

Pueblo of Zuni
Cultural Resource Enterprise

ETHNOHISTORICAL INTERPRETATION
AND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA RECOVERY
ALONG NAVAJO ROUTE 9101, JEDDITO ROAD,
NAVAJO COUNTY, ARIZONA

VOLUME 1

Prepared by
David C. Eck

With contributions by
Alysia Abbott, Roger Anyon, Eugene Bowekaty, Kenny Bowekaty, Trixi D. Bubemyre,
T. J. Ferguson, Ph.D., Harris Francis, Margaret Glass, Klara Kelly, Pamela McBride,
Paul Morgan, Davis C. Nieto Jr., Gary O'Brien, Loren Panteah, Donovan K. Quant,
Susan J. Smith, Kate Thompson, Stephen Tillinghast, and Jeffery K. Waseta

Fieldwork Conducted Under
Navajo Nation Cultural Resources Investigation Permit C9616
and
Bureau of Indian Affairs Permit NAO-ARPA-96-010

Prepared by the Zuni Cultural Resource Enterprise
under the Administration of
the Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department
for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Area Office,
Branch of Roads, Gallup, New Mexico

Contract No. C30657-N9101
NAU-89-003.6

Submitted to
Nina Swidler
Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department
Roads Planning Program, Flagstaff Office

Zuni Cultural Resource Enterprise Project No. ZCRE-013-96
Zuni Cultural Resource Enterprise Report No. 562

November 1998

ABSTRACT

The Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department (NNHPD), Roads Planning Program, under an Indian Self-determination and Education Act Contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) solicited Zuni Cultural Resource Enterprise (ZCRE) to provide cultural resource services. The agreement for services is set forth in Contract No. 30657, Modification Three: "Phased Data Recovery on Navajo Route 9101, Jeddito Road, Navajo County, Arizona; Task Order No. Three: Archaeological Data Recovery, NAU-89-003.6." This document is provided in partial fulfillment of that contract, reporting the data recovery activities and findings. The undertaking is one of road construction on Navajo Nation Partitioned Lands. The BIA proposes to rehabilitate Navajo Route 9101 (N9101) from its intersection with State Highway 264 to Jeddito. This road segment, the Cedar/Jeddito School Access, covers 1.3 mi in Navajo County, Arizona, and can be found on the Keams Canyon, Arizona 7.5-min USGS quadrangle map. The fieldwork was conducted under Navajo Nation Cultural Resources Investigation Permit C9616 and Bureau of Indian Affairs permit NAO-ARPA-96-010.

During data recovery fieldwork, those portions of four archaeological sites falling within the area of effect for the undertaking were investigated further via hand excavation, backhoe trenching, and scraping. All four sites are considered to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Their Navajo Nation site numbers are: AZ-O-10-32, AZ-O-10-33, AZ-O-10-35, and AZ-O-10-38. As a result of testing excavations, ZCRE demonstrated that construction of the proposed N9101 road project would cause the complete destruction of eligible resources within the right-of-way at sites AZ-O-10-32, AZ-O-10-33, AZ-O-10-35, and AZ-O-10-38. In order to arrive at a determination of no adverse effect, ZCRE conducted archaeological excavations at these four sites, all of which were included in the Phase II Data Recovery program for mitigation of effect.

A total of 190 features were defined across the four sites, 55 of which were identified during testing and 135 of which were discovered during data recovery. Seventeen of the features were surficial, and nine of these were outside the area of effect. Fifteen of the 190 features were structural. ZCRE had projected that as many as 20 structures actually existed within the area of effect. The additional five structures anticipated proved not to exist within the area of effect, but may be present outside the right-of-way. Twenty-four of the features were extramural, including middens, hearths, roasting pits, earthen pits, and burials. Two features proved to be natural, representing buried drainage channels. Another 116 features were architectural (postholes, ventilators, niches, benches, etc.) or internal to the structures (including earthen pits, hearths, ash pits, deflectors, and the like). The number of extramural features fell below the 30 that were anticipated, while the number of internal and architectural features vastly exceeded the 60 anticipated. Sixteen features were problematic, in that they proved to be noncultural or too ephemeral to be relocated and investigated during data recovery.

Data recovery efforts were supplemented by a pilot study in ethnohistoric interpretation that involved participants from the Hopi, Navajo, and Zuni tribes. The study was conducted to provide alternative views of culture history, cultural affiliation, and interpretation. Successful cooperation of the three participating groups in this study provided invaluable insights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	v
List of Figures	xiv
List of Tables	xxi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Description of the Undertaking	2
Authority	2
ZCRE N9101 Project History	2
2. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	11
Modern Environment	11
Physiography	11
Geology	12
Geomorphology	14
Hydrology	16
Pedology	16
Climatology	17
Botany	19
Zoology	25
Paleoenvironment	31
Geomorphology	32
Palynology	32
Dendroclimatology	33
Environmental Summary	34
3. CULTURE HISTORY	37
The Paleoindian Adaptation	37
Clovis	38
Folsom	38
Later Complexes	38
The Archaic Adaptation	39
Cochise Culture	39
Desha Complex	40
Pinto Basin Complex	40
Oshara Tradition	40
The Puebloan Adaptation	41
Basketmaker II	43
Basketmaker III	44
Pueblo I	44
Pueblo II	45
Pueblo III	46
Pueblo IV	46

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
External Contact and the Historic Period	47
Southern Utes	47
Navajos	47
Northern Tonto Apaches	48
Hopi Pueblos	48
Historical Synopsis	49
4. PREVIOUS RESEARCH	51
Regional Research	51
Local Cultural Resource Investigations	52
ZCRE N9101 Cultural Resource Investigations	56
Reassessment	56
Archaeological Extent Testing	57
5. RESEARCH DESIGN	61
Environmental and Economy	62
Mobility/Sedentism	62
Land Use	65
Population and Demography	69
Population Change	69
Local and Regional Population Growth and Abandonment	70
Social Organization	71
Patterns of Intersite Integration	72
Horizontal Organization	73
Vertical Organization	73
Regional Relationships	73
Cultural Affiliation and Boundaries	73
Processes on the Peripheries of Regional Systems	77
Fundamental Research Requirements	78
Archaeological Description Requirements	78
Chronology Requirements	78
Environmental Study Requirements	79
Formation Processes Requirements	80
Research Design for Final Data Recovery	81
Environment and Economy	82
Population and Demography	82
Social Organization	83
Regional Relationships	84
Fundamental Research Requirements Revisited	84
6. METHODS	85
Field Methods	85
Traffic and Safety Control	85

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Fencing	86
Mechanized Operations	86
Surface Collection	87
Hand Excavation	87
Backhoe Excavation	87
Recording and Provenience Methods	88
Provenience	88
Records	89
7. SITE AZ-O-10-32	93
Donovan K. Quam and Davis C. Nieto Jr.	
Introduction	93
Survey Data	93
Testing Data	95
Data Recovery Excavations and Feature Descriptions	104
Field Methods	104
Backhoe Excavation	105
Feature 1 Roomblock	118
Feature 5 Extramural Activity Area	133
Feature 6 Pitstructure	141
Feature 8 Pitstructure	152
Feature 9 Pitstructure	159
Feature 10 Pitstructure	170
Feature 15 Midden	185
Feature 16 Pitstructure	189
Feature 17 Pitstructure	211
Feature 32 Pit	227
Feature 33 Pit	228
Feature 34 Pit	230
Feature 101 Pit	232
Analytical Contributions	234
Ceramics	234
Chipped Stone	234
Ground Stone	235
Faunal Remains	235
Floral Remains	235
Chronometrics	236
8. SITE AZ-O-10-33	237
Jeffery K. Waseta and Eugene Bowekaty	
Introduction	237
Survey Data	237
Testing Data	242

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Data Recovery Excavation and Feature Descriptions	248
Field Methods	248
Backhoe Excavation	250
Extramural Features	255
Feature 6 Midden	270
Feature 9 Pitstructure	277
Feature 15 Pitstructure	303
Feature 16 Pitstructure	312
Feature 18 Pitstructure	323
Feature 22 Pitstructure	340
Analytical Contributions	346
Ceramics	346
Chipped Stone	346
Ground Stone	347
Ornaments	347
Faunal Remains	347
Floral Remains	348
Chronometrics	348
9. SITE AZ-O-10-35	349
Jeffery K. Waseta	
Introduction	349
Survey Data	349
Testing Data	351
Data Recovery Excavation and Feature Descriptions	353
Backhoe Excavations	354
Archaeology	359
Feature 5	360
Feature 8	370
Analytical Contributions	370
Ceramics	370
Chipped Stone	371
Faunal Remains	371
Floral Remains	371
10. SITE AZ-O-10-38	373
Jeffery K. Waseta	
Introduction	373
Survey Data	373
Testing Data	373
Data Recovery Excavations and Feature Descriptions	377
Analytical Contributions	380
Ceramics	380

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Chipped Stone	380
Floral Remains	380
Archaeology	380
11. GEOMORPHOLOGICAL STUDIES	381
Kate Thompson, Gary O'Brien, Paul Morgan, and Stephen Tillinghast	
Introduction	381
Regional Geology and Geomorphology	381
Geoarchaeology of the Study Area	384
Soils in the Area	386
Dune Soils	386
Alluvial Soils	387
Site Descriptions	387
Site AZ-O-10-32	387
Site AZ-O-10-33	387
Site AZ-O-10-35	389
Conclusions	389
12. ARCHAEOBOTANICAL REMAINS	393
Pamela McBride	
Introduction	393
Methods	395
Vegetal Sample Analysis	395
Radiocarbon Sample Analysis	395
Flotation Samples	396
Quantification	397
Results of Flotation, Radiocarbon, and Vegetal Sample Analyses	398
Uncharred Plant Remains from Flotation Samples	398
Charred Plant Remains from Flotation Samples	398
Wood from Flotation and Radiocarbon Samples	409
Results of Vegetal Sample Analysis	415
Discussion	417
Research Issues and the Archaeobotanical Assemblage	417
Comparative Perspectives: Jeddito Plant Remains in a Regional Context	421
Summary and Conclusions	426
13. POLLEN ANALYSIS	429
Susan J. Smith	
Introduction	429
Methods	429
Pollen Types	430
Economic Taxa	432
Results and Interpretations	433

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Site AZ-O-10-32	433
Site AZ-O-10-33	438
Site AZ-O-10-35	440
Site AZ-O-10-38	440
Conclusions and Research Questions: Environment and Economy	441
Land Use	441
Season of Occupation	442
Diet and Subsistence Practices	442
14. FAUNAL REMAINS FROM ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA RECOVERY ALONG NAVAJO ROUTE 9101, JEDDITO ROAD	445
Margaret Glass	
Methodology	445
Description of the Samples	446
Taxonomic Groups	451
Lagomorphs	451
Rodents	451
Carnivores	453
Artiodactyls	453
Nonmammals	453
Site Specific Analyses	454
Site AZ-O-10-33	454
Site AZ-O-10-32	462
Summary and Conclusions	473
15. ANALYSIS OF CERAMIC ARTIFACTS RECOVERED FROM FOUR SITES	475
Trixi D. Bubemyre	
Introduction	475
Methods and Procedures	475
Ceramic Taxonomy	476
Result of Analysis	478
Site AZ-O-10-32	478
Site AZ-O-10-33	510
Site AZ-O-10-35	539
Site AZ-O-10-38	541
Chronological Correlates	541
Summary and Conclusions	541
16. CHRONOLOGY	543
Relative Dating	543
Stratigraphy	543
Ceramic Artifacts	547

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Absolute Dating	551
Dendrochronology	552
Radiocarbon Dating	553
Archaeomagnetic Dating	558
Site and Intrasite Chronology	561
Conclusions	567
17. FLAKED AND GROUND STONE ARTIFACTS	571
Alysia L. Abbott, Kenny Bowekaty, and David C. Eck	
Introduction	571
Methodology	571
Raw Material Analyses	572
Reduction Analyses	573
Thermal Alteration Analyses	576
Ground Stone Analyses	576
Results of Analysis	578
Descriptive Summaries	579
Raw Material Analysis Results	581
Reduction Analysis Results	584
Thermal Alteration Analysis Results	586
Ground Stone Analysis Results	588
Conclusions	593
18. MINERALS, PIGMENTS, SHELL, AND OTHER MATERIALS	595
Minerals	595
Site AZ-O-10-32	595
Site AZ-O-10-33	596
Pigments	597
Site AZ-O-10-32	597
Site AZ-O-10-33	599
Site AZ-O-10-35	601
Shell	602
Miscellaneous Items	602
Summary	602
19. SUMMARY	605
Archaeological Investigations	605
Level of Effort	605
Results of Investigations	607
Architecture	608
Artifacts and Other Materials Recovered	609
Ceramic Artifacts	609
Flaked Stone Artifacts	610
Ground Stone Artifacts	611

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Faunal Specimens	611
Floral Remains	612
Pollen Evidence	612
Chronometrics	613
Geomorphological Investigations	614
20. CONCLUSIONS FROM THE ARCHAEOLOGY	615
Research Design	615
Environment and Economy	616
Population and Demography	618
Social Organization	621
Regional Relationships	623
Fundamental Research Requirements	628
Archaeological Description Requirements	628
Chronology Requirements	628
Environmental Study Requirements	629
Formation Processes Requirements	629
21. PILOT STUDY IN ETHNOHISTORIC INTERPRETATION	631
Specifications	631
Prospectus	632
Implementation	635
Fieldwork	636
Laboratory Sessions	636
Input	637
22. HOPI FOOTPRINTS IN THE JEDDITO VALLEY: INTERPRETATION OF ETHNOHISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY	639
T. J. Ferguson, Ph.D.	
Introduction	639
Footprints on the Landscape: A Hopi Paradigm of Archaeology and History	639
Purpose of Chapter	639
Project Study Area	640
The N9101 Project Area	640
The Jeddito Valley Study Area	640
Project Research Design	642
Goals and Objectives	642
Research Themes	642
Methodology	642
Ethnohistorical Overview of Hopi History in The Jeddito Valley	645
Epistemological Issues	645
Ethnohistoric Perspectives on Hopi History	647
Summary	665

