

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CULTURES AND CULTURAL AFFILIATION: HOPI AND ZUNI PERSPECTIVES IN THE AMERICAN SOUTHWEST

Kurt E. Dongoske, Michael Yeatts, Roger Anyon, and T. J. Ferguson

Archaeologists and Native Americans apply different concepts to classify ancient groups of people who lived in the past. This is a topic of current interest because many archaeologists in the United States are now having to determine the cultural affiliation of the materials they study to comply with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. The Hopi and Zuni tribes in the American Southwest are used as case examples to examine how and why archaeological and tribal views of cultural affiliation are divergent. We suggest anthropological perspectives of culture need to be reintegrated into archaeological theory in collaboration with Native Americans in order to interpret the past in a manner that is both useful and interesting to the multiple audiences interested in our work.

Los arqueólogos y los indios norteamericanos aplican diferentes conceptos para clasificar los grupos humanos que vivieron en el pasado. Este es un tópico de interés actual debido a que muchos arqueólogos hoy tienen que determinar la afiliación cultural de los materiales que ellos estudian para así acatar la ley, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Se utilizan los casos de las tribus Hopi y Zuni como ejemplos para examinar cómo y por qué las perspectivas arqueológicas y tribales son divergentes. Se sugiere que las perspectivas antropológicas de cultura necesitan ser reintegradas en la teoría arqueológica en colaboración con los indios norteamericanos para interpretar el pasado de una manera útil e interesante para la variada audiencia interesada en nuestro trabajo.

Archaeologists have long struggled with the issue of how to assign meaning to the material remains they study. Inferring behavior, ethnicity, and cultural affiliation from artifacts is as difficult today as it has ever been. Since the beginning of systematic archaeological research in North America, archaeologists have endeavored to link contemporary Indian groups with the archaeological record. As a research focus, the effort given to this pursuit has waxed and waned in popularity. Today, primarily as a result of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the need to establish cultural affiliation between modern and ancient peoples is bringing a new exigency to research detailing cultural and temporal linkages.

The past that archaeologists construct and the past detailed in Native American oral histories obviously have some congruence as they were produced by the same series of events. Archaeological culture histories and tribal oral

histories, however, do this in fundamentally different ways, for different purposes. As a result, the correspondence between the two types of knowledge is not always consistent. In the American Southwest, for example, these divergent perspectives are manifest in the concept of archaeological cultures and how the Hopi and Zuni people identify their past. Hopi and Zuni view their past in terms of their ancestors, the real people who lived at the sites now studied by archaeologists. Archaeologists, conversely, have traditionally classified the past in terms of archaeological cultures—abstract units of analysis defined by comparative sets of material traits.

In this article, using the American Southwest as an example, we reexamine the utility and application of the archaeological definition of “cultures” through the classification of material traits and the ramifications of this approach for discerning the past within the contemporary legal and social context. First, we explore the development of the

Kurt E. Dongoske and **Michael Yeatts** ■ Cultural Preservation Office, The Hopi Tribe, P.O. Box 123, Kykotsmovi, AZ 86039

Roger Anyon ■ Heritage Resources Management Consultants, 3227 North Walnut Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85712

T. J. Ferguson ■ Heritage Resources Management Consultants, 5000 West Placita de los Vientos, Tucson, AZ 85745

archaeological culture concept and contrast it with the Hopi and Zuni perspectives of their own history. After these distinct views of history are presented, the theoretical constraints of integrating the two are explored. Simply returning to the simple ethnographic analogies of nineteenth-century archaeologists, or the cultural historical approach popular in the mid-twentieth century, is not considered viable in relation to the tasks facing archaeologists today. Moreover, we contend that new theoretical and methodological approaches to the archaeological record must be developed. These approaches need to be cognizant of tribal historical knowledge and integrate these traditional perspectives into the way archaeologists interpret the archaeological record.

Early Approaches to Tribal Histories and Archaeology

The earliest archaeologists in the Southwest interpreted the archaeological record in ethnographic terms. In a real sense, archaeology was understood as paleoethnography. The research programs of archaeologists such as Cushing (1890), Mindeleff (1891), and Fewkes (1896, 1898a, 1898b, 1900, 1909) sought to link the prehistoric ruins of the Southwest to modern Pueblo tribes, a bold and much needed antidote to antiquarian notions that these ruins were related to the Aztec or other cultures in Mexico rather than the Pueblo or other southwestern tribes (Lekson 1988:220–222). Excavations clearly demonstrated that the material culture found in prehistoric pueblo sites was similar in many respects to that of the nineteenth-century Pueblos, and the function of many archaeological items could be readily interpreted using ethnographic analogy, which helped to map the rich oral traditions of Pueblo migration onto the archaeological record.

