the above-referenced survey leads into this drainage.

Geologically, the area is characterized by metamorphic and sedimentary formations of the younger Precambrian Age, dominated by quartzite and sandstone which are overlain in some locations by Devonian-age limestone outcrops (Wilson et al 1959). The quartzite and sandstone formations are extremely weather resistant, resulting in sharp escarpments along mesa edges. The limestone formation weathers rapidly, producing vast scatters of chert and chaledony nodules; soil development is also a result of this weathering process. Soils are generally finely textured with moderate moisture storage capacities; depths vary from thin, under-developed deposits around rock outcrops to deep deposits in mesa centers and drainage bottoms.

The physical environment of the surrounding region consists of high, open mountains and sediment-filled basin lowlands. Both the Mogollon Rim and Diamond Rim are within 10 kilometers north of Shoofly Village (Figures 7 and 8); these geologic features critically affect rainfall patterns within central Arizona and specifically serve as an orthographic belt producing approximately 20 inches (51 centimeters) of precipitation per year (Sellers and Hill 1974) in the immediate area, most of which falls between June and October in the form of summer monsoons.

In summary, the ecotonal zone described for Shoofly Village provides an abundant and diverse biotic community from which past and present inhabitants of the region could make a living. This community provides an effective means for measuring the productivity of the elements utilized by human populations (after Ford 1972), and environmental variables which serve to constrain cultural adaptation.
CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT

A substantial amount of archaeological research has been conducted in the Payson region, though to date only Roger Kelly's (1969) survey, and Alan Olson's (1971) and Bruce Huckell's (1978) salvage excavations have been published. Research has been dominated by survey, the first documented being conducted in 1954 by Olson and Olson (1954) for the Chicago Field Museum of Natural History, Southwestern Expedition. Fifty-five sites were recorded, including Shoofly Village (Houston Mesa Ruins - Olson #25; NA1902; AZ 0:6:10 (ASM)) and other pueblos, single-room (boulder outline) sites, pithouses, mescal pits, cave sites, and large sherds and lithic scatters. This was followed by Fred Peck's (1956) survey of the East Verde River drainage system (north and west of Shoofly Village) from its source under the Mogollon Rim to its junction with the Verde River. As was typical of work conducted during this period, both of these efforts were biased towards the recording of large site complexes, especially pueblos, compound wall sites and cliff dwellings.

The 1960s and 1970s were characterized by continuing surveys, often accompanied by limited excavations. The most extensive include those conducted by the Museum of Northern Arizona on Tonto National Forest lands (Kelly 1969) in the immediate vicinity of Shoofly Village and a four-year program implemented through a series of field schools beginning in 1975 sponsored by Arizona State University (Dittert 1976a, 1976b, Francis 1977; Henderson and Blank 1977; Lightfoot et al 1977; Jeter 1978; Abbott 1981). Forty-nine sites were recorded during Kelly's survey, including "Houston Mesa Ruins" (NA9753). During the 1975 Arizona State University field season these ruins were relocated, identified as AZ 0:11:6 (ASU), and the name changed to Shoofly Village (Most 1975, 1976).

A few sites were recorded in the Payson region prior to the 1950s by H. S. Colton and H. S. Gladwin. Specifically, Harold S. Gladwin, through his research institute at Gila Pueblo, was issued a permit for investigations at Rye Creek Ruin, 10 miles south of Payson, in 1930 (Halseth files, Pueblo Grande Museum). During this time he apparently sent fieldworkers into Payson; undocumented reports show that John Hughes (working for Gladwin) visited Houston Mesa Ruins and Round Valley Ruins (local informant; Russell 1930). Russell's account notes that Hughes exposed 170 burials, recovered 138 complete pots, and found a few cremations with small ollas (1930) at the Round Valley site. Written evidence of excavations reported at Shoofly Village have yet to be located.

In addition, Tonto National Forest Archaeologists have conducted numerous cultural resource clearance surveys, recording hundreds of sites within the Payson region. Such extensive and long-term efforts have produced a significant data base from which an understanding of site type variability, settlement patterns, and subsistence practices
can be achieved, as well as a recognition of the vast temporal spans and divergent cultural relationships represented. However, data specific to cultural affiliation and regional chronology are severely limited.