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Interpretation of the Archaeological Record of the N9101 Sites	666
Results of Fieldwork	666
Review of Artifacts	673
Conclusion: Linking Archaeology And Ethnohistory in	
Cultural Resources Management	677
Conclusions from Archaeological, Ethnographic, and Historical Sources ...	677
The Politics of Research in the Age of NAGPRA	679
Recommendations for Future Research	680
 23. NAVAJO (<i>DINÉ</i>) ETHNOGRAPHY	 681
Klara Kelley and Harris Francis	
Background	681
Location, Scale, and History of Project Area	681
The Archaeological Focus of This Project and Surrounding Context	684
Sources of Information	685
The Navajo Cultural Encyclopedia	685
Previous Documentation	688
Present Custodians of Navajo Cultural Encyclopedia	689
Research Methods	690
Methods for Compiling and Interpreting Previous Documentation	690
Methods for Consulting Navajo Ceremonialists	691
Confidentiality	693
Results	693
Summary of Previously Recorded Navajo (<i>Diné</i>) Oral Tradition	694
Results of Consultations with Ceremonialists	702
Conclusions and Recommendations	712
<i>Diné</i> Oral Tradition	712
Possibilities for Dialogue	713
Management Issues about <i>Diné</i> Tradition and Precolumbian	
Archaeological Sites	714
 24. ZUNI CULTURAL CONTEXT AND INTERPRETATIONS	 717
Roger Anyon and Loren Panteah	
Introduction	717
Purpose of the Chapter	717
History And Structure of the Project	717
Zuni Cultural Resource Advisory Team	718
Confidentiality	718
Human Remains	718
Structure of the Chapter	719
Goals, Research Issues, and Methods	719
Goals and Research Issues	719
Methods	723

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Cultural Context and Culture History	727
Zuni Perspectives on <i>A:Shiwi</i> History, Migrations, and the Search for <i>I:di wana'a</i>	727
Zuni Connections with Hopi	729
The Jeddito Archaeological Sites	731
Zuni Research and Interpretations: Field Archaeology	732
Jeddito Project Area: Fieldwork	732
Cultural Context: Fieldwork at Hopi	744
Zuni Research and Interpretations: Artifacts	745
Floor Assemblages	745
Selected Materials from Nonfloor Contexts	752
Conclusions	756
Conclusions and Recommendations	757
Research Conclusions	757
Management Issues and Recommendations	759
Future Collaborative Research Potential	761
 25. CONCLUSIONS FROM THE ETHNOHISTORY	 763
Research Design	763
Environment and Economy	763
Population and Demography	764
Social Organization	765
Regional Relationships	765
Fundamental Research Requirements	766
Archaeological Description Requirements	766
Chronology Requirements	766
Environmental Studies Requirements	767
Formation Processes Requirements	767
 26. PILOT STUDY EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 769
Communication and Participation	770
Assessment	770
Testing	771
Final Data Recovery	772
Coordination	772
Conflict Resolution	773
 REFERENCES CITED	 775

Chapter 23

NAVAJO (*DINÉ*) ETHNOGRAPHY

Klara Kelley and Harris Francis

BACKGROUND

This chapter is part of an interdisciplinary intensive data recovery program prescribed by federal and Navajo Nation cultural resource management law and policy as a condition for rehabilitating Navajo Route 9101, Jeddito Road. The archaeological part of this program involved data recovery excavation at four small pre-Columbian sites in the road right-of-way and relating the results to the contemporaneous archaeology of the surrounding region. The surrounding region is defined (to cover the surrounding contiguous area under jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation) as the Jeddito Island. The ethnographic part of this program covers relevant Navajo (*Diné*), Zuni, and Hopi ethnography and policies that members of each group advocate for doing and reporting this type of ethnoarchaeological research. There were separate researchers for each tribe.

This chapter covers the Navajo part. The purpose of the Navajo part of the project is to learn

1. what Navajo oral tradition has to say about the four archaeological sites;
2. what Navajo oral tradition has to say about the geographical (especially Jeddito Valley-Antelope Mesa) and temporal (especially pre-Columbian) contexts of the four archaeological sites;
3. how custodians of Navajo tradition think we should protect and manage the four sites and similar situations; and
4. how these custodians of Navajo tradition think Navajo oral tradition should be recorded, used, and disseminated (if at all).

Location, Scale, and History of Project Area

Jeddito Road is 2.1 km (1.3 mi) long and connects the Navajo community of Jeddito to State Highway 264, the main east-to-west artery through the center of Navajoland. The Jeddito Navajo community consists of a school, housing, and chapter (community meeting) compound in a spring-fed *rincon* in the middle of Navajo land and on the eastern edge of Hopi land.

Jeddito is located inside a reservation created by Executive Order in 1882 (hereafter called the 1882 Executive Order Reservation or 1882 Reservation). The administrative history of this reservation and its partitioning has helped to spoil previously uneven relations between Navajos and Hopis. These hostilities today affect the present project, both by precluding shared ethnography and by affecting what members of each group say to the ethnographers. A review of this administrative

history is therefore an indispensable context for our research results. Needless to say, the most detailed sources of administrative history are records kept by the governments involved, especially the federal government, and the summary in this section reflects that (Brugge 1994; Cahn 1982; Clemmer 1979; Correll and Dehiya 1978; Indian Law Resource Center 1979; Kelly 1970; Redhouse 1985; Whitson 1985). Navajo oral history about these same events appears later in this chapter.

In 1848, the U.S. government signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo with Mexico and took control of what is now the southwestern United States. By 1868, the U.S. Army had subjugated the Navajos. For four years, the Army had held perhaps half of the Navajo people captive in Fort Sumner, New Mexico, a concentration camp far east of their homeland. In 1868, the Navajos finally signed a treaty with the United States that set aside a reservation in the middle of their former homeland. Many Navajos went back to their former homes beyond the boundaries of this reservation, including places west of the Navajo reservation around the Hopi villages.

In 1882, President Chester A. Arthur by Executive Order set aside a reservation for the Hopi Indians "and other such Indians as the Secretary of the Interior may see fit to settle thereon" (Executive Order of December 16, 1882, in Correll and Dehiya 1978:13). The federal government wanted to stop Mormon expansion in the Arizona territory (Dockstater 1979:526). But the issue that finally called forth the Executive Order was Hopi resistance when the local Indian agent tried to take their children away to school. To enhance the agent's authority, the agent asked President Arthur to formalize his jurisdiction as a reservation. Arthur drew its boundaries to the agent's arbitrary specification that it fit into the existing cadastral grid (Indian Law Resource Center 1979:7-14). At the time, the Hopis were concentrated in villages on three mesas west of Keams Canyon, while Navajos lived in extended family compounds dispersed throughout the rest of the new 1882 Reservation, including the area around Jeddito.

In the 1930s, the federal government forced both Navajos and Hopis to reduce their livestock, and it introduced other range planning and conservation measures to diminish the erosion and burden of silt in the Colorado River that was threatening the government's investment in Boulder (Hoover) Dam near Las Vegas, Nevada. (The dam was planned in the late 1920s to generate power for booming Los Angeles [Fonaroff 1963].) The federal government divided the 1882 Reservation as well as surrounding Navajoland into grazing districts, one of which, Land Management District (LMD) 6, was reserved exclusively for Hopi use. The federal government had recently organized the Hopi Tribal Council, in the face of much Hopi opposition, to represent what were formerly politically autonomous villages. This council, along with other groups of Hopis, protested that the federal government was treating LMD 6 as the Hopi Reservation, ignoring Hopi claims on lands outside LMD 6 (Clemmer 1979:533-538). In 1943 the federal government expanded and fenced the LMD 6 boundary. Federal designation and expansion of LMD 6 as exclusively Hopi forced 100 or more Navajo families to abandon their homes and move outside the new boundary in the late 1930s and early 1940s.

In 1958, Congress authorized Hopis and Navajos to sue each other over surface ownership of 1882 Reservation lands. This authorization followed 20 years of mineral company inquiries about leasing and a 1956 federal survey that found important coal deposits in the northern part of the 1882 Reservation. Settling disputed surface rights would simplify the lease negotiations between mining

companies and tribal governments. The Hopi Tribal Council took up the challenge in 1961 by suing the Navajo Tribal Council (*Healing v. Jones*). After a complex chain of court rulings, in 1977 a federal judge drew a partition line to separate the Hopi half of the acreage beyond LMD 6 (called Hopi Partitioned Lands or HPL) from the Navajo half (called Navajo Partitioned Lands or NPL). A refinement of this partitioning was to carve from the southeastern HPL the "Jeddito Island," an enclave of particularly dense Navajo settlement. The partitioning also required members of each tribe living on lands partitioned to the other—about a dozen Hopi families and several hundred Navajo families—to move. Many Navajos with homes in HPL near the Jeddito Island therefore moved across the boundary into the island.

The relocations have enlarged the Jeddito community and created the need for the road paving project that precipitated this research. Archaeological remains show that, since pre-Columbian times, the springs here have supported residents and ceremonial centers. These sites are at the northeast end of a major ceremonial district along the east side of Antelope Mesa. The preeminent center in this district (at least in both documented and oral history) was at the southwestern tip of Antelope Mesa, the fabled *Awatovi*, hereafter called by the Navajo name *Tááláhooghan*.

Presumably the springs also attracted the first traders here (Babbitt Brothers and Wilmer Roberts) around 1910. The Jeddito trading post closed in 1970 (Kelley 1974; compare Zimmerman 1995:Confidential Appendix Attachment C). The Jeddito school dates from 1959 (Young 1961:22). Most if not all the original school buildings have been torn down and a new compound was completed in the early 1990s. Housing consists of both homes built and used by Navajo extended families (including both long-term residents and recently relocated families) and a new housing development built by the Navajo Housing Authority (an enterprise owned by the Navajo Nation government) in the early 1990s. The Jeddito Chapter is one of 110 similar units of Navajo self-government, the first of which the Bureau of Indian Affairs helped organize throughout Navajoland beginning in the late 1920s. Whether Jeddito was organized as a chapter this early is unclear. During the 1930s stock reduction, the federal government withdrew support for chapters, evidently because they were hotbeds of opposition. The Navajo Nation government reorganized chapters in the late 1950s. Construction of the first Jeddito chapter house evidently postdates 1959 (Young 1961:335-339). The present chapter house was built within the last two or three years. The half-dozen buildings and the housing compound in the present chapter house tract date from 1965, 1980 to 1986, and 1996 (Touchette 1996:19) and reflect surges in the functions and responsibilities of chapters.

The geographical frame of reference for this Navajo ethnographic paper is supposed to coincide as much as possible with that of the archaeology: the Jeddito community and the Jeddito Island. But the literature and the Navajo traditional experts we've consulted have other relevant geographical contexts that we can't ignore. For example, *Tááláhooghan*, with its links to Canyon de Chelly and Chaco Canyon, is the local place most emphasized in Navajo ceremonial histories, yet it lies beyond the Jeddito Island on Hopi lands.

The Archaeological Focus of This Project and Surrounding Context

The objects of intensive data recovery are four archaeological sites clustered in a 0.8-km-long (0.5-mi-long) stretch of the right-of-way. According to surface survey and limited testing studies (Eck 1996a) the overlapping periods of use of these four sites span the years AD 1000 to 1300. The sites are small, with at most a handful of pitstructures (some but not all probably ceremonial chambers). They seem to have been general-purpose homesites for small social groups (extended families most likely) and their ceremonial activities.

Archaeologists have used the Navajo-derived name "Anasazi" for sites in this region that date from about AD 1 to 1500. The Navajo usage of "*Anaasázi*" is somewhat different from the archaeologists' usage, as has been discussed in the archaeological treatment of culture history (Chapter 3). The "Navajo Nation Policy for the Protection of *Jishchaa'*: Gravesites, Human Remains, and Funerary Items" (Navajo Nation 1996:2) defines *Anaasázi* as "the *Diné* term for all ancient peoples who inhabited *Diné* customary lands, including all peoples whom archaeologists call 'prehistoric.'" To avoid ambiguity, we avoid using the term as much as possible. When we do use it, we follow archaeologists' usage when summarizing archaeological findings and Navajo usage when discussing Navajo thought about the sites and their time.

These sites undoubtedly relate in some way to other sites outside the right-of-way. The archaeological research design assumes that they relate at least to the archaeology of the surrounding Jeddito Island, and to *Tááláhooghan*, outside the Island. We assume that these sites were part of a contemporaneous network of general- and special-purpose sites. One important type of pre-Columbian special-purpose site during this period was the great house, a specialized ceremonial compound or temple typically surrounded by a community of dispersed small general-purpose sites like the four that are the focus of this project (Fowler and Stein 1992; Stein and Lekson 1992). Such great-house communities seem more common farther east, but something similar may be going on here. Before we started this project, we had visited Jeddito with Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department (NNHPD) Chaco Protection Sites archaeologist John Stein, who identified a possible great house south of Dove Spring and about 1.2 km (0.75 mi) north of the cluster of interest here. This site, though covered by sand, seems to be a small-scale version of the great-house plan that is typically found farther east (an elevated building with an open plaza or performance space to the southeast, fronted by an earthen berm where people disposed of or offered pottery, especially painted). The pottery seems to date to the period AD 1000 to 1150 (John Stein, personal communication 11 August 1996). *Lölöqanqwtuyqa*, located about 3.2 km (2 mi) to the east, is a possible successor. Not until after about AD 1300 did people build the big sites on the mesa rim above the Jeddito School rincon (*Mösöftanga* and Pink Arrow, with *Kookopngyamu* as possible successor), as well as *Tsaqwpahu* and *Kawayqa'a* to the southwest (Adams et al. 1990:Tables 1 and 2; Brew 1979:514-515).