Cushing (1896), Fewkes (1900), Mindeleff (1891) and others explained prehistory in terms of the themes found in those oral traditions. Cushing (1890) applied a protostructuralist approach, extending insights gleaned from Zuni ethnography to the explanation of evolutionary trends in the development of Puebloan architecture from cliff dwellings to plaza-oriented pueblos, or the ceremonial function of sites such as Casa Grande in southern Arizona. Fewkes (1900) often took a more direct historical approach by identifying the

place names in Hopi oral traditions with particular archaeological sites and then recounting the history of what had transpired at those sites.

The more archaeologists worked in the Southwest, however, the clearer it became that Pueblo oral history did not specifically discuss each archaeological site and that an additional interpretive framework was needed to acquire and evaluate knowledge about the past. By the turn of the century, archaeologists began to define regional variations in the prehistoric architectural and material remains, although it was all still attributed to one culture ancestral to the modern Pueblo tribes. Pepper (1902) provided an early temporal subdivision of this southwestern prehistoric culture when he postulated that Basketmaker material represented an earlier development of the Pueblo. Others, like Hough (1907:25–26), began to segregate temporally distinct culture areas based on artifactual evidence such as ceramic forms and designs.

Culture History, Science, and Tribal Oral Histories

As the level and intensity of archaeological fieldwork increased in the early part of the twentieth century, the variability manifest in prehistoric materials became increasingly recognized. Initially, efforts concentrated on establishing temporal order through the use of stratigraphic excavations. By the 1920s it was clear that both the temporal and spatial aspects of the archaeological record needed assigned order using widely accepted conventions. In the Southwest, this led to the first Pecos Conference with a goal to establish a temporal and spatial framework for prehistoric archaeology to facilitate communication among archaeologists working in the region (Kidder 1927). Ceramics, architecture, and mortuary practices assumed central roles in providing the means to order archaeological materials, and, for some archaeologists, constellations of these traits became a proxy for cultural affiliation or ethnic identification (McGregor 1977:44).

In the 1930s it became clear that the Pecos classification required expansion to incorporate archaeological materials found beyond the Colorado Plateau. The work of the Gladwins (Gladwin 1957; Gladwin and Gladwin 1934; Gladwin et al. 1937), Haury (1936), and others

established the Hohokam and Mogollon as archaeological cultures distinct from the prehistoric "Anasazi"¹ or Pueblo sequence. Methods for sorting the archaeological record into these temporal and spatial units became a primary focus of archaeological theory. Thus began the shift from a taxonomy based on mapping modern tribal groups into the past to one focusing more on material similarity. Structured on unilineal evolutionary theory, a means of ordering prehistoric cultural materials was borrowed from natural science. Archaeological cultures were designated as having roots, stems, and branches to identify spatial differentiation, with periods and phases to identify temporal differentiation.

Southwestern archaeologists inferred that these culture areas reflected distinct groups of prehistoric people. These groups formed the basis of the culture area concept that we work with today. The equation tying these archaeologically defined prehistoric cultures to modern Indian groups was largely relegated to the issue of regional abandonments, i.e., the depopulation of particular areas was explained by saying people went to Hopi, Zuni, or other modern Pueblos (Reed 1950). By and large, however, questions of linkage between archaeological cultures and modern-day tribes, and the development of the theoretical underpinnings necessary to make these links, became secondary to the other more pressing research questions of the day.

As archaeological research in the Southwest continued, the cultural historical approach became paramount. Once identified, branches and phases became units of analysis to compare the development and growth of different groups of people throughout the region. The culture area concept proved useful for describing broad time-space systematics and still provides an often-used shorthand for summarizing constellations of material traits.