A detailed review of previous Payson area research (Stafford 1979) suggests that four broad periods of prehistoric occupation are present. These include a preceramic period ranging from 9500 B.C. (Clovis) to A.D. 500, a Hohokam occupation beginning sometime after A.D. 500 and extending to A.D. 1000, a Southern Sinagua occupation ranging from A.D. 1000 to A.D. 1400, and finally a protohistoric period characterized by Apache and Yavapai regional exploitation. Other researchers (Lightfoot et al 1977; Jeter 1978; Wood 1983a, 1983b) have attempted to refine these phase sequences, especially with regards to the Hohokam occupation of the area.

Most sites recorded within the Payson region have been tentatively dated to the A.D. 1100 to 1400 period. Notable during this period is the significant variability found within site types. It is this variability found within site configuration and associated material assemblages which has led to debates regarding cultural affiliation. For example, Kelly (1969), Jeter (1978), Hammack (1969) and McAllister and Wood (1981) believe their investigations demonstrate Salado affiliations while others (e.g., Olson and Olson 1954; Peck 1956; Olson 1971; Hanson 1976; Stafford 1979; Huckell 1978; Henderson n.d.) see more similarities to the Southern Sinagua. Finally, several researchers have developed a model of indigenous development reflecting participation within regional interaction spheres (e.g., Fish and Fish 1977; Fish, Pilles, and Fish 1980; Pilles 1981; Lerner 1984).

Particularly relevant to Shoofly Village during the latter half of this period is evidence suggesting that several large masonry site complexes were constructed which seem to reflect intensive, short-lived occupations. However, because no absolute dates currently exist for the Payson area due to the general lack of excavated sites and poor preservation of datable remains, there are no means for determining the validity of this assertion. Indeed, caution has to be exercised when using any dates as they are based only on ceramic cross-dates and other relative dating techniques (cf. Henderson n.d.). Shoofly Village provides an opportunity to obtain such data; a large amount of burned material has already been recovered and submitted for C-14, dendrochronological and archaeomagnetic testing. Further, why these large site complexes were built, when they were built, their exact sphere of influence, and why they were abandoned remain to be discovered. Research conducted at Shoofly Village is aimed at answering such questions.
IMPACTS

Shoofly Village has had high visibility throughout its life history as one of only a handful of large masonry site complexes in the Payson region. Subsequently, it has been directly impacted by casual collecting and pothunting, especially in the period following the arrival of Anglo settlers in the area during the mining booms of the early 1900s. Further, there are unsubstantiated reports of excavations at the site in the 1930s; efforts are being made to document these. Nevertheless, none of these activities have severely damaged the archaeological record, and architectural features remain intact in a natural state of stabilization.

Preservation of the site's integrity is foremost within the design of research currently being conducted by Arizona State University and future plans for interpretive park development. Research is being conducted within a sampling framework which allows 95% of in situ deposits to remain intact, and plans are being made for stabilization of excavated areas. Therefore, these activities are incorporated into this nomination and are being done in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

BOUNDARY JUSTIFICATION

The boundaries submitted with this nomination are based on the limits of a 100% survey of the area immediately adjacent to the compound wall at Shoofly Village (Figure 1). A total of 12.25 hectares (approximately 31 acres) has been delimited. These boundaries are justified in that substantial archaeological materials are documented within them, and a fall-off in density is observed to correlate with distance from the site complex (Figure 6). Additionally, as noted above, burials have been recovered outside the compound wall, although formal cemetery areas have yet to be defined.
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STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

SUMMARY

Shoofly Village Ruins has the potential to address a variety of issues that have relevance not only to our understanding of prehistory within a local and regional setting, but which can potentially influence our understanding of the dynamics of Southwestern prehistory. These issues include chronology, cultural affiliation, spheres of influence, subsistence practices, and settlement patterns. Our knowledge of the area has been limited by previous investigations which focused on survey, resulting in the above-referenced lack of excavated data and recovery of datable remains. Shoofly Village Ruins is significant at the National and State levels for the information it contains: relevant to the prehistory of the Payson region, the life history of large archaeological site complexes, and its interpretive value for the general public. The site is unique in that it appears to be the only relatively intact large site remaining in the Payson region eligible for protection; other known large complexes have fallen into or always have been in private ownership or have been severely impacted by vandalism and pothunting activities.