One also wonders whether this little community, of which the four sites and the possible great house were part, was related to *Tááláhooghan* about 16 km (10 mi) to the southwest. According to Brew (1979:515), *Tááláhooghan* was "well established in the twelfth or early thirteenth century." Was *Tááláhooghan* at the time simply another example of the same type of

community, or did it have an added function (and attraction factor) as a center for long-distance trade and accompanying ceremonialism? (Much long-distance trade at this time in the Southwest seems to have been in ceremonial items and raw materials, like turquoise and feathers.)

Furthermore, some archaeologists (Lekson 1997; Stein and Fowler 1996) suggest that above the level of pre-Columbian great-house communities was a superregional ceremonial center, first Chaco (AD 850 to 1150), then Aztec (AD 1150 to 1300). Chaco and Aztec are districts with concentrations of great houses, great kivas, roads, and other special ceremonial architecture. These districts didn't necessarily dominate politically—maybe they dictated ceremonial calendars (as architectural and other features tend to align with movements of various celestial bodies). They were major nodes for trade in ceremonial items as far away as northern Mexico. Was the community at Jeddito part of ceremonial systems that Chaco and then Aztec coordinated? How (if at all) did *Tááláhooghan* fit into these systems? And were communities in the Jeddito and *Tááláhooghan* localities part of the Chaco system before AD 1000? What happened after AD 1300? Stein (personal communication 11 August 1997) suggests that after AD 1300, Antelope Mesa may have assumed ceremonial leadership from Aztec. The Antelope Mesa ceremonial district might have had *Tááláhooghan* as the preeminent site (comparable to Pueblo Bonito and Aztec) and included the other big post-AD 1300 sites—*Kawayqa'a* and *Tsaqwpahu*, Pink Arrow, *Mösöftanga* and *Kookopngyamu*. One difference seems to be that at the Chaco and Aztec districts, ordinary people seem to have lived in small "background" sites dispersed amid the great houses, but later, at Antelope Mesa (as throughout the Colorado Plateau), ordinary people may have aggregated into the great houses themselves, so that these big sites were no longer great houses, but actual villages (Adams et al. 1990; Stein and Fowler 1996). This could account for the abandonment of the four sites discussed in this report.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The Navajo Cultural Encyclopedia

To cover the topics outlined above in the Background section, we consulted the Navajo cultural encyclopedia. By "cultural encyclopedia" we mean the traditional stories, practices, and rules that encode theories and models of the cosmos and its components, the histories of the cosmos and its inhabitants (mortal and immortal), and what people must do to fit into the right places in the cosmos. The Navajo cultural encyclopedia exists mainly in the memories and practices of living people who pass pieces of it down through time from mouth to ear. Custodians of the cultural encyclopedia—those who take main responsibility for learning and teaching particular parts of it—are elderly heads of extended families and ceremonialists. Parts of this cultural encyclopedia also have been written down by Navajos on their own or as told to anthropologists. For this project, then, we consulted previous literature on Navajo culture and Navajo ceremonialists (since ceremonialists are the main custodians of Navajo culture beyond the range of traditional practices of Navajo families).

Oral tradition in general differs in important ways from permanent material (written) records. A written record or text is fixed, although how people interpret it in different times and contexts may change. But oral tradition isn't tangible texts; rather it is manifest only when those who know it tell

or otherwise perform it. A chunk of oral tradition is bound to vary from one teller or performer to another and even among performances of a single teller. The experiences and memory limitations of learners may introduce more variation.

But oral traditions also protect themselves against random change (Connerton 1989; Foley 1988; Olrik 1992; Rubin 1995; Vansina 1985). Groups may have strong restrictions on who can teach; who can learn; and how, when, and where teaching and learning can take place. Also, custodians of oral tradition load it with cues to help them remember it accurately, and these stabilize it. These cues include various poetic devices like rhyme, rhythm, fixed sequences, and "magic" numbers. Other stabilizing features of oral traditions are associating the visual and the verbal: describing easily visualized scenes organized in predictable forms (like the four directions); associating particular narrative elements with different parts of a scene or visual sequence; and even storing these scenes as petroglyphs, pictographs, murals, codices, and sandpainting prototypes.

An important stabilizing method is to take the limited body of well-known stories that most people learn in childhood and use them to carry more esoteric meanings, loading them with special codes to cue these meanings. Ceremonial specialists teach their students the versions of well-known stories with these codes added, then teach them how to decode the story (or tantalize them with hints so they figure out the meanings themselves, which reinforces memory). Specialists teach how to use the story as a script to help one remember the parts of a ceremonial performance, their sequence, and other performance rules. Different tellers can tell the same basic story in different ways, to carry different coded esoteric meanings. Also, a chunk of oral tradition, passing from mouth to ear through time, is reinterpreted with changes in time, place, and circumstance. It picks up and loses elements, and contains incomplete traces of its own history. It contains material that people at any one time may not be able to interpret without knowing its history. Little information about its history may exist beyond these traces in the tradition itself. Oral tradition is like an intangible version of a stratified archaeological deposit with missing and disturbed strata. The foregoing describes Navajo oral tradition no less than any other (Kelley and Francis 1994).

One interest that the Navajo cultural encyclopedia holds for this project is what it may tell directly or indirectly about the history of the pre-Columbian sites that are the project's focus.

The Navajo parts of the cultural encyclopedia that relate most explicitly to the pre-Columbian period are the stories of the origins and evolution of various Navajo ceremonies, hereafter called ceremonial stories. Evidence that Navajo ceremonial stories are set in the pre-Columbian period is, first, that the stories include events at occupied ceremonial centers that archaeologists say were abandoned during pre-Columbian times; and, second, that almost no stories even mention non-Indians or domesticated livestock that loom so large in post-Columbian Navajo history. Yet many anthropologists believe that Navajos (and the related Apaches) weren't in the southwestern United States until late pre-Columbian times after most of these archaeological sites were abandoned (Brugge 1983). The idea of Navajo connections with *Anaasázíis* is controversial among non-Navajo as well as among academic scholars. Most Navajos nevertheless argue that Navajo forebears were in the Southwest in pre-Columbian times.

W. H. H. H.

We will discuss Navajo ceremonialists' ideas about the *Anaasázíis* and why Navajo stories tell about them below in the Results section. Meanwhile, it is enough to say here that Navajo stories about clan origins (for example, Matthews 1897) suggest two lines for transmitting ceremonial stories: (1) Puebloan (and perhaps indigenous Mexican) descendants of pre-Columbian people who became certain Navajo clans in post-Columbian times; (2) pre-Columbian people who stayed in present Navajoland and whose descendants are members of certain Navajo clans. Early in this century, Jesse Walter Fewkes (1919:262-281) laid out how various clans could have brought certain ceremonial iconography and practices from various speech communities and archaeological districts to Hopi. We believe that one can generalize this process to all Southwestern Indian clans. The histories of different clans start in various regions among various speech communities. Groups of clan members break away and move through a series of places. As they move, they change language, pick up affiliates from clans of their hosts, and move on. (Sometimes a speech community may be more stable geographically than the family trees of its members—as they move geographically, individuals and groups may move in and out of a speech community temporarily or permanently.) The result today is that members of a particular clan and others affiliated with it are spread among various Puebloan, Apachean, and other Indian communities. Different Navajo clans have different histories, and some are linked to different ceremonies (see Results below; Kelley and Francis 1994). In other words, one way or another, forebears of Navajos today were in the southwestern United States in pre-Columbian times.

We defend oral traditions in general, and Navajo ceremonial stories in particular, as an intellectually respectable source of information about pre-Columbian history. But most ceremonial stories won't tell straightforwardly about unique chronological events. Instead, especially before conquest and colonization, Navajo and other Southwest Indian societies were probably like comparable egalitarian societies elsewhere in the world recorded ethnographically: ceremonialism governed political and social relations among people(s) and between humans and the personified forces of the earth, water, and sky (cosmos).

It is hard to tease apart ceremonialism and political events in these stories. Navajo stories about the origins and development of ceremonies contain a lot of explicit cosmology. Yet many of these ceremonial and cosmological stories are told as political events, but in cyclical (ceremonial) time rather than linear (political) time. These are all characteristics of origin myths all over the world. These and other "political" stories may be scripts for recurring ceremonial reenactments of prototype cosmological events represented as political alliances and conflicts. This compression shows the political dimension of ceremonialism—it regulates relations among humans and between humans and immortal powers of earth, water, and sky. Stories also validate political relations among humans by grounding those relations in cosmology. And political events tend to merge with mythical prototypes that are scripts for ritual dramas of cosmology.

In the last century or so, Navajo ceremonialists have let anthropologists record thousands of pages of ceremonial stories. What happens when oral traditions become documents? Feedback between fixed written versions and mouth-to-ear telling is inevitable. Literate researchers and others may unthinkingly consider written forms more authoritative than the forms they hear from contemporary tellers. But they still use contemporary tellers to help them interpret the written versions. The tellers themselves may have access first- or secondhand to written representations of

their forebears' tellings. Purely mouth-to-ear teaching with resulting variability also flows on around the fixed written versions, drawing things from the written versions back into the mouth-to-ear stream.

Besides the difficulty of anchoring indigenous myths in linear time, some archaeologists may be uncomfortable with indigenous oral tradition (not just Navajo) because these archaeologists reject creationism (Christian fundamentalism) in their own culture. Perhaps the foremost reason for this aversion is that creationism today is pitted against evolutionism, while most archaeologists espouse both natural and cultural versions of evolutionism. They see creationism as a Euro-American cultural myth analogous to indigenous American origin myths.

This polarity blinds one to the idea that myths (including Christian ones) are, among other things, models of the cosmos and its earthly, celestial, and water systems. They contain theories of processes that keep these systems alive. Working with custodians of an oral tradition helps one understand that certain people in societies with few historical records nevertheless use models to recognize and communicate abstractions. Myths are their encyclopedia of such models. One may believe that the natural and social sciences have advanced human understanding of these processes and still not reject these older models. Cultural evolutionists should understand that these models are, at the least, earlier and essential steps in what evolutionists consider the progressive evolution of human knowledge. Myths may also informatively encode systematic relationships (among celestial bodies, for example). With their drive toward synthesis and compression, myths may even preserve knowledge of subtle systematic relationships missed by some modern scientists who isolate their objects of study, but postpone (or leave for others) an adequate synthesis of results.

Archaeology can historicize myths and thereby help tease apart the cosmological and political events. For example, archaeology can date particular sites mentioned in the myths. This lets the myths suggest ceremonial and political practices that happened at those sites and others of the same time. Archaeologists' descriptions of the architecture may tell about the performance spaces for the ceremonialism encoded in the origin myths. Thus archaeology may add information within the traditional narrative framework, rather than asserting a competing narrative. The archaeological remains, stories and other traditions of all Southwestern Indian communities (and probably those even farther afield) all contain pieces of the past. If we put all these pieces together, the gaps won't be as huge as if we choose only one kind of piece and ignore all the others.

The end result of putting the pieces together should be various hypothetical narratives of the Southwestern past. These narratives can serve, like theories, as sources of hypotheses to test with archaeological and other information. Comprehensive narrative construction and hypothesis testing is beyond the scope of this project. We hope that the Navajo oral tradition reported in this chapter, along with the other information in the rest of the report, can contribute to future narratives that can generate testable hypotheses.

Previous Documentation

Previous documentation of Navajo oral tradition about the pre-Columbian Antelope Mesa-Jeddito Valley study area takes three forms: published literature, unpublished research materials, and the "gray literature."

Published and unpublished research materials consist mainly of stories attached to various Navajo ceremonies, or ceremonial repertoires. About two dozen repertoires are known historically, although not all have survived to this day (Young and Morgan 1980:421). A ceremonial repertoire consists of procedures, songs, prayers, paraphernalia, raw materials, and rules for making and combining these elements into a ceremonial performance of the particular type for which the repertoire is named, for example, Blessingway or Nightway. The repertoire also includes the stories that tell how the repertoire originated and developed. Between the 1880s and the present, at least 67 to 69 narratives representing 21 ceremonial repertoires and 46 tellers have been written down and published in readily available form. Most were recorded in the 1920s and 1930s, usually by anthropologists. Tellers from all over Navajoland are represented. Texts are in English and sometimes also in the original Navajo of the telling. We consulted our personal research records based on this whole body of narratives for this report to find stories that mention the Antelope Mesa-Jeddito region. In addition, for previous projects we have consulted selected unpublished narratives. This project unfortunately doesn't allow enough time for us to canvass unpublished sources systematically.

Finally, we have consulted the "gray literature" of cultural resource management inventories and sacred place inventories for various land claims and related lawsuits.

The ceremonial narratives tend to cover places all over Navajoland, and especially on routes travelled by the original ceremonial initiate(s) who put the ceremonial repertoire together. Many routes in the stories match trails recorded in early post-Columbian times or pre-Columbian routes modelled by archaeologists. The gray literature tends to reveal dense local landscapes of sacred places, with only hints of associated ceremonial stories that might connect them with each other and with places farther away.

Present Custodians of the Navajo Cultural Encyclopedia

Past experiences have taught us that Navajo ceremonialists are the most likely to know about the remote past, and local people are most likely to know details about their home areas. Thus local ceremonialists are likely to be the most informative people for a project like this.

Navajo ceremonialists are most likely to have knowledge and concerns about the *Anaasázi*. Adults, even those in egalitarian societies like Navajo, don't all know all the volumes of their cultural encyclopedia. Instead, many adults in these societies specialize in various types of closely guarded esoteric knowledge, which they bring to ceremonialism. Navajo society includes a wide variety of ceremonial practitioners. Chanters manage entire elaborate multifaceted ritual dramas of one to nine nights; know many hours of origin narrative behind the performed procedures; collect plants, animals, minerals, waters, and other raw materials for paraphernalia; and train apprentices. There are at least two dozen different types of ceremonial (dramatic) repertoires, but few chanters know more than one or two of these, and no two chanters (even teacher and student) know exactly the same things. Besides the chanters are many other types of ceremonial practitioners who do small ceremonial procedures, gather certain types of raw materials, and so forth. Many know associated stories; others don't. Each has his or her own body of esoteric knowledge.