In general, it was assumed that modern southwestern tribes, such as the Hopi and Zuni, grew directly out of the prehistoric culture that preceded them in their present homelands, in this case the "Anasazi" archaeological culture. Even so, some archaeological research, as much by happenstance as any other reason, established other possibilities. For instance, over a period of two decades, the Field Museum of Natural History undertook a

series of excavations to investigate a sequence of sites ranging from early Mogollon pithouse villages to late prehistoric pueblos, uncovering in the process substantial evidence of cultural continuity between the Mogollon and historic Zuni (Martin and Rinaldo 1947, 1960; Martin et al. 1961).

As the cultural historical approach became popular, a fundamental shift occurred in the way archaeologists viewed the links between the archaeological record and tribal oral histories. Earlier archaeological research had used tribal oral histories as a guide to identify relevant research areas, and to link modern and ancient peoples through a direct historical approach that worked from the present to the past. With the cultural historical approach, tribal oral histories were discounted, and archaeological reconstructions of prehistoric cultures became the focus of research. Tribal oral histories were used anecdotally when they fit an archaeologically derived picture. The many points where tribal oral histories diverged from archaeological narratives were largely ignored. Interpretations of the archaeological record tended to work from the past to the present.

The "New Archaeology" of the 1960s (Binford and Binford 1968; Hill 1970; Longacre 1970) shifted archaeological research away from the cultural historical approach but the spatial and temporal units of archaeological cultures remained the basic frame of reference. In the Southwest, research continued to use concepts such as branches and phases as units of analysis. Consequently, the static constraints of culture history still limited the ability of archaeologists to address questions of cultural and social dynamics. In addition, the emphasis of New Archaeology on an objective scientific approach as the principal means of understanding the past essentially demoted tribal oral histories to scientific irrelevancy. The particularistic facts of tribal history that are so important to the Hopi and Zuni people became secondary to the use of ethnographic data in a deductive-nomological paradigm. Ethnographic data essentially served as examples to be employed in cross-cultural inferences regarding more general human adaptation.

It is ironic that today many southwestern archaeologists continue to conceive of archaeological cultures in essentially ethnographic terms, considering them to be tribal groups that are synonymous with ethnically distinct groups of people.

This perspective is clearly articulated by Haury (1985:xvii) in the preface to his 1985 book on the Mogollon, in which he states:

I am well aware that pottery cannot always be used as a certain identifier of a people, but one need look only at the pottery produced today by Southwestern Indians to realize that there is a one-to-one correlation between type and tribe for most of the vessels produced. I believe this situation obtained in antiquity as well, and that the inference that Anasazi-Mogollon ceramic differences denote "tribal" differences is sound.

Many archaeologists still think this way, rarely, if ever, considering the underlying epistemological issues. Archaeological cultures are generally defined on the basis of the static configuration of architecture, pottery, and other forms of material remains. How these trait groups relate to real, emically defined cultures or ethnic groups is rarely considered, and the anthropological theory necessary to make such links is weak within archaeology.

Hopi and Zuni: Traditional History and Archaeology

The Hopi and Zuni are living dynamic cultures. Their traditional histories are long and incorporate many individual groups of people, each with unique histories. Thus, not one, but multiple tribal histories operate on multiple levels. The history in oral traditions is embedded in moral and religious precepts, and much of this knowledge is therefore esoteric (Anyon et al. 1997).

In the Hopi culture, each clan and religious group has a unique tradition that specifically accounts for how and why it came to be at Hopi. There is general agreement on the main tenets of Hopi origin and migration, but many accounts show considerable variation in specific details (Ferguson and Dongoske 1994:24). A key element in the Hopi origin account is the covenant made with Ma'saw, Guardian of the World, when Hopi ancestors emerged into the Fourth World from the *Sipapuni* (place of emergence). This led to the migration of more than 100 clans to the *Tuuwanasavi* (earth center) on the Hopi Mesas (Ferguson and Dongoske 1994:26).

Individual clan histories recount in detail the gradual movement of these clans across the Southwest. In many respects, the very concept of "Hopi" as a distinct cultural and ethnic unit does

not really have a reality until the "gathering of the clans" on the Hopi Mesas. Before that, the ancestors of the Hopi were organized not as a single tribe but as many distinct clans. Some Hopi clans have direct ancestral ties to the *Motisinom* or "first people" (which some archaeologists might identify as the Archaic or perhaps Paleoindian cultures of the Southwest). These ancestors were joined by other clans that fled from the ancestral village of Palatkwapi located far to the south (Nequatewa 1967; Teague 1993). The combination of these groups is now collectively referred to by the Hopi as the *Hisatsinom*, or "people of long ago" (Jenkins 1994). The Hopi believe these clans ranged far and wide in their migrations and were components of many different archaeological cultures, including the Anasazi, Mogollon, Hohokam, Salado, Cohonina, Fremont, and Mimbres. None of these archaeological cultures by themselves are thus adequate to incorporate all of the Hopi and their ancestors.