CHRONOLOGY

A large amount of burned roofing material has been collected to date, and several samples have been submitted for dendrochronological dating; unfortunately, results have been poor. However, additional burned deposits have been collected from floors and hearths and a number of samples have been selected for C-14 dating. Finally, archaeomagnetic samples have been collected from hearths and submitted for dating. It is believed that by exploring the full range of datable material collected we will not only be able to accurately obtain occupation dates for Shoofly Village but also help resolve chronological issues relevant to ceramic cross-dates, thereby aiding in the refinement of ceramic typologies, especially for plainwares.

CULTURAL AFFILIATION AND SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

Two avenues of investigation are available at Shoofly Village from which to address these issues. Most promising for the issue of cultural affiliation is a substantial burial population. Twenty burials have been recovered during fieldschool activities, and an additional twelve have been reported by local informants (these, however, are not available for study). The burials recovered during fieldschool investigations provide us with valuable data regarding nutrition, pathologies, and mortuary practices (Figures 10).

Spheres of influence can best be addressed through imported and exotic artifacts.
While these comprise only approximately one percent of the artifact assemblage recovered, they are valuable for the insights they provide regarding trade relationships, sources for raw materials, and design elements utilized within the cultural and social frameworks at Shoofly Village.

**Subsistence Practices**

As mentioned above, extensive agricultural features have been observed immediately adjacent to Shoofly Village, especially in an area east and south of the compound wall. This area is characterized by a large, shallow grassy basin, with evidence for water retention capabilities. Additionally, purposeful terracing and rock borders extend throughout this basin.

Excavations within the compound wall have produced numerous samples of floral and faunal remains, many of them carbonized. Flotation studies have recovered evidence of 12-row corn, squash, two types of beans, and wild walnuts. The presence of two types of beans is significant in that one, lima beans, is thought to represent interaction with populations further south (especially the Verde Valley - J. Miller, personal communication). Further flotation and pollen studies remain to be completed. However, these initial results substantiate our hypothesis of a mixed subsistence strategy (utilization of both domestic and wild resources) and suggest roof-top activity areas and storage activities in specific rooms.

Faunal studies also remain to be completed, but results to date further substantiate a mixed subsistence strategy which includes hunting (deer, rabbit, rodent, bird). In summary, the occupants of Shoofly Village employed a subsistence strategy which made full use of the ecotonal zone they lived in, including modification of the land to enhance domestic crop production.

**Settlement Patterns**

It was suggested earlier that one of the most significant and unique aspects of Shoofly Village is the fact that it contains the full range of expected architectural forms for the Payson region. Arizona State University has the opportunity to study examples of each of these forms at Shoofly, coupled with concurrent investigations at individual smaller sites located on parcels of land scheduled for exchange. This provides a rare case for research aimed at understanding architectural variability.
and determining whether it represents functional, temporal, social or other phenomena.

Life History and Interpretive Value

Shoofly Village has always been significant at the local level. Long-term Payson residents report that the "locals" know the site as "Grand Ruins" and many report excavation experiences with early researchers (yet to be documented) and as casual collectors. The development of an archaeological park at the site will greatly enhance appreciation for cultural resources and make them available to the general public (Myers, 1985; Figure 9).

The research commitment by Arizona State University seeks to fully examine these valuable data within a sampling framework; this commitment increases the site's significance in that methodological and theoretical advancement can be made for the region and the information will be disseminated for professional and public use.
Figure 1.

Location of Shoofly Village Ruin including proposed boundaries (approximate).
Figure 2. Example of large rectangular room space and masonry style, central roomblock.

Figure 3. Example of detached curvilinear room; note floor features.
Figure 4. Map of Shoofly Village showing relationship of various architectural features and compound wall.
Figure 5. Example of grinding stones found throughout Shoofly Village in room contexts.
Figure 6. Map of features recorded outside the compound wall at Shoofly Village by Lindauer (1984); these features included within the nomination.
Figure 7. Photo showing Diamond Rim and Mogollon Rim beyond. View towards the northwest from Shoofly Village. (Photo by June Payne)

Figure 8. Another view of the rims, looking north and northeast from Shoofly Village. (Photo by June Payne)
Figure 9. Example of a possible park setting focused on the prehistoric site of Shoofly Village.
Figure 10. Photo showing in situ artifacts over burial recovered during 1985 field season, Shoofly Village.
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