A couple of generations ago, those not trained in ceremonial esoterica learned the basic outlines of origin stories and common or household ceremonial practices. (Today many adults don't know these things). But many didn't learn the esoteric details or the multiple levels of meaning that a basic story framework can carry. The same story can encode one system of hidden meanings in one ceremonial repertoire, and another system in another repertoire. Also, Navajos are still taught as children that Navajos have nothing to do with *Anaasázi* archaeological remains or with certain plants, creatures, and natural processes. Only those initiated into ceremonial practices that employ the powers of these things are supposed to learn about how ceremonies originated with them or use them.

RESEARCH METHODS

We used research methods that would provide the most information within the time and money limits of this project.

Methods for Compiling and Interpreting Previous Documentation

We gave priority to using previous documentation that includes the published (rather than unpublished) ceremonial stories, because we have already combed the published ones systematically to compile all story references to each place mentioned in this body of stories. We also preferred gray literature from lawsuits (rather than from cultural research management projects) because much of the lawsuit research focuses specifically on ceremonial places and therefore we've already incorporated this information into our research records. This project's scope is too limited for systematic work with unpublished narratives in archives and with routine cultural resource management reports, the vast majority of which in our experience contain no information on Navajo oral tradition. In these two labor-intensive low-priority categories we have used cultural resource management reports for earlier phases of the Jeddito Road project and unpublished narratives that we had already consulted for other projects.

Procedures for compiling and interpreting information from previous documentation are as follows. We pulled our research records for the Jeddito community, *Tááláhooghan*, and other locations in Jeddito Island. These research records identify and summarize the part of each ceremonial story that mentions each place. Again, these stories most explicitly encode historical information about ceremonialism. Almost all the stories take the form of a young person (usually a man) travelling from place to place, learning at each place something (a prayer or song, locations of a certain plant or mineral, and so forth) to add to the emerging ceremonial repertoire. We assume that the young traveller (the initiate) embodies the ceremonial repertoire. He or she therefore also personifies the bundle (*jish*) that contains all the material things used in the repertoire (each of these things has its own power, so collectively as the *jish* they embody the power of the repertoire).

When one reads or hears the stories with these assumptions in mind, the series of homes of the initiate (many of which are near pre-Columbian archaeological sites) may be, among other things, shifting centers of ceremonial practice. (The home of the *jish* may be like the homesite where Navajos customarily bury a newborn's umbilical cord to keep the person coming back from later life wanderings.) Each story set at a pre-Columbian ceremonial site seems to be also a script for a ritual

drama or practice performed there during the period when archaeologists say the site was used. We assume that these scripts also reflect changes in pre-Columbian ceremonialism as it has come down to modern Navajos, so the dramas and practices approximate rather than replicate the pre-Columbian versions. That one finds variants of particular procedures, paraphernalia, songs, prayers, or story episodes in more than one repertoire may mean that ceremonialists have recombined ceremonial elements over time.

In the Results and Conclusions sections below, we summarize what stories interpreted in this way tell about the four sites and their geographical and historical context. We emphasize that *Navajo ceremonialists do not necessarily share the foregoing assumptions*. Therefore, the *people whom we consulted*, as we are about to describe, *would not necessarily agree with these interpretations*, which are based on a theory of history different from theirs.

We had hoped to ask local ceremonialists for their own interpretations of these previously published stories as well. We were unable to do so, however, for two reasons: ceremonialists' reticence, and report deadlines that forced us to finish most fieldwork before the wintertime when Navajo custom allows storytelling.

Methods for Consulting Navajo Ceremonialists

As explained above, we favored consulting local ceremonialists. The time limits within which we had to consult local experts on the range of separate issues for this project made working intensively with a small number of local Navajo ceremonialists seem like the best approach. Our original plan was to do several consultations with a core group of three or four individuals, covering the range of issues stipulated in our scope of work. We hoped to add single consultations with other local people to get more detailed information on specific issues, such as origins of local clans. The consulting arrangement we ended up with is slightly different from the original plan.

To form our core group of local ceremonialists, we first contacted the Jeddito Chapter. One of the chapter officials there recommended four local Navajo ceremonialists. We then contacted another Navajo ceremonialist, a member of NNHPD's *Hataa'ii* Advisory Council (published stories associated with the ceremony she practices are set at *Tááláhooghan*). She minimized her knowledge about *Tááláhooghan* and recommended two of the four people recommended by the chapter official. Informal consultation with Harris Francis's family (which has historical ties to *Tááláhooghan*) produced the same two names.

We also contacted the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society. This is the oldest organized group of Navajo ceremonial practitioners, with members all over Navajoland. (It was the only organized group until NNHPD organized its own *Hataa'ii* Advisory Council, which we decided not to consult at this stage because that group may review parts of this report, thus making earlier consultation redundant.) We contacted the Society's president, who introduced us to the membership at a meeting 1 June 1997. Also at the meeting were the two most-recommended Jeddito ceremonialists, who by then had agreed to work with us.

We ended up working with a core group consisting of the two repeatedly recommended local ceremonialists and the president of the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society. These consultations covered the full range of topics in our scope of work. First we met with the two local ceremonialists for a far-ranging discussion of these topics. Then we met separately with the president of the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society for a similar discussion that left out local history since he is not a local resident.

We then did brief consultations with four others whom these three recommended (a fifth person didn't want to discuss these matters until the winter storytelling season). As the core group wished, the main thrust of these supplemental consultations was about the general relationship between Navajo oral tradition and the *Anaasázi*.

We then reported these results to each member of the core group in separate consultations. We also asked questions about their statements in previous consultations that we didn't understand. These consultations occurred between May and early November 1997.

Finally, we tried to arrange for the core consultants to comment on the archaeological manifestations of the four sites. None wanted to visit the sites or see the artifacts, but preferred to work with photographs. For ZCRE to prepare the photographs took longer than originally planned; for that and other reasons, the consultation was deferred to December 1997. At that consultation, the core consultants asked us to set up a meeting of the whole *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society to discuss proper treatment of excavated artifacts and other materials. This meeting was in February 1998.

All consultations were conversations in Navajo between Harris Francis and the consultants. We both took notes and (when allowed) Kelley ran the tape recorder. Immediately after each untaped consultation, Kelley went over her notes with Francis so he could correct and add to them. After a taped consultation, we each separately listened to the tape, with Francis producing a close translation and Kelley adding to notes taken during the consultation. Then we went over Francis's close translation to resolve any inconsistencies. We paid all consultants for their expertise and time. In accord with Navajo custom, we usually offered a retainer when arranging a consultation for a later date.

These consultations proved to be complicated and we ended up spending many hours beyond our scope of work. Some complications were constraints on information exchange, including the following:

1. Most ceremonialists scrupulously observe the traditional prohibition on telling stories outside the time between roughly November and January. Since we had to do most of our work before November, consultants could offer only sketches of stories.
2. Most consultants didn't allow tape recording, although we were able to tape our long main consultation with the two local ceremonialists.

3. Ceremonialists who do know a lot more are loathe to tell it except to those they train. Spreading esoteric knowledge diminishes its power and may give it to people who will use its power irresponsibly, thereby hurting themselves or others. Many details were therefore off-limits for us.
4. A ceremonialist may not want to tell you things in private for fear that you'll spread word around (accurately or not) about what he or she said, triggering criticism from his or her colleagues. If you go to the opposite extreme and ask for discussion at an organized group meeting (such as the organized association of Navajo ceremonialists), people may hesitate to speak for a similar reason, especially if they have no feel for consensus on the issue. This is why we tried to consult ceremonialists in small private groups, so as to learn where consensus exists and where it does not. (This process resembles, to some extent, the way small groups of ceremonialists discuss things in the sweatlodge, although one of the authors will never experience the real thing!)

Other complications were logistical. All three core consultants are very busy with their practices, and getting them together proved almost impossible. Only one has a telephone, and he was almost never home anyway. Even setting up an appointment with one person often required repeated visits before finding him at home. A visit to Jeddito was a three-hour round trip for us, and we made many such trips without making contact.

Confidentiality

There are two versions of this report, one filed with NNHPD that includes confidential material and an expurgated version submitted to Zuni Cultural Resource Enterprise (ZCRE) after NNHPD reviewed and approved it.

We asked the core group to sign consent forms that let us use their statements in this report. These forms are attached to the confidential appendices that contain their statements. We didn't ask supplementary consultants to sign such forms for fear of subverting our assurances to them that we would report consensus and describe the range of different opinions without singling anyone out.

RESULTS

This section summarizes the information gained from the sources consulted for this project. Additional details and translations of tapes are in Confidential Appendices 1 through 4, which we submit to NNHPD only. In the previous sections, we have used the name "Navajo" rather than the self-identifier "*Diné*" because the discourse is within a governmental cultural resource management framework, where "Navajo" is the common usage (as in Navajo Nation). This section and the next one, however, also summarize statements from the more traditional viewpoints of ceremonialists and others. In these contexts we therefore use "*Diné*."

Summary of Previously Recorded Navajo
(Diné) Oral Tradition

Anaasázi-Diné Relations

Previously recorded *Diné* oral history consists of a "main stalk" or master chronology and various stories that branch from it. The main stalk is part of the Blessingway ceremonial repertoire, which (at the end of the main stalk chronology) comes to govern all the other *Diné* ceremonial repertoires. From the main stalk branch histories of other ceremonial repertoires and also of clans. Different tellers may disagree on where their versions of a particular repertoire's history connects with the main stalk (Kelley and Francis 1994; Wyman 1970).

These stories, both main stalk and branches, are full of references to landscapes remote and accessible all over the Colorado Plateau (for example, Fishler 1953; Klah 1942; Matthews 1897; O'Bryan 1956; Wyman 1970; Yazzie 1984). They tell of events when people still inhabited dozens of pre-Columbian archaeological sites. Yet they rarely refer to places outside the Colorado Plateau, and they identify only one route from outside as an ancestral *Diné* migration route—from the Pacific Coast or southern Great Basin. *Diné* ceremonial stories also consistently tell or imply that:

1. *Diné* originated not far north of their present homeland.
2. *Diné* and *Kiis'áanii* (village Indians) originated together. Their forebears moved up through a series of lower worlds and emerged together onto the present earth surface at the same place. Then they spread out.
3. The criteria to distinguish *Diné* from *Kiis'áanii* that the stories emphasize are house form (*Diné* have hogans, *Kiis'áanii* have rectangular aboveground architecture), settlement pattern (*Diné* are dispersed, *Kiis'áanii* are aggregated) and perhaps habitat (*Diné* are mobile uplanders, *Kiis'áanii* are sedentary lowlanders), proficiency in farming (*Diné* farming isn't as productive as *Kiis'áanii*), and hairstyle (*Kiis'áanii* wear bangs, *Diné* don't). The two groups traded and intermarried. Language differences are largely unmentioned.
4. *Diné* lived around and interacted with the *Anaasázi* occupants of Chaco Canyon, Mesa Verde, Canyon de Chelly, Tsegi Canyon, Black Mesa, settlements south of the Little Colorado River, and elsewhere on the Colorado Plateau that archaeologists have dated to the AD 800s through 1200s. A large proportion of branching stories especially are set at these places.
5. According to the main stalk, *Anaasázi* inhabitants of the Colorado Plateau were annihilated by powerful malevolent gods (some perhaps formerly venerated), by natural disasters, and by epidemics. Some versions say all inhabitants were annihilated. The main stalk stories say that to make the world safe for future humans, the immortal Changing Woman appeared on earth, mated with the Sun, and gave birth to the Twins who were destined to kill the monsters.

6. According to some clan histories, small groups survived and stayed in the Colorado Plateau. In the main stalk stories, after the Twins killed the monsters, their mother went to the Pacific Coast and an offshore home. Here (or enroute through what may be Death Valley) she created the progenitors of certain *Diné* clans. These people repopulated the land of the former monsters and *Anaasází*. Small bands of isolated wanderers joined them to form a growing network of other bands and a social fabric of exogamous clans.
7. Still later, according to various clan stories, some *Kiis'áanii* from the edges of the Colorado Plateau moved among the growing population of the Plateau. They joined existing *Diné* clans or were recognized as clans in their own right.
8. During this time of clan coalescence, Changing Woman taught the *Diné* the Blessingway ceremonies that are the root of "modern" *Diné* ceremonialism. One purpose was to keep peace among the people.

The foregoing points appear sometimes explicitly and sometimes implicitly in *Diné* stories. Tellers do not clearly identify the *Kiis'áanii* with the *Anaasází*. These points form a background in the stories for other matters more important to the tellers: the history of human relationships with the great immortal beings of the cosmos and the right ways to live with those powers. Appendix M shows which previously recorded stories the foregoing generalizations are based on and also adds some examples.

Stories About the Study Area

Narratives about histories of ceremonies are the backbone of *Diné* pre-Columbian history of *Tááláhooghan* and the Jeddito Island study area. Here we summarize what the whole body of published ceremonial stories and selected unpublished ceremonial stories tell about these places. These stories mention *Tááláhooghan*, Jeddito (*Jádi Tó*) Spring (14.4 km or 9 mi southwest of the Jeddito community), Antelope Mesa as a whole, and Bad Spring in the Jeddito Community. We also include two trails that pass through the Jeddito Island study area. One of these trails is connected with *Tááláhooghan*, according to previously recorded ceremonial stories. The other trail is identified with a local place just outside the Jeddito Island according to our consultants for this project (discussed below under Results of Consultations with Ceremonialists). It is also described in ceremonial stories that imply the trail crosses the study area because a line connecting the places in stories passes through the study area.