As with the Hopi, Zuni oral traditions portray similar complexities in the development of the Zuni tribe. Unlike Hopi, however, the oral history of Zuni is embedded primarily in the accounts of kivas, priesthoods, and medicine societies rather than in clan migration histories. Although all Zunis have a general understanding of tribal history, each religious group within Zuni society has a unique account of its own origins, which are known in great detail, but only to those initiated into the group and thus entrusted with that knowledge. Without going into esoteric details, two basic elements common to all the Zuni oral histories can be identified as being relevant to archaeological research. First, migrations are a consistent element of all Zuni oral histories, and different groups of ancestors had different migration routes. Second, Zunis have stories of encountering other people and engaging in conflict as part of their migrations.

After emerging from the fourth level of the underworld, at the location now known as the Grand Canyon, the Zuni began their spiritually destined journey in search of the "middle place," or *Itiwana*. Zuni accounts record the splitting and joining of various groups during these migrations (Bunzel 1932; Ferguson and Hart 1985:20–23; Stevenson 1904:73–89). One group is said to have journeyed to the south, to the "land of everlasting sunshine," never to return. Further along the jour-

ney the remaining Zuni split into three groups, one going up the Little Colorado River to Zuni itself, another traveling to the north, and a third traveling to the south. The Zuni clans were created relatively late in this historical sequence, when the Zunis were traveling through the Little Colorado River valley immediately prior to arriving at the Middle Place. Itiwana, the Middle Place, was occupied by another people before the Zunis arrived, and an epic battle was waged that the Zuni won with the spiritual assistance of the war gods. As the Zunis settled in the Middle Place, some of the earlier inhabitants were incorporated into the Zuni tribe. After long and eventful migrations, each of the other ancestral groups eventually joined the rest of the Zuni at the Middle Place.

After considering these accounts, it should be clear why statements from the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office often refer to the Hopi and their ancestors and why statements from the Zuni Heritage and Historic Preservation Office often refer to the Zuni and their ancestors. The Hopi and Zuni view of the past is far more dynamic than that portrayed by archaeologists using the archaeological culture area concepts so popular in the Southwest. At any point in time until their arrival at their ultimate destination, the ancestors of the Hopi and Zuni may have belonged to any number of archaeological cultures. For instance, it is probable that different groups of ancestors of both the Hopi and Zuni were simultaneously affiliated with the archaeological cultures known as the Anasazi, Mogollon, and Hohokam. Similar affiliations exist with other archaeological cultures at other times. The Hopi and Zuni perceive their connection to the archaeological record in terms of the ancestors who lived at and used various sites, and these ancestors traveled far and wide on their migrations.

It is possible to characterize Puebloan migrations in terms of ethnic coresidence. We note, however, that for the Hopi and Zuni, ethnicity is expressed far more in religious beliefs and language than material culture, and this makes identifying ethnic coresidence a challenging concept to operationalize in archaeological research. The case of the Hopi-Tewa of First Mesa is illuminating in this regard since it is one of the best-known ethnographic examples of ethnic coresidence. The Hopi-Tewa village of Hano, also called *Okeowangi* (the village or people of the village),

was established on First Mesa at the request of the Walpi village chiefs following the Pueblo Revolt of A.D. 1680 (Stanislawski 1979:600). While Walpi is spatially separated from the other villages on First Mesa, Hano and the adjacent Hopi village of Sichomovi are architecturally contiguous and virtually indistinguishable from one another. Not only is Hano architecturally related to the other Hopi villages, the pottery produced by potters in Hano is identical to that produced in the other First Mesa Hopi villages. In fact, the point that much of the "Hopi" pottery is produced by Hopi-Tewa potters should serve as a cautionary note to archaeologists who, without critically examining the underlying epistemological issues, are frequently willing to infer a cultural or ethnic affiliation based solely on prehistoric ceramic types; pots do not necessarily equal people.