Tááláhooghan (Awatovi). The ruin and surrounding area named for it constitute a central place in stories of several ceremonial repertoires. (A more detailed discussion can be found in Appendix N.) Some of the stories (Clinton 1990; O'Bryan 1956:143-157 for Frenzyway; Wheelwright 1946a:84-90 for Waterway ceremonies) tell of an old woman, the Picker Up, who picks up bits of turquoise, travelling with her son or grandson, called in various versions Picker Up or Rough Skin. The pair travel from Chaco Canyon to *Tááláhooghan* by way of Aztec/Salmon Ruins (Greater Aztec), Buffalo Pass or Narbona Pass, Canyon de Chelly or Canyon del Muerto, and

northern Black Mesa. They settle in a small masonry shelter on the outskirts of *Tááláhooghan* (sometimes [e.g., Wheelwright 1946a:86] described as below the midden, which they pick over). Later the young man returns to Chaco Canyon (where he is called Home Made of Feathers) and challenges the Great Gambler or White Butterfly. On the way he stops at various places (different ones in different versions of the story), including Canyon de Chelly and the Crumbled House Valley, Aztec, and elsewhere in the San Juan Basin. At these places he creates prototype planting ceremonies and seduces all the girls. (In other variants of this story the old woman is Obsidian Woman or Vegetation Woman, who travels from, respectively, Jemez or Chaco Canyon to Walpi or an unspecified Hopi village (Haile 1978; Kluckhohn 1967; both for Frenzyway ceremonies).

In this same group of stories, *Tááláhooghan* is also a central place in the young man's initiation. The Sun and other immortals take him from *Tááláhooghan* to be initiated at Landmark Towards Bigwater (Woodruff Butte). Then he goes back to *Tááláhooghan* and seduces the Non-Sunlight Struck Girls. (In one version [O'Bryan 1956:149-152], the names of these girls are the same as the Acoma names for the head ceremonialist and his bundle [Ellis 1974a:15].) The girls' father, a Sunwatcher, seeks the young man as far as Navajo Mountain, and finally finds him near *Tááláhooghan* by measuring footprints with crossed sticks. The young man learns hunting ceremonialism that requires a stalking suit. Later, he is transformed into a coyote. His children become antelope and game guardians. The place from which the young man leaves and returns is Yellow Rock Point just southwest of the Jeddito Island.

Tááláhooghan is said (Haile 1981:217-220 for Upward-Reachingway ceremonies) to have been one of only four places with Non-Sunlight-Struck Ones (the others were Salmon or *Wijiji*, Allantown, and one in the south), perhaps an indication of ceremonial preeminence like setting a regional ceremonial calendar. The stalking suit may be a code for masked ceremonial dancing, this place being a center for that practice and its spread (according to our consultants).

The stories of the Red Ant People also feature *Tááláhooghan* (Haile 1981 for Upward-Reachingway; Newcomb n.d.; Wheelwright 1958, n.d.; Wyman 1965; all for Red Antway). The Red Ant People first live in the Jemez Mountains, then the upper Black Creek Valley, the central Chuska Valley, the Defiance Plateau, and finally the Lava Buttes around *Tááláhooghan*, which house other Ant People. These *Tááláhooghan* Ant People include Red Ant Man and his grandmother, who live in a curved shelter of a juniper tree on the bluff side below *Tááláhooghan* (Wheelwright n.d.). Like the Picker Up mentioned above, Red Ant Man seduces girls at *Tááláhooghan*, goes to Landmark Towards Bigwater (here described as a place far south where flowers always bloom, possible meaning Mexico), and gets turned into a coyote. Restored, he tracks his family ultimately to the Defiance Plateau (Fluted Rock) and upper Black Creek Valley (Wheelwright n.d.). He learns parts of the emerging Red Ant ceremonial repertoire at Navajo Mountain, White Cone, and many other places in the Lava Buttes. The final home of Red Ant Man, now full of ceremonial knowledge, is *Tááláhooghan*.

In Nightway ceremonial history, the Stricken Twins come from Canyon de Chelly to *Tááláhooghan* and Walpi to get valuables as a fee for a cure from the immortals in Canyon de Chelly (whom masked Nightway dancers now impersonate; Matthews 1902:836-858). The discussion below of the Water People's Trail also is relevant, since one of the many versions of their story (Haile 1981:162-175) says they stopped at *Tááláhooghan*.

One ceremonial story may also refer to the destruction of *Tááláhooghan* around AD 1700 (Clinton 1990). Various accounts, including non-Navajo versions (Courlander 1971:174-185, 1982:55-60; Fewkes 1898:603-606; James 1974:39-45, 59-64; Lomatuway'ma et al. 1993:275-410; Montgomery et al. 1949:20-24; Van Valkenburgh 1941:6; Voth 1905:46-55; Yava 1978:35-38, 88-96;), tell how, after the Pueblo Revolt of AD 1680 and Spanish Reconquest in 1692 through 1694, *Tááláhooghan* let the Spanish return to revive the pre-Revolt Franciscan mission there. Apparently to squelch the Spanish intrusion, men from Hopi villages to the northwest attacked *Tááláhooghan* (the whole settlement, not just the mission), killing many and taking women and children captives, many of whom they then killed on the march back to the attackers' homes. Some who escaped from *Tááláhooghan* joined *Diné* in the surrounding area and in Canyon de Chelly, where they became *Diné* Tobacco branch of the *Tachii'nii* clan, Coyote Pass clan, and others.

Jádi Tó. In the Red Ant stories set at *Tááláhooghan* (described above), the wife of Red Ant Man turns into a deer at this spring. The man later sends his son to join a herd of antelope here (Wheelwright 1958, n.d.). Another version of this story (Clinton 1990) places the transformation at Yellow Rock Point southwest of the Jeddito Island.

Antelope Mesa. Antelope Mesa is the body of an earth figure that provides herbs (water is also implied) for various ceremonial repertoires, including those whose stories are sketched above (Clinton 1990:Appendix; Van Valkenburgh 1974:183-184).

Bad Water. This spring near the Jeddito School is the armpit of Antelope Mesa as an earth figure (Clinton 1990:Appendix).

Water People's Trail. The stories sketched above branch off the main stalk of *Diné* oral tradition. Various versions of the main stalk and the clan stories that branch from it tell the route of the Water People, the clan progenitors whom Changing Woman creates in the west and sends back to repopulate the monster-ravaged former *Anaasázi* land. The Water People's route splits around the San Francisco Peaks, where the Arrow People try to block their way. From here the Water People begin to differentiate into four or six named clans, each of which links up with other groups encountered enroute. One branch goes more-or-less straight northwest to Canyon de Chelly, across the Chuskas, and into the San Juan Basin. In the one version of this route (Haile 1981:162-175) that specifically names a place in the study area (*Tááláhooghan*) the route goes on to Bear Spring, Toyei, *Tsénii'Tó* (spring near Steamboat), Balakai Mesa, southeastern Black Mesa, Wheatfields and over the Chuskas into the San Juan Basin (Newcomb and Tsaya Canyon near Chaco, where the people meet people from Chaco itself). The Water People travelled with canes and packs on their backs full of corn (Klah 1942:114-122).

Buffalo Trail. Other branching ceremonial stories (Haile 1943:178-217 [*iinaji*]; Reichard 1975:68-71 [*na'at'oyee*]; Wheelwright 1958:23 [*na'at'oyee*];) tell of Abalone Shell (yellow or red shell) Woman and the Buffalo People travelling past the San Francisco Peaks to southeastern Black Mesa and Many Farms, over Buffalo Pass, across the San Juan River to the La Plata Mountains, and on. The published versions of this story mention no place in the study area, but the study area is on the line of travel and consultants connect this story to a place near the Jeddito Island. More details on the Buffalo Trail are given in Appendix N.

Local Gray Literature

Although it provides almost no ceremonial stories, the consulted gray literature describes ceremonial associations with most places discussed above as well as several other places in or near the Jeddito Island. There is also some information on clans.

Locations. The following locations were found in the gray literature:

1. Traditional hunting location south of State Highway (SH) 264 (Zimmerman 1995:Confidential Appendix, sacred place 2). This place (not precisely located) is related to ceremonial hunting for antelope and deer. It may be southeast of the Jeddito Island, possibly a rincon below a hill in the same general area recorded by Navajo Nation (1977:place 12) where hunters offer Gameway prayers.
2. Home of Endless Snake south of SH 264 and east of Jeddito Wash (Zimmerman 1995:Confidential Appendix, sacred place 3). This place also is not precisely located and may be outside the Jeddito Island. The snake's burrow extends to San Francisco Peaks. The report does not give enough information to figure out which ceremonial stories this place might relate to. One wonders if this story is a trace of something related to *Lölöqanqwtuyqa* on the east side of Jeddito Wash north of SH 264, since the Hopi name of that site refers to Great Snake. Great Snake homes in *Diné* ceremonial stories in general are found on divides of drainage basins. The Great Snake embodies the power of storms and thus the hydrological cycle. It seems to be, among other things, an icon or sign delineating those divides. Great Snake is also the main great power in stories of the *Diné* Windway and Big Starway (Wheelwright 1946b, 1956; Wyman 1962) and Beautyway (O'Bryan 1956:130-131; Wheelwright 1951; Wyman 1957; not the same as Blessingway) and is important as well in Enemyway (Haile 1938:141-175; O'Bryan 1956:130-131; Wyman 1975).
3. Talking rocks (also former sweatlodges) in Jeddito community about 0.8 km (0.5 mi) southwest of Jeddito School (Zimmerman 1995:Confidential Appendix, sacred place 4). The people interviewed gave no further details.
4. Hunting corrals on Antelope and Roberts Mesas (Zimmerman 1995:Confidential Appendix, sacred place 5). The people interviewed gave no further information or locations. They may include corrals recorded around 1960 for Navajo Land Claim (discussed below).
5. Navajo Land Claim archaeological sites. The following archaeological sites (all prefixed W-LLC-MJ) seem to be inside Jeddito Island (Navajo Nation n.d.; Stokes and Smiley 1964):
 - a. A and F, antelope corrals on the ridge northwest of Jeddito school;
 - b. T, a site southeast of the junction of SH 264 and 77, the approximate location of Zimmerman's (1995:Confidential Appendix) sacred place 2 traditional hunting location and Navajo Nation (1977) place 12 mentioned above;

- c. OO, PP, and QQ, sites about 4.8 km (3 mi) east of Jeddito school;
- d. III, *Ye'ii hooghan* (Nightway ceremonial structure) about 4.8 km (3 mi) south of Jeddito School, with tree-ring date of 1797 incG (Stokes and Smiley 1964:20, Specimen 2418, incomplete, beetle galleries present). (This location would be 0.8 km [0.5 mi] east of Sand Spring near [one hopes outside] a powerline corridor);
- e. JJJ, site about 4.8 to 6.4 km (3 to 4 mi) south of Jeddito school; and
- f. KKK and LLL, sites southwest of the junction of SH 264 and 77.

Clans. Although the consulted gray literature tells nothing about the histories of local clans, Zimmerman (1995:Confidential Appendix, Table 1.1) does identify the clans that seem to be most numerous in and near the Jeddito community: *Táchii'nii*, *Kiyaa'áanii*, and *Tábaahá*. One can then consult the ceremonial and related literature for clan histories that might be relevant to this study. We also include here clans that our own consultants mentioned, which are also represented among Zimmerman's (1995) consultants. The gray literature and consultants emphasize six clans.

1. *Kiyaa'áanii* (Towering House). This clan takes part in the Water People's migration from the Pacific Coast. In many stories, it is one of the clans that the Water People divide into after they move east of the San Francisco Peaks. In other stories, *Kiyaa'áanii* join the Water People during their pilgrimage eastward (Franciscan Fathers 1910:427; Goddard 1933:165-179; Klah 1942:114-122; Matthews 1897:147-149; Mitchell 1978:114-122; Preston 1954:23; Winnie 1982; Wyman 1970:325-334;). One of the routes of the Water People passes through the study area, as discussed above. In most stories of the Water People's migration, they end up east of the Chuska Mountains in the San Juan Basin south of the river. Several stories specify their end point as the gap at Crownpoint and the ruin *Kin Yaa'a*. (The Muddy Water complex in the Crownpoint gap dates AD 1000 to 1200, *Kin Yaa'a* dates AD 1000 to 1125 [Fowler and Stein 1992]). In some stories, the Water People encounter the *Kiyaa'áanii* for the first time when they reach *Kin Yaa'a*. Linked clans (with whom intermarriage is forbidden) include, according to various sources, *Tééh Hogáhnii* (White Valley People), *'Azee' Tsoh Diné'é* (Big Medicine People), *Bitáq'nii* Leaf People, *Dzih't'ahnii* (Mountain Base People), *Shash Dine'é* (Bear People), *Tázhii Dine'é* (Turkey People), *Naadaq' Dine'é* (Corn People), *Hashk'aqan Hadzo'ó* (Yucca Fruit Territory People), and *Áshijhii* (Salt People; Franciscan Fathers 1910:427-428; Preston 1954:23). According to Preston (1954:23), the *Kiyaa'áanii* clan originated among the *Kiis'áanii* but some members are descendants of White Mountain Apaches who came to live with *Kiis'áanii*. Forbes (1966:343) says that White Mountain (Cibecue) Apaches have such a clan, which, like all western Apache clans, came from "house beneath water" (*kiya-an*, a cognate name for *Kin Yaa'a*), north of the Little Colorado. At *Kin Yaa'a*, the Water People gamble and plant wide cornfields. According to some stories, the children who later went to learn Blessingway from Changing Woman came from here (Fishler 1953:91-102; Klah

1942:122-125; Mitchell 1978:180, 185; Wyman 1970:327-333). *Kin Yaa'á* and Hosta Butte, its corresponding landmark, also figure in other ceremonial stories linked to the Chaco Canyon sites through gambling and in other ways.

2. *Tábaqhá* (Edgewater). According to some tellers (Matthews 1897:142-143; evidently the source of Van Valkenburgh 1941:61), members of this clan originally came from where Santa Fe is now and migrated westward to *Dinétaħ* to join the other clans gathering there. This clan has links to Zuni and Salt clans, also *Ma'ii Deeshgiizhnii* (Jemez). It also absorbed Apaches, Paiutes (Preston 1954:25; Matthews 1897:142-143) and "the *Náasaz (Anaasázi) Dine'é*, or the wanderers (cliff dwellers)" (Franciscan Fathers 1910:430).
3. *Táchii'nii* (Red Forehead or Red Streak into Water). According to one story (Matthews 1897:145-146), the forebears of *Táchii'nii* clan survived the monsters who ravaged the lands in *Anaasázi* times. Preston (1954:25) says they migrated into Navajoland from the San Francisco Peaks and left various members scattered along this route, which seems to be the same as that of the Water People. Thus they left members in southeastern Black Mesa (where the Water People encountered them, according to Haile 1981:162-175), Canyon de Chelly, near Buffalo Pass and the west side of the Carrizos, and north of the San Juan River in the La Plata Mountains (the latter are called Ute *Tachii'nii*). Various members of the local Tobacco (*Nátòh*) branch of this clan tell that the clan originated at the San Francisco Peaks and moved to *Tááláhoogħan* as well as many of the other places also named by Preston. The clan includes descendants of survivors of the 1700 *Tááláhoogħan* massacre who joined *Diné* families in the surrounding area (*Nátòh Dine'é Táchii'nii* Clan People 1981; Courlander 1971:177-184; Brugge 1994:8-9). Linked clans include Zuni and Mohave or Yavapai (*Dilzhéhi*), and also *Kin'ichii'nii* (Redhouse) identified with San Juan Pueblo (Franciscan Fathers 1910:430; Matthews 1897:145-146). The clan also has several other branches besides Tobacco, like Rabbit and Squash (Preston 1954).
4. *Ma'ii Deeshgiizhnii* (Coyote Pass - Jemez). This clan and *T'ógí* (Woven-Grass Packsack) identify their ancestral home as a Chaco-period (AD 1100 to 1200 [Fowler and Stein 1992]) ruin (Kin Nahzin) between *Kin Yaa'á* and Chaco Canyon. From there some people went to Laguna, later to join the *Diné* as *T'ogi* clan. Others went to Jemez and then became *Diné* as *Ma'ii Deeshgiizhnii* (Fransted 1979:39). According to Van Valkenburgh (1941:7, 18, 80), this clan came from predecessors of Jemez Pueblo. The first group joined *Diné* in the southern part of *Dinétaħ* before the Pueblo Revolt. During the Pueblo Revolt, some Jemez people killed Franciscan priests, were banished by another faction, and fled to the west side of Mount Taylor to join *Diné* there. After the Pueblo Revolt, several groups of Jemez people fled into the *Diné* country, one first going to White Mountain Apache country and then moving north to Hopi First Mesa. In the AD 1730s, descendants of this group joined refugees from the AD 1700 *Tááláhoogħan* massacre at Canyon de Chelly and "merged" with other *Ma'ii Deeshgiizhnii* and *Diné* there. One young member of this clan says he was taught that the clan came from *Dinétaħ*, moved through Buffalo

Pass to Canyon de Chelly, then on to Black Mesa (Robert Johnson, personal communication 8 May 1992). Various sources link *Mą'ii Deeshgiizhnii* with *Tsé'íjikini* (Crack-in-Rock House), *Tódich'í'ni* (Bitter Water), *Tódik'ózhí* (Salt Water), *Ashjhi* (Salt), *T'ógi*, and *Tábaqhá* (Franciscan Fathers 1910:428-429, 431; Matthews 1897:158; Preston 1954:25; Sapir 1942; Winnie 1982).

5. *Totsohnii* (Big Water). This clan is also from the Water People, taking its name after the Water People moved east of the San Francisco Peaks (Franciscan Fathers 1910:427; Goddard 1933:165-179; Matthews 1897:159; Van Valkenburgh 1941:151). The clan is associated with *Tótsoh*, a large spring in *Diné'tah* (Van Valkenburgh 1974:151), and also with a waterfall south of Crownpoint (Fishler 1953:91-102). Earlier the clan was called by the cognate name *Tó'itsonii* (Yellow Water; Klah 1942:114-122). Linked clans according to various sources cited here include *Bit'ahnii* (Under Wraps) or *Bit'aqanii* (Leaf), *Hasht'ishnii* (Mud), *Tsédeeshgizhnii* (Rock Gap), *Lók'aa' Dine'é* (Reed), *Tsé'ta'áanii* (Rock Face), and *Hooghan káni* (Many Hogans)
6. *T'ááshchí'í* (Redbottom). This clan and *Deeshchii'ni* were two parts of a band of Apaches who came into *Diné'tah* from the south and there linked with *Tsi'naajinii* after the Water People and others had settled there (Franciscan Fathers 1910:430; Matthews 1897:147; Preston 1954:24).

Implications of Previous Studies for the Four Excavated Sites

As far as we can tell, no previously recorded *Diné* oral tradition specifically mentions the Jeddito School rincon or the four excavated sites. But this place is on or near several long-distance ceremonial routes between *Tááláhooghan* and Black Mesa - Canyon de Chelly - Chinle Valley, routes that extend south of *Tááláhooghan* perhaps into Mexico, southwest and west of the San Francisco Peaks to the Pacific Coast, eastward to Chaco Canyon and the southern San Juan Basin, and northeast to the Mesa Verde-Aztec ruins region north of the San Juan and on to the western Great Plains. The stories that involve these routes are clearly set in pre-Columbian times, since they tell of active ceremonialism and settlement at various pre-AD 1300 great houses on the routes. The route that features *Tááláhooghan* most prominently in the stories about times before AD 1300 is the circuit for (personified) turquoise from Chaco and Greater Aztec through northern Black Mesa to *Tááláhooghan*, and for (personified) plants and feathers from the subtropical southland through *Tááláhooghan* and Canyon de Chelly into the San Juan Basin.

There is some evidence of archaeological remains at and near *Tááláhooghan* that date between AD 1000 and 1300 (Brew 1979:515; also discussed in Chapter 4), the time when the four little Jeddito sites were occupied and when first Chaco, then Aztec, were ceremonially dominant. The routes in the *Diné* stories include Chaco and Aztec in their heydays, thus linking a possible early ceremonial component at or near *Tááláhooghan* with those centers. The four sites therefore might have had contact with the cosmopolitan ceremonial exchange that the stories suggest for these routes, but perhaps more as a backwater of *Tááláhooghan* than directly. Excavations at the four sites did

not produce evidence of trade in turquoise, plants, or feathers. The beads of local light gray siltstone excavated from the four sties, where they were evidently produced, look like imitation shell beads. The routes described above, then, evidently were not supplying much shell to the Jeddito area, unless whatever shell was coming in failed to trickle down to the backwaters of *Tááláhooghan*. We defer more detailed interpretation to Appendix N.

Results of Consultations with Ceremonialists

Summary of Consultations with All Ceremonialists

Connections Between *Diné* and *Anaasázi*. Questions about connections between *Diné* and *Anaasázi* in general resulted in the following consensus.

1. No one really knows about the *Anaasázi*. Those who knew are gone.
2. *Diné* stories don't tell where the *Anaasázi* came from.
3. The *Anaasázi* were destroyed because they painted images of wind on pottery, and wind or a firestorm therefore destroyed them.
4. *Anaasázi* and *Diné* were alike in how they lived (except for their pottery).
5. The *Anaasázi* were a separate people who emerged on this earth before *Diné* and other Indian groups.
6. Opinions differ about whether anyone survived the forces that killed off the *Anaasázi*, and whether any modern *Diné* clans or other tribes can claim to come from *Anaasázi*.
7. *Diné* have stories that tell about *Anaasázi* times, and certain *Diné* ceremonies are connected with (originated at) *Anaasázi* sites (now ruins) or use *Anaasázi* artifacts.
8. Improper contact with *Anaasázi* things can make *Diné* sick, which is treated by certain ceremonies (opinions differ about which ones).
9. Because *Diné* stories and ceremonies are attached to certain specific *Anaasázi* archaeological sites, and because improper contact with *Anaasázi* things can make *Diné* sick, *Diné* want government agencies to consult them routinely about protection of *Anaasázi* archaeological sites and graves both on and off Navajo Nation lands.

We emphasize the implication of the above consensus: when a government agency makes such a consultation, *Diné* are unlikely to require any special treatments of an *Anaasázi* site or grave unless it is connected with *Diné* ceremonies or is located in or it is near a *Diné* community.

We also note that in the past five years we've discussed *Diné-Anaasázi* relations informally with other ceremonialists in various parts of the Navajo Nation. The above points also cover their statements. Some in the western Navajo Reservation denied that *Wupatki* or pre-Columbian dwellings in northwest Navajoland are *Anaasázi*, associating them instead with *Kiyaa'áanii*, *Tsénjikini*, *Kin'ichü'nii*, and *Tachii'nii* clans. Some consider these clans to be *Anaasázi* descendents. And some in the eastern Navajo Reservation's central Chuska Valley consider local pre-Columbian sites the relics of mixed groups that included their own ancestors.

Policy and Management Concerns. In the spring of 1997 we asked all consultants privately about how they as ceremonialists think *Anaasázi* archaeological sites should be managed. The same question, with an emphasis on what to do with items excavated from *Anaasázi* archaeological sites, was the focus of a meeting in February 1998. Because this meeting flowed from a consultation about the four sites in December 1997, and because it was our last consultation, we report the results at the end of this section. The earlier, private, consultations revealed the following points of consensus and difference:

1. Avoid *Anaasázi* sites whenever possible.
2. Opinions vary on what to do when a site cannot be avoided.
3. To care for artifacts excavated from *Anaasázi* sites that cannot be avoided, the Navajo Nation should keep ceremonially useful artifacts in Window Rock and lend them out to ceremonialists.
4. Opinions vary on what to do with artifacts that are not loaned to ceremonialists.
5. Excavated human remains must be reburied, but opinions vary on where to rebury.

Consultations with Local Ceremonialists

On 11 June 1997, we met the two local ceremonialists at the home of one. This long consultation was the result. The following excerpts from the translation of that consultation also incorporate information from later brief contacts with them to clarify certain points. Author's comments, to explicate or give background information, are enclosed in brackets. ...separate statements widely separated in the interview.

The Pre-Columbian Period in General. [Statements from this consultation are included in the section Summary of Consultations with All Ceremonialists.]

Local Sacred Places and Their Stories.

1. Local springs. Bad Water (*To Níhxoní*) here at Jeddito is called that because the water spreads out on plants and makes them rot. [This is the spring just west of the school.] It's not the same as Dove Spring, which is a sacred place [The USGS map shows Dove Spring about 0.8 km or 0.5 mi north of the school; this seems to be the

spring intended here, but it might mean the Dove Spring 8 km (5 mi) or so north identified as sacred by Van Valkenburgh (1974:183) and Navajo Nation (1977:place 2)]. Long ago only a few people lived around here. They had no water. The Dove People found Dove Spring and saved everyone.

2. *Tááláhooghan*. A long time ago lots of gourds (dippers) were there. Antelope were called [ceremonially] from there. A long time ago, people used to gather there for teaching, lessons. Its name comes from *Hatáál Hooghan* (Home of Ceremonies). People used to plant corn, squash, melons, and peaches. Hopis and *Diné* lived there as one community. But the actual *Hatáál Hooghan* wasn't at the spot now called *Tááláhooghan*; it was northeast of there [may mean that the ceremonial place isn't the same as *Tááláhooghan* spring and canyon]. The name *Tááláhooghan* is applied to the whole surrounding area. There was a house up on top where old men came from all over, but no one really lived there. ... And in the Beadway ceremonial tradition eagles were tied up over there [at *Tááláhooghan*?; possible implication that *Tááláhooghan* is the source of Hopi eagle ceremonialism, which is analogous to the *Diné* Beadway], and also the [Hopi?] dance with snakes that is like Beautyway (*Hoozhonee* [originated there]). Nightway masked dancing (*Na'akai*) also evidently originated there, but it's too dangerous now to tell the story [followed by statement that may allude to story of Stricken Twins]. [Comment that ceremonial stories and songs should not be written down or taped follows this statement, as discussed in the section on Policy and Management Concerns below.] ... Tobacco (*Nat'oh Dine'é*) *Tachii'nii* clan people now living near *Tááláhooghan* say that long ago people (possibly their own ancestors) were thrown off the cliffs [followed by statement perhaps implying that local *Diné* went on the Long Walk to Fort Sumner to escape complete annihilation by Hopis. Next is post-Fort Sumner history summarized below under Modern History] ... But anyway, long before that, the *hataafis* used to come together at *Tááláhooghan* also for a certain specific reason on a specific date, a specific month. Maybe the Hopis used to gather there too, maybe that's how they learned some of the stories and ceremonies.
3. *Jadi Tó*. This name covers the whole valley, but it also refers to the spring several miles southwest of the school. People used to irrigate fields that ringed the spring.
4. Ceremonial route. There is a string of places tied together by [a certain specified ceremonial] story (too dangerous to tell now). That string of places passes through here. [Places named also appear in the relevant ceremonial literature].
5. White Hill (*figai Yaa Náálk'id*). This is a place outside Jeddito Island with a cairn on the ceremonial route mentioned above. [It is probably the same place as place 10 listed by Navajo Nation (1977)].

Clan stories. [The following are some clans in the Antelope Mesa-Jeddito Valley area.]