Despite the similarity in their material culture, the Hopi and Hopi-Tewa maintain separate ethnic identities. According to Don James, a Hopi-Tewa from Polacca, the primary attributes that identify his people as a distinct ethnic group are coded in the language, religious ceremonies, and associated ritual paraphernalia, none of which is well represented in the archaeological record or easily studied. It is the shared history and beliefs of the group that unite them. If archaeologists cannot differentiate between ethnic groups using standard analytical classes within a contemporary setting where we know ethnic differentiation exists, we are not sanguine about the meaningful identification of ethnicity in the archaeological record, especially if that ethnicity is defined in terms of archaeological cultures.

How can we better examine culture and ethnicity in the past? A start would be to create classification schemes specifically designed for that purpose. Toward this end, criteria identified by tribal consultants as significant in defining their respective cultures should be used to reevaluate culture areas. In this regard, we were impressed by Hopi cultural advisors who visited the sites being investigated by Arizona State University during the Roosevelt Dam Modification Project in central Arizona (Dongoske et al. 1993). Water Clan symbols were observed by cultural advisors in rock art and ceramics and then verified by identification of Water Clan ritual objects in the artifactual assemblage. What we think is needed, however, is a sus-

tained, in-depth analysis of this sort of cross-media symbolism and how it is used in interpretation of Puebloan cultural affiliation, not just casual observations made during a one-day visit.

The Situation Today

Archaeologists now find themselves with new challenges. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) requires that cultural affiliation be determined for cultural items found on federal and Indian lands. NAGPRA is, of course, human rights legislation to redress what was an unbalanced political and moral situation (Tsosie 1997). As such, it is designed to give tribes an equitable stake in determining the repatriation of culturally affiliated items, including human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony. Archaeological information only provides one means for establishing cultural affiliation within this legal arena. Oral history, ethnographic data, linguistics, folklore, biology, and other types of evidence also provide legally mandated means for establishing cultural affiliation, and many archaeologists rightfully turn to these in developing assessments of cultural affiliation.

To some degree, in determining cultural affiliation, archaeologists are returning to the literature of the past. The works of Cushing and Fewkes once again have direct relevance to contemporary legal and bureaucratic issues. In the course of using these texts, some archaeologists also seem to be taking a nineteenth-century view of the world. Without fully evaluating the historical processes that have produced the current categories of archaeological culture, and without critically examining these constructed cultures in the light of what we know about culture and ethnicity, too many archaeologists still hope to find a one-to-one correlation between archaeological cultures and modern tribes. These archaeologists consequently have a very narrow view of the affiliation between archaeological cultures and particular modern tribes. Having been taught that modern Pueblos are descended from the "Anasazi," such archaeologists express dismay when the Hopi and Zuni tribes claim cultural affiliation with the Mogollon, Hohokam, Salado, Fremont, and other archaeological cultures. Given the dynamic and complex nature of history as expressed through

both Hopi and Zuni traditional history, however, these statements should come as no surprise.

The issue of scale is central to the determination of cultural affiliation. Take, for example, a common point in the process, a modern-day tribe. The archaeologist, working from past archaeological cultures to the present, sees a modern tribe as a single-unit end point in the process of reasoning when determining cultural affiliation. Tribal members, working from the present to the past, see themselves as a complex system of families, clans, medicine groups, religious societies, and priest-hoods. As we have noted above, Hopi relationships to ancestral archaeological sites are primarily based in clan histories, where Zuni relationships are more often reckoned through medicine groups, religious societies, and priest-hoods. Consequently, archaeologists and tribes have different concepts about the past at a point where we should expect congruity of scale for determining cultural affiliation.

It is equally important to reiterate that cultural, ethnic, and tribal affiliation is not necessarily synonymous with archaeological cultures. For example, in the Southwest, a number of Puebloan tribes can have equally valid cultural affiliation to an entire archaeological culture area, certain portions of that area at different times, specific sites, or even just certain cultural items. The land and its resources have played many critical roles to many Puebloan groups over many centuries. Land uses have overlapped. Different groups have occupied the same area at different times, just as the same group has occupied different areas at different times. Cultural entities have fissioned many times and reconstituted themselves in various ways to produce the modern tribes. There is, thus, shared cultural history and therefore affiliation between the modern Puebloan tribes and many archaeological areas.