1. *Naneesht'ezhi* (Zuni) *Tachii'nii*. A mother and daughter used to live around Sanders or Ganado Mesa (*íichii' Deez'áhi*, same name for both places), moving here and

there. This side of Sanders (*Chíih Haageedi*) they visited Zunis (*Na'asht'ézhi*) who gave them food. When the girl grew up, the mother went back home but the girl stayed and became a Zuni. Her descendants are the *Naneesht'ézhi* branch of the *Táchii'nii* clan.

2. *Kin (Dibé?) ízhinii and Jaa yaalóolii Dine'é* once lived in the Keams Canyon area. Maybe they're connected with *Tááláhooghan*. They moved out from the Hopis. The place was called Cultivated Spruce (*Ch'ó Baa Ahosyáni*). [The consultant later didn't remember using this place name and couldn't tell us where the place is.]
3. *Yé'ii Dine'é* (Holy People) *Kiyaa'aanii*. They came from the Hopis, from In-Between House (*Ata' Kin*). They're the same clan as Mountain Cove (*Dziht'ah Dine'é*) clan, White Corn clan, Eagle Clan, Turkey Clan [presumably Hopi clans]. The Hopis are west, Tewas (*Naashashii*) are east, *Yé'ii Dine'é Kiyaa'aanii* are in middle. [This sounds like Sichomovi between Walpi and Hano.]
4. *Tábaqahá*. There were people called Watersnipe People (*Tábaasdisí Dine'é*), and they came from Toyei. [The statement may imply that these people are part of *Tábaqahá* clan.]
5. *Má'ii Deeshgiizhnii*. They're part of a group of clans that also includes *Áshijhii*, *Tsénjikiní*, and *Dibé ízhinii*. They come from a place called *Má'ii Deeshgizh* [Coyote Pass - ancestral Jemez settlement]. [Note that according to Sapir (1942), all these clans form a related group that can't intermarry.] Hopis have a Coyote clan.
6. *T'ááshchí'i*. This is another local clan.
7. *Tótsohnii*. Eventually people were moving into Hopi (*Ayahkin*). And there was a guy over there named Little Prairie Dog (*Dlóó' Yázhí*), who was known as a medicine brewer (*azee' íbbeezi*). He was *Tótsohnii* clan. Over at Walpi are some *Tótsohnii* clan people too, the *Tótsohnii* people evidently came from Hopis.

Local Modern History. [As discussed above under *Tááláhooghan*, consultants seem to suggest that local *Diné* went to Fort Sumner to escape attacks by Hopis.]

When people came back from Fort Sumner, Black men drew the reservation boundary here. [According to Brugge (1994:28, personal communication 6 July 1997), in 1890 Hopis refused to send their children to school until the federal government did something to keep *Diné* away from the lands the Hopis claimed. So Black soldiers from Fort Wingate took the children to school and then marked a boundary in a 25.6-km (16-mi) radius from Mishongnovi.] ... Then some years ago a *Diné* man from Tuba City, *Adoo'ks'ósii Yázhí*, came around here with Mormons who studied the *Anaasázis* and posted signs telling us not to go where the ruins are. [According to *hataafi* and former

Navajo Tribal Council delegate Nevy Jensen (personal communication 9 April 1998), *Adoołts'ósií Yázhí* worked with archaeologists on the Navajo land claim before the Indian Claims Commission during the 1950s and sometimes accompanied land surveyors working with the Hopi Tribe's lawyer John Boyden to interpret for local *Diné*. Brugge (1994:36, 40-43) says he was a college-educated mainstay for both the Indian Claims Commission and *Healing v. Jones* fieldwork.] After that, a report was read publicly, and they drew the big boundary. At this same time, the Mormons found coal and gas underneath. But *Diné* were living on the land, so Hopis were told to claim the land. The report that was read publicly said that the land didn't belong to us *Diné*, that no one knows where we came from. [The consultant said that he and other *Diné* found out about this report from a Hopi who had a copy of it, so evidently the public reading of the report was for Hopis.] This was after District 6 [LMD 6] was established and fenced. This *Adoołts'ósií Yázhí* told people that the land was being studied and people would be paid for it. Wood was being taken from sweatlodges and hogans for tree-ring dates. But the compensation was a lie. [Navajo Nation government didn't distribute land claim compensation among individual *Diné*.] It was because of the *Anaasázi* that we were pushed out. ... Now the Hopis again are exploring remote places in the Jeddito Island, maybe preparing to claim it. [Consultant's extremely compressed theory of Navajo-Hopi land dispute litigation should be compared with the Background section above. Consultant suggests here that Hopi claims of descent from *Anaasázi* led federal courts to favor Hopi claims to the land over the claims of Navajo residents.]

Policy and Management Concerns. [Our consultations with local ceremonialists revealed several concerns:]

1. Puebloan claims to *Anaasázi* ancestry. *Anaasázi* arrowheads are part of our *jish*. These *jish* have been passed down for generations. Hopis say that *Diné* got ceremonies from them, but that's not true. They claim to be the *Anaasázi*, but Hopi pottery is different from *Anaasázi*. Hopis decorate their pottery too, but decorations are different. *Diné* were told not to put designs on pottery because pottery is made of Mother Earth. Zunis and others from around Albuquerque also claim to come from the *Anaasázi*. But the professional archaeologists have been given the sole responsibility of moving *Anaasázi* remains; it's not the job of the Hopis or Zunis. [This statement is based on the consultants' idea, expressed to the authors in situations outside this project, that the Navajo Nation should not give members of other tribes access to cultural resources on its lands unless those tribes reciprocate. Unfortunately, we didn't ask consultants how they view members of other tribes who happen to be professional archaeologists working under contract with the Navajo Nation.]

2. Archaeological Treatment of *Anaasázi* Remains. When *Anaasázi* remains first appeared in the [Jeddito?] road right-of-way, the first idea was to rebury them just outside [inside] the right-of-way. But a ceremonialist objected because of questions about who would handle the remains and do the reburial: *Diné* aren't supposed to handle *Anaasazi* remains [ceremonialist objected to *Diné* working on the actual reburial]. You can't rebury remains just anywhere in Navajoland, because local people don't want that and children might see the remains during reburial. The *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society has discussed what things should not be disturbed. We [Society members] agree that these things should include spotted owl habitat, ceremonial performance sites, former homesites, medicine-gathering places, and places where sacred stone prayer offerings are placed. But we couldn't agree on what to do about *Anaasázi* burials. [Some said] maybe they're our relatives, [others said] maybe not, so do we just make a road over them? What if the grader unearths the remains? Meanwhile, Hopis have run over *Diné* sweatlodges with their graders, they've even set *Diné* houses on fire. ... [In other words, *Diné* sweatlodges should be just as worthy of protection as are *Anaasázi* sites.]

If you build a house or something on top of an *Anaasázi* grave, you might get sick later. There are ceremonies that can help with that kind of sickness (not connected with Enemyway). *Anaasázi* archaeological sites are scattered all over, and every time we want to build a house, someone will tell us there's one lying underneath there. It's hard to know what to do. Discussions about these issues are even more difficult because they concern things you're not supposed to talk about in public, or in someone's home, like here, where the talk might endanger the inhabitants. ... Hopis want to be consulted about the *Anaasázi* remains at this Jeddito road, but what about them, they put a road through a cemetery at Keams, took out all the remains (including the grave of a consultant's mother) and we don't know what they did with them. ... *Ceremonialists should say "NO" to all excavations on Navajo land until the archaeologists consult local ceremonialists and the Diné Spiritual and Cultural Society.* This is because archaeologists take artifacts away and disturb remains, and that can harm local residents. [The implication is that, even though the organization doesn't yet have a resolution covering this issue, its members can deal with treatment of *Anaasázi* remains case by case.]

3. Recording and using *Diné* oral tradition. Our tradition is oral and should not be written down or tape-recorded. Some ceremonial songs have been tape-recorded, and we don't have a ceremony to restore the ceremonies that have been desecrated in this way. ... What has been recorded here should be presented at a meeting (of the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society) for approval to go in your report. [Subsequently consultants allow us to use this information in this report, even though we hadn't been able to present it at a meeting. We would still like to present this material at a meeting, perhaps a joint meeting of NNHPD's *Hataa'ii* Advisory Council and the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society.]

4. Access to ceremonial places. *Diné* and Hopi ceremonialists should consider getting together about access to sacred places on each other's land and getting permits for ceremonial activities. There was an incident where Hopi rangers stopped a *Diné* ceremonialist from gathering ceremonial herbs near *Táádláhooghan* because he didn't have a permit. ... When a ceremonialist tells a whole story with places all over, the information about places far from his home area might not be reliable; he might not be familiar with those places. We ceremonialists need to consult each other about places in the different parts of our ceremonies outside the places we have visited.

More on Policy and Management Issues

In a separate consultation of 31 March 1997, before we started this project, we asked the head of the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society how, if at all, cultural resource consultants can use previously recorded oral tradition responsibly. He said that permanent representations of anything to do with *Diné* ceremonialism (including written and taped records) are harmful and should not have been made. However, since such things exist, they should be repatriated to the area within the Four Sacred Mountains. The information should not be publicized, but people whose work is to protect *Diné* ceremonialism and sacred places should have access to them.

More insight into why permanent representations of ceremonial things are dangerous comes from two discussions sponsored by Gray Hills High School in Tuba City on 11 and 24 February 1997. These discussions covered a similar issue: can *Diné* artists and art teachers use things connected with *Diné* ceremonialism in paintings and drawings? Participants included *Diné* artists, art teachers, and ceremonialists. The ceremonialists all agreed that sandpaintings, ceremonial paraphernalia, and ceremonial acts should not be represented outside of actual ceremonies. To do so is to expose people to the power of these things without the protection of the ceremonial setting. Nor can one "decommission" their power by changing certain details; if anything, that makes the images even more dangerous and out of control.

Summary of Consultations About Photos of Four Excavated Sites and Their Artifacts

On 4 December 1997 at the Jeddito Chapter House, we helped Project Director David Eck consult the two local ceremonialists about the four excavated sites. One of the two did not arrive until late in the consultation; thus only one consultant commented on sites and artifacts. Eck used a computer monitor to display photographs of excavated structures and other features of the four sites and the individual artifacts recovered. Francis interpreted and Kelley took notes (the consultant did not want tape recording). After seeing a few examples of certain types of images, such as collections of common types of potsherds and lithic artifacts, all participants agreed to streamline the presentation by skipping additional such images and focusing on unusual items and any other types that the consultant asked about. Images included no human remains or artifacts found in graves since, in accord with Navajo Nation policy, no such items were photographed in the first place.

Site specific comments. The consultant did not comment on images of the structures and other features themselves. He told us mainly how Navajos use artifacts of the types shown, including such artifacts salvaged from *Anaasázi* sites. Comments were recorded for nine artifacts:

1. Wood splinter marked as if wound with cord, FS 579 from site AZ-O-10-32, from Feature 104 (the hearth in the first surface room). The consultant said it was probably for sewing (based on a medium-range view when first seen).
2. Tularosa Black-on-white sherd, FS 113 from site AZ-O-10-32, from the plaza in front of the roomblock. The consultant said that designs like this (whirlwind) are why the *Anaasázi* were destroyed. They were destroyed twice because of these designs.
3. Black-on-red sherd, FS 311 from site AZ-O-10-32, from plaza in front of the roomblock. The consultant said that red pottery clay (paste, unfired) is needed for drums, because it can be fired hard.
4. Mortar, FS 541 from site AZ-O-10-32, from Feature 16, "kiva." According to consultant, *Diné* mash medicine, and also rabbits and other small animals, in these.
5. Ground stone slab with traces of red pigment, FS 322 from site AZ-O-10-32, from Feature 17. The consultant suggested that the pigment was most likely for painting pottery. Eck added that the red pigment might be mixed with other substances, including plant juice, and asked whether mixed or unmixed, firing might turn it black.
6. Small ground stone with flat and rounded surfaces, made of coarse red sandstone, FS 440 from site AZ-O-10-32, from Feature 17. The consultant suggested that the source of this rock might be south of Holbrook. Eck noted that a distant source might explain why only small pieces of such rock it have been found in these sites.
7. Soft white calcite lump with two grooves as if for binding it to a handle, FS 442, from site AZ-O-10-32. The consultant suggested this item could be a mallet.
8. Juniper splinter, FS 579, from site AZ-O-10-32, found in hearth, Feature 104 (second, close-up viewing). The consultant suggested that the item is probably a needle, the same kind that *Diné* use to make ceremonial masks.
9. Pumice item, blackened on the bottom with shallow basin, and stubby handle, FS 342 from site AZ-O-10-33. The consultant suggested the item might have been used for warming food.

Policy and Management Concerns. Both consultants were uncomfortable giving their policy and management opinions without their colleagues as witnesses. They offered the following:

1. Arrowheads, manos, and metates are items that Navajos still collect and use today. The consultant says that the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society needs to consider what is the proper disposition of these items when archaeologists take them from *Anaasázi* sites. Members want the items to stay in Navajoland and not be given to Hopis or other tribes. Maybe the group will agree they should be stored in Window Rock. Some at least would like arrowheads loaned out to *hataafii* for ceremonies.

2. Human remains should be returned to the earth.
3. Whole pots and certain other artifacts could be kept in Window Rock (Museum) for teaching children. But in general *Anaasázi* items are dangerous for *Diné* to look at. The *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society needs to decide as a group what artifacts, if any, the Museum could use for educational purposes, whether to exhibit them or keep them in storage for private viewing, and so forth.

Summary of *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society Meeting

For a fuller range of *Diné* ceremonialists' opinions and concerns, the two local consultants at the 4 December 1997 meeting asked if David Eck could do a similar presentation at a meeting of the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society. This meeting was held on 12 February 1998 at the Jeddito Chapter House. Eck set up a computer monitor to show the images used in the 4 December consultation. Harris Francis told the group about our work on this project. The group chose to discuss the general question of how they as ceremonialists think *Anaasázi* archaeological sites and excavated items should be treated. Eck therefore didn't make a presentation to the group, but instead showed images to individual members on request and was on hand to answer questions. Also present were Nina Swidler of NNHPD Roads Planning Program to answer questions, and observers Grace Morgan (Navajo Nation Archaeology Department) and Robert Johnson (NNHPD Roads Planning Section), who helped interpret for Swidler. Francis and Kelley took notes. The following excerpts are from Francis's direct translations of statements by *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society members. Brackets enclose authors' comments.