Recognizing temporal scale in land use is also critical. NAGPRA places some importance on the concept of aboriginal tribal areas as determined by the United States for Indian land claims. While this concept has utility in NAGPRA, it is extremely limited in the determination of cultural affiliation. Many archaeologists fail to consider how recent these land claims areas are within the American Southwest. Using land use areas in A.D. 1848 as a way to determine the extent of cultural

affiliation has no relevance to the use of land by migrating Zuni and Hopi ancestors in the ancient past when, at various times, these migrating groups traversed, lived in, and buried their dead throughout almost all of present-day New Mexico, Arizona, and portions of Colorado, Utah, and Nevada.

Where Do We Go from Here?

There are no simple scientific or bureaucratic answers to the complex social, historical, and archaeological issues dealing with cultural affiliation. We suggest that archaeologists take a closer look at archaeological culture concepts and develop new interpretive frameworks equating archaeological materials with present-day tribes. To a large extent, this will require the reincorporation of anthropological perspectives of culture into archaeological theory. To do this effectively, archaeologists need to collaborate with Native American tribes to integrate their perspective of the past into contemporary archaeological research. Collaboration is essential because much of what defines cultural or ethnic identity is contained within the history of the members of that culture, and members of the tribes are in a good position to identify the traits that are used for self-identification. At Hopi and Zuni, it is religious leaders who maintain this type of information, and as part of their authority they have the proprietary right to decide what and how esoteric information should be used in scholarly research.

We need to move beyond the anecdotal use of oral traditions to bolster archaeological narratives. In this regard, we think Vansina's (1985) *Oral Tradition as History* provides the rigorous methodology needed to construct history through the analysis of individual oral traditions. Vansina provides a way to identify the historical commonalities that underlie variation in the form, content, and social use of different accounts. He does this by treating oral traditions as testimony, and then stringently analyzing a corpus of testimonies to cross-check and internally validate historical content. We think the application of Vansina's methodology to Hopi and Zuni oral traditions would produce systematic information about cultural affiliation to archaeological sites, as well as a number of testable propositions that could then be investigated using archaeological data.

The incorporation of traditional history into the suite of evidence used by archaeologists for interpreting the past will potentially require the reconciliation of contradictory views. Historically, when the Native American view of the past and the archaeological reconstruction differed, it was the Native American view that was generally discounted as "mythology" or "religion." Just because archaeologists study tangible remains does not mean that their interpretation of artifacts will always be correct. It is theory that provides a framework for interpreting the archaeological record, and this is an area where the incorporation of Native American knowledge of the past can be of great benefit.

In summary, to make archaeology more useful to Native American tribes and to infuse the discipline with a new vitality, archaeologists need to focus on the variation in the archaeological record rather than the reduction of that variation to define units of archaeological cultures. New technology continually provides us with more ways to analyze variation than were available to earlier generations of archaeologists. We clearly need to bridge contemporary work to past units of analysis, but we also need to move beyond identifying archaeological units as if that were the ultimate research goal. As archaeologists we question whether categories like Anasazi, Mogollon, and Hohokam have much analytical utility in terms of meeting either the legal mandate to determine cultural affiliation or the scientific goals of contemporary archaeology. As archaeologists who work with Indian tribes, we know these categories are not very meaningful in relation to the ways Pueblo people think of their ancestors.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Leigh J. Kuwanwisiwma of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, Andrew L. Othole and Joseph Dishta of the Pueblo of Zuni, as well as the Hopi and Zuni cultural advisory team members, for many insights into cultural affiliation from a tribal perspective. In addition, we thank three anonymous reviewers and Keith Kintigh for insightful comments and suggestions for improvements. María Nieves Zedeño translated the abstract into Spanish. This paper was first presented at an April 1995 Arizona Archaeological Council symposium entitled "The Culture Concept in Contemporary Southwestern Archaeology," in Tucson, Arizona.