Diné and *Anaasázi*.

1. Some say the *Anaasázi* are our enemies (*anaa'*). Others say they are our forebears (*nihizázi*). That's where the name came from [the name is a compound of two seemingly contrasting words, enemy and forebear].
2. My elders call them *nihizázi* (our forebears), they were *Diné*, they are us, our ancestors. ... *Anaasázi* pottery is ours. *Anaasázi* buildings our ours. Our clan *Tsénjikiní* [Rock Crevice House, Cliffdwelling] is *Anaasázi*. Our *Kin'ichíí'nii* [Redhouse] clan, the same. Also our *Kiiyaa'áanii* [Towering House] clan.
3. When a person gets sick, they have a blackening ceremony. The *Anaasázi* were humans. After death, the human ghost (*bich'íjdii*) becomes an enemy (*anaa'*). ... They [*Anaasázi*] were us. ... Their ghost is like an enemy. When we die we become a ghost (*ch'íjdii*).

Treatment of artifacts and sites.

1. The *Anaasázi* are part of our land, they are known by what's in the ground [people study them by digging in Navajoland]. ... We're going to be taking these things to Window Rock where they will pile up with no prayers. It's going to affect our

leaders [*Anaasázi* artifacts are dangerous, especially if not ceremonially cleansed; if they accumulate in storage in Window Rock, the Navajo Nation capital, they will have a bad effect on Navajo Nation government leaders. Instead, the items should be treated as follows:]

Do [cleansing] ceremonies for the artifacts first.

Ask local communities to say what they want done with the artifacts.

The broken artifacts should be washed and blessed, then returned to the earth.

The whole artifacts should be examined by local and other *hataaʔii* to decide which ceremonies they can be used for, then offered to *hataaʔii* for their use.

[Group reaction in general was agreement.]

2. Rebury human remains and potsherds right on site, as near as possible alongside the right-of-way.

Navajo Nation Government Responsibility. Robert Johnson and Nina Swidler told the group about the Navajo Nation Cultural Resources Protection Act of 1988. They also sketched the process for making regulations for the law, which NNHPD has started. Members' comments were as follows.

1. Where are our elected officials? ... We use projectile points (*béeshiist'odii*) and potsherds (*ásaats'iil*) for ceremonies, we grind up potsherds for figurines and also potters use them. We need to say this in front of leaders and chapter officials. If they're not here, there's going to be more controversy in the future.
2. Our leaders come to these meetings, where are they? We should not make a resolution for now, until Window Rock (NNHPD) comes up with the regulations.
3. There is a law, in the Tribal Code. Concerning *Anaasázi*, those who are our ancestors (*nihízázi*) [human remains identified as *Diné*], [the law] says to return artifacts to Window Rock. So there will be regulations, that's what we don't have. They [NNHPD] are in the process of drafting regulations now. After the lawyers [Navajo Nation Department of Justice] look at it, then [NNHPD's] *Hataaʔii* Advisory Council will look at it. Then we [*Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society] can come up with a support resolution. We need to know if a *hataaʔii* can get artifacts on loan to use.
4. It's true that *Anaasázi* are our ancestors (*nihizazi*). Let Window Rock make the policy statement, then give it to *Diné* elders for them to make a support resolution.

The group voted unanimously to wait for NNHPD's *Hataaʔii* Advisory Council to make a statement on the draft regulations. Then the Society will produce a supporting resolution.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Previous studies and our consultants have provided different but complementary information on the issues that this report is supposed to address. Previous studies offered mostly *Diné* oral tradition about the study area. Consultants offered mostly recommendations about the policy issues, including the issue of when and how one should record oral tradition. For example, they considered only sketches of oral tradition to be right for the circumstances of this project. Where previous studies and consultants addressed the same topics, they were consistent with each other. Here we summarize our findings from all sources combined.

Diné Oral Tradition

Diné Oral Tradition About the *Anaasázi*

The previously recorded *Diné* stories about the *Anaasázi* are consistent with consultants' statements about the *Anaasázi* and their connection with *Diné*. We're sure that consultants had in mind current versions of these stories when they told us their thoughts about the *Anaasázi*. The summaries of the literature and consultants above are about as succinct as we can make them. In a nutshell, consultants and previously published sources agree that many *Diné* ceremonial stories and procedures originated at *Anaasázi* sites when the *Anaasázi* were actively using those sites. Opinions differ on how these stories and procedures came to *Diné* in more recent times. The diverse histories of clans, especially those associated with particular ceremonial repertoires, are part of the transmission process and at least partly account for differences of opinion about that process.

Diné Oral Tradition About the Study Area

Neither consultants nor previous studies revealed stories clearly set in the Jeddito School rincon during pre-Columbian times. However, previous studies have recorded many stories centered on *Tááláhooghan* (Awatovi), including stories of events at *Tááláhooghan* that are coordinated with ceremonialism in the pre-AD 1300 great houses of Chaco and Aztec. Because they include information about the times of the four sites studied in this project, these stories have clear implications for the pre-Columbians living at those and other nearby sites.

These stories about pre-Columbian times place *Tááláhooghan* on routes of ceremonial travel connected to the Pacific Coast, Mexico, and Chaco Canyon and the San Juan Basin by way of northern Black Mesa and Buffalo Pass, or by way of Canyon de Chelly and Narbona Pass. These stories and others set perhaps later also show that many modern *Diné* ceremonies originated or evolved at *Tááláhooghan* in pre-Columbian and early post-Columbian times. The massacre of *Tááláhooghan* people in AD 1700 triggered a climactic dispersal and final abandonment. People from *Tááláhooghan* joined *Diné* living elsewhere to become local segments of certain *Diné* clans. Consultants sketched a similar history of *Tááláhooghan* and added some local clan histories. These clan histories suggest a great deal of fragmenting and mixing of *Diné* and *Kiis'aaniis* (villagers) from Jemez, Hopi, and Zuni.

Appendix N offers an anthropological perspective on what the *Diné* stories suggest about pre-Columbian times at *Tááláhooghan* and the Jeddito Island study area, when combined with archaeological and other cross-cultural information. We relegate this anthropological synthesis to an appendix partly because the main purpose of this chapter is to report what *Diné* have said about the study area. We don't want an anthropological voice to drown out the *Diné* voices. Another reason is that the synthesis is a preliminary sketch. A more complete synthesis requires systematic comparison between details in the *Diné* stories and details in the archaeology of Antelope Mesa. Since work on this chapter and the background research on Antelope Mesa archaeology for this report were concurrent, we could not make such a synthesis within this project's time limits. Yet, as discussed in the Background section above, learning about the past must come from combining the archaeological record with both oral and written stories. The archaeological record and stories are present forms that contain traces of events throughout their pasts. Enlightenment comes from comparing interpretations of the stories and interpretations of the archaeological record, noting apparent congruences and discrepancies, and figuring out possible causes of those apparent congruences and discrepancies. We hope for a future synthesis of Antelope Mesa archaeology and oral tradition of *Diné* and other tribes.

Possibilities for Dialogue

What are the possibilities for dialogue among custodians of the *Diné* cultural encyclopedia, *Diné* general public, archaeologists, and anthropologists who study oral tradition? Where, if at all, is there an overlapping frame of reference?

The *Diné* stories about *Tááláhooghan* (not the stories as interpreted by anthropologists and combined with archaeological evidence to reconstruct the pre-Columbian past) illustrate some reasons why *Anaasázi* remains may be significant to *Diné*. These and other stories connected with places in and around the study region are about active ceremonialism. Therefore ceremonialists are reluctant to reveal the details that make *Anaasázi* and other places significant to them. This reticence of course disappoints researchers with academic interests in *Anaasázi* archaeology, *Diné* oral tradition, and the relationship between them. More importantly, this reticence hinders the kind of documentation that cultural resource management laws and policies ordinarily require to protect places and the interests of particular groups in them. It also may hinder *Diné* ceremonialists and the *Diné* general public agreeing on proper treatment of *Anaasázi* remains in the path of development.

At this point, we don't see a common frame of reference among *Diné* ceremonialists, the *Diné* general public, archaeologists, and anthropologists who study oral tradition—that is, there are no first principles in common about what to protect or how and why to protect it. But cultural resource management laws at least create a forum for discussion, since these laws require researchers to consult all groups with traditional interests in particular cultural resources. Clearly the archaeologists and anthropologists who do legally required "traditional cultural properties" consultations must involve *Diné* ceremonialists and the *Diné* general public in decisions about how to treat *Anaasázi* sites.

Management Issues About *Diné* Tradition and Pre-Columbian Archaeological Sites

This section compiles the policy and management concerns and ideas from the various consultations discussed above. Here we use "*Anaasázi*" as defined by the Navajo Nation's *Jishchaa'* policy (Navajo Nation 1996), which covers basically pre-Columbian remains. Author's comments are included in brackets.

Routine Consultations with *Diné*

Diné stories and ceremonies are attached to certain specific pre-Columbian archaeological sites; improper contact with *Anaasázi* things can make *Diné* sick; and archaeological projects that open up *Anaasázi* sites and remove artifacts and graves may expose local *Diné* residents to inadvertent glimpses or other contacts that may hurt them later.

Therefore government agencies must consult *Diné* routinely about protection of *Anaasázi* archaeological sites and graves both on and off lands under Navajo Nation jurisdiction. This doesn't mean that *Diné* will have concerns about every single *Anaasázi* site, only that they must have an opportunity to comment. These consultations must *routinely* include *Diné* ceremonialists, including the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society.

Intertribal Consultations

If the Navajo Nation is going to consult other tribes routinely about pre-Columbian remains (and other cultural resources) on lands under its jurisdiction, then those same other tribes must consult *Diné* routinely about cultural resources on lands under these other tribal jurisdictions. *Diné* and ceremonialists of other tribes should consider getting together about access to sacred places on each other's land, getting permits for ceremonial activities, and related issues.

Using *Diné* Tradition in Consultations

Diné tradition is oral and should not be written down or tape recorded. Once that is done, the ceremony is desecrated and there is no ceremonial way to undo the damage.

Permanent representations of anything to do with *Diné* ceremonialism (including written, audiotaped, filmed, and videotaped records) should not have been made. These things should not be represented outside of actual ceremonies (or in the case of stories, proper season and setting). When these representations exist outside actual ceremonies (or, in the case of stories, outside the proper season and setting), people are exposed to their power without the protection of the ceremonial setting or season and therefore may suffer later. As noted above, one cannot "decommission" their power by changing certain details; if anything, that makes the images even more dangerous and out of control. Therefore, consultations with *Diné* ceremonialists and others must not require recording the relevant ceremonies or stories.

However, since permanent records of ceremonies and stories already exist, they should be repatriated to Navajoland, including to the Navajo Nation Museum. The information in these

permanent records should not be publicized, but people whose work is to protect *Diné* ceremonialism and sacred places should have access to it.

When a ceremonialist tells a story, the information about places far from his or her home area might not be reliable; he or she might not be familiar with those places. Therefore it is important to consult *local* ceremonialists, which can be done through the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society as well as through chapter officials and NNHPD.

Treatment of *Anaasázi* Archaeological and Human Remains

Anaasázi sites should be avoided whenever possible.

To care for artifacts excavated from *Anaasázi* sites that cannot be avoided, first all the artifacts should be ceremonially cleansed. Then, ask the local chapter what they want done with the artifacts. The broken artifacts should be washed and blessed, then returned to the earth. The whole artifacts, including arrowheads, manos, metates, and pottery, should be examined by local and other ceremonialists, including the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society, to decide which ceremonies they can be used for, then offered to *hataaʼíi* for their use. The Navajo Nation could keep ceremonially useful artifacts in its Museum in Window Rock and lend them out to ceremonialists.

Artifacts from *Anaasázi* sites in Navajoland should not be given to other tribes. [Statements about intertribal consultations above suggest that giving artifacts to other tribes under certain circumstances might be possible under some kind of mutual agreement that allows *Diné* to have artifacts from sites under other tribal jurisdictions.] Whole pots and certain other artifacts could be kept in Window Rock Museum. *Anaasázi* items are dangerous for *Diné* to look at, however. The Museum must consult ceremonialists, including the *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society, about what artifacts, if any, to use for education, whether to exhibit them or keep them in storage for private viewing, and so forth. Large quantities of *Anaasázi* artifacts should not be amassed in Window Rock, because they would endanger Navajo Nation government leaders.

Excavated human remains must be returned to the earth, but opinions vary on where to rebury. In general, reburial should be as close to the original grave as possible, but it also must be out of the way of local residents. Reburial must be done so that local residents, especially children, do not accidentally see the remains. It is the responsibility of professional archaeologists to move *Anaasázi* remains. Navajos shouldn't do this.

The foregoing guidelines are responses to our question how *Diné* ceremonialists think excavated *Anaasázi* artifacts should be treated. These treatments are what the ceremonialists consider compatible with *Diné* customs and beliefs. Some of these guidelines might be hard to follow within the constraints of federal law. Asking our consultants how to follow their guidance within those constraints would have required, first, some sort of workshop to explain the intricacies of federal law. Such a workshop was beyond the scope of this project. It is a logical next step for the future. We recommend that NNHPD hold such a workshop-consultation with its own *Hataaʼíi* Advisory Council, to which *Diné* Spiritual and Cultural Society members and any other interested *Diné* ceremonialists are also invited. Proper roles for *Diné* and members of other tribes who are also archaeologists is a related issue that such a workshop-consultation should cover.