References Cited

- Ahlstrom, R. V. N., D. E. Purcell, M. Zyniecki, D. A. Gilpin, V. L. Newton
1993 *An Archaeological Overview of Grand Canyon National Park*. SWCA, Inc., Flagstaff, Arizona.
- Anyon, R., T. J. Ferguson, L. Jackson, L. Lane, and P. Vicenti
1997 Native American Oral Tradition and Archaeology: Issues of Structure, Relevance, and Respect. In *Native Americans and Archaeologists, Stepping Stones to Common Ground*, edited by N. Swidler, K. E. Dongoske, R. Anyon, and A. S. Downer, pp. 77–87. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Binford, S. R., and L. R. Binford
1968 *New Perspectives in Archaeology*. Aldine, Chicago.
- Bunzel, R.
1932 Zuni Origin Myths. In *47th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for the Years 1929–1930*, pp. 545–609. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Cushing, F. H.
1890 Preliminary Notes on the Origin, Working Hypotheses, and Primary Researches of the Hemenway Southwestern Expedition. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Americanists*, pp. 151–193. International Congress of Americanists, Berlin.
1896 Outlines of Zuni Creation Myths. In *13th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1891–1892*, pp. 321–447. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Dongoske, K., T. J. Ferguson, and L. Jenkins
1993 Understanding the Past through Hopi Oral History. *Native Peoples Magazine* 6(2):24–31.
- Ferguson, T. J., and K. Dongoske
1994 Navajo Transmission Project EIS: Hopi Ethnographic Overview. Produced by the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office in association with the Institute of the North American West, Tucson, Arizona. Report on file at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, Kykotsmobi, Arizona.
- Ferguson, T. J., and E. R. Hart
1985 *A Zuni Atlas*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- Fewkes, J. W.
1896 The Prehistoric Culture of Tusayan. *American Anthropologist* 9:151–174.
1898a Preliminary Account of an Expedition to the Pueblo Ruins Near Winslow, Arizona, in 1896. *Annual Report 1896*, pp. 517–540. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
1898b Archeological Expedition to Arizona in 1895. *Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for the Years 1895–1896* 17:519–742. Part 2. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- 1900 Tusayan Migration Traditions. In *Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for the Years 1897–1898* 19:573–634. Part 2. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- 1909 *Antiquities of the Mesa Verde National Park, Spruce Tree House*. Bulletin No. 41. Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D.C.
- Gladwin, H. S.
1957 *A History of the Ancient Southwest*. Bond Wheelright Company, Portland, Maine.
- Gladwin, H. S., E. W. Haury, E. B. Sayles, and N. Gladwin
1937 *Excavations at Snaketown, I: Material Culture*. Medallion Papers No. 25. Gila Pueblo, Globe, Arizona.
- Gladwin, W., and H. S. Gladwin
1934 *A Method for the Designation of Cultures and Their Variations*, Medallion Papers No. 15. Gila Pueblo, Globe, Arizona.
- Haury, E. W.
1936 *The Mogollon Culture of Southwestern New Mexico*. Gila Pueblo, Medallion Papers No. 20. Gila Pueblo, Globe, Arizona.
1958 Evidence at Point of Pines for a Prehistoric Migration from Northern Arizona. In *Migrations in New World Culture History*, edited by R. H. Thompson, pp. 1–6. Bulletin No. 29(2), Social Science Bulletin No. 27. University of Arizona, Tucson.
1985 *Mogollon Culture in the Forestdale Valley, East-central Arizona*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Hill, J. N.
1970 *Broken K Pueblo: Prehistoric Social Organization in the American Southwest*. Anthropological Papers No. 18. University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Hough, W.
1907 *Antiquities of the Upper Gila and Salt River Valleys in Arizona and New Mexico*. Bulletin No. 35. Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D.C.
- Jenkins, L.
1994 Hopi Navotiat . . . Hopi Knowledge of History: Hopi Presence on Black Mesa. Manuscript on file with the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, Kykotsmobi, Arizona.
- Kidder, A. V.
1927 Southwestern Archaeological Conference. *Science* 66:486–491.
1936 Speculations on New World Prehistory. In *Essays in Anthropology Presented to Alfred L. Kroeber*, edited by R. H. Lowie, pp. 143–152. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Lekson S. H.
1988 The Idea of the Kiva in Anasazi Archaeology. *Kiva* 53:213–234.
- Longacre, W. A.
1970 *Archaeology as Anthropology: A Case Study*. Anthropological Papers No. 17. University of Arizona, Tucson.
- McGregor, J. C.
1977 *Southwestern Archaeology* 2nd ed. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Martin, P. S., and J. B. Rinaldo
1947 *The SU Site: Excavations at a Mogollon Village, Western New Mexico*. Anthropological Series No. 32(3). Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.
1960 *Table Rock Pueblo, Arizona*. Fieldiana: Anthropology Vol. 51(2). Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.
- Martin, P. S., J. B. Rinaldo, and W. Longacre
1961 *Mineral Creek Site and Hooper Ranch Pueblo*. Fieldiana: Anthropology Vol. 52. Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.
- Mindeleff, V.
1891 A Study of Pueblo Architecture in Tusayan and Cibola. In *Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology* 8:3–228. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Nequatewa, E.
1967 *Truth of a Hopi*. Reprint. Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff.
- Pepper, G. H.
1902 The Ancient Basket Makers of Southeastern Utah. *Journal of the American Museum of Natural History* 2(4). Supplement.
- Plig, F.
1979 Prehistory: Western Anasazi. In *Southwest*, edited by A. Ortiz, pp. 108–130. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 9, William C. Sturtevant, general editor.

- Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Reed, E. K.
1950 Eastern-Central Arizona Archaeology in Relation to the Western Pueblos. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 6(2):120-138.
- Stanislawski, M. B.
1979 Hopi-Tewa. In *Southwest*, edited by A. Ortiz, pp. 587-602. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 9, William B. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Stevenson, M. C.
1904 The Zuni Indians, Their Mythology, Esoteric Fraternities, and Ceremonies. In *Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* 23:1-634. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Teague, L. S.
1993 Prehistory and the Traditions of the O'odham and Hopi. *Kiva* 58:435-454.
- Tsosie, R.
1997 Indigenous Rights and Archaeology. In *Native*

Americans and Archaeologists, Stepping Stones to Common Ground, edited by N. Swidler, K. E. Dongoske, R. Anyon, and A. S. Downer, pp. 64-76. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

- Vansina, J.
1985 *Oral Tradition as History*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Note

1. "Anasazi" is an archaeological term introduced by Kidder (1936:152). It is a corruption of a Navajo word that is sometimes translated as meaning "enemy ancestor" (Ahlstrom et al. 1993:61; Plog 1979:108). The Hopi and Zuni tribes consequently think this term should not be used to label their ancestors.

Received December 9, 1996; accepted March 14, 1997; revised May 5, 1997.

NEW BOOKS FROM TENNESSEE

American Material Culture

THE SHAPE OF THE FIELD
Edited by Ann Smart Martin and J. Ritchie Garrison
A Winterthur Book, distributed for the Winterthur Museum by UT Press. Objects in museums, the buildings that surround us, the clothing we wear—all are forms of material culture that we use to create and mediate social relations. This volume brings together important new research in American material culture. From Tupperware to stuffed owls, from modern dolls to colonial portraits, the subjects under study here demonstrate how things provoke and sustain human dramas.
360 pages, illus.
ISBN 0-912724-35-8, \$39.95

Exploring Everyday Landscapes

PERSPECTIVES IN VERNACULAR ARCHITECTURE, VII
Edited by Annmarie Adams and Sally McMurry
These seventeen essays confirm the transformations now taking place in the study of vernacular architecture. Moving away from an emphasis on old, rural structures using traditional forms and materials, scholars are now exploring a wider range of buildings and landscapes—from company towns to grand expositions.
December, 344 est. pages, illus.
ISBN 0-87049-983-1, \$30.00 pa

Carolina's Historical Landscapes

ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES
Edited by Linda F. Stine, Martha Zierden, Lesley M. Drucker, and Christopher Judge
Synthesizing research in archaeology, geography, and history, these essays focus on the rich landscapes of the Carolinas. Their interdisciplinary approach will deepen the reader's understanding of how people have changed the land and how they, in turn, have been changed by their interaction with it.
304 pages, illus.
ISBN 0-87049-976-9, \$45.00

Annapolis Pasts

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY IN ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND
Edited by Paul A. Shackel, Paul R. Mullins, and Mark S. Warner
Bringing together research from the Archaeology in Annapolis project, the contributors to *Annapolis Pasts* use archaeological data to interpret the emergence of capitalism as both a dynamic market force and an equally dynamic body of social rules. Their studies range from eighteenth-century formal gardens to nineteenth- and twentieth-century African American neighborhoods.
January, 328 pages, illus.
ISBN 0-87049-996-3, \$50.00

Shipping and handling: \$3.50 for first book; \$.75 for each additional book.


The University of Tennessee Press
KNOXVILLE 37996-0325