

Rec'd from
8/27/02

THE PECTOL SHIELDS: A CULTURAL EVALUATION

Study Conducted for Capitol Reef National Park
as part of an Investigation for
Repatriation of the Pectol Shields

Polly Schaafsma
Research Associate, MIAC/Laboratory of Anthropology
Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe

June 7, 2002

INTRODUCTION

The Pectol shields have been thoroughly described by earlier consultants for the repatriation investigation conducted by Capitol Reef National Park (Lanford 2001; Loendorf 2001; Wright 2001). (For illustrations of the shields, see Appendix A). Rather than repeat their fundamental descriptions of the shields, I will review their essays, evaluating their assessments, finally offering a new set of arguments for a different cultural origin of the Pectol shields. I have little to add to the dates obtained in earlier studies (Berger and Libby 1968; Grant 1967) on the basis of radio-carbon samples or to the basic description of the shields themselves.

Loendorf and Lanford both attribute the Pectol shields to Athapaskans. Loendorf attributes shields 11 (Shield with Singular Triangular Motif) and 12 (Shield with Dot Motif) to the Navajo. He considers, however, Pectol Shield no. 191 (Shield with the Red, Rust, Black, and Green Triangular Motifs) (see Kreutzer 1994; Lanford and Miller 2000) to be Pueblo, specifically Jemez, in origin. Barton Wright (2001) rejects both Navajo and Hopi similarities to the Pectol shields, but suggests no alternative origin.

In contrast, I argue that the Pectol shields are all Ute in derivation, basing my arguments on provenience, a matter to which I give considerable weight, in conjunction with positive and

negative evidence provided by shield designs of the contending ethnic groups. Baldwin, in an earlier publication (1997:12), also concludes, based on their dates and provenience, that the Pectol shields are Ute.

CHRONOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Pectol shields have been dated by C14. Dates from the shields themselves fell between A.D. 1650-1750 (Berger and Libby 1968:149; Kruetzer 1994:2), while AMS dates obtained from the attached straps produced slightly earlier results, ie. 1500 (Kruetzer 1994:107-108; Loendorf and Conner 1993). At the most, the shields appear to bridge the span from the Late Protohistoric to the early Historic periods. The earlier C14 dates on the shields themselves place them firmly in the early Historic period.

Being large in size, (ie. from 76.2 cm to 96.5 cm) (Kruetzer 1994:107), the shields were of necessity used by pedestrian warriors, not equestrian, who carried small shields on horseback. The size of the shields could be viewed as having chronological implications preceding the introduction of the horse, but rock art and other images indicate that this is not necessarily the case. Guns and/or horses appear to be contemporary with pedestrian shield bearers in numerous rock art panels (see Keyser and Klassen 2001:Fig. 13.25b; Fig. 13.36 and in the Biographic tradition (A.D. 1700 to late 1800 from the

Northwestern Plains (Keyser and Klassen 2001:Fig. 14.5: one figure holds a rifle; others dated a c. 1700 are shown with horses (Keyser and Klassen 2001:fig. 14.18). While in the Southern Plains and the Southwest, most tribes acquired the horse in the early 17th century, horses may have been obtained a little later in the north. Keyser and Klassen (2001: 222) describe an historic, pre-horse battle in southern Alberta around 1725 in which both sides used metal-tipped spears, long bows and arrows, and large body shields. Loendorf (2001:9-12) cites numerous examples of the use of large body shields historically. In the Segesser hide paintings, dating prior to A.D.1758, or around the mid 18th century, pedestrian warriors confront men on horseback (Hotz 1970).

Even prehistorically, small hand-held shields are portrayed in Anasazi and Fremont rock paintings and petroglyphs from presumably around the thirteenth century (Schaafsma 2000: frontispiece and Fig. 2.16), ideal for use with clubs in hand-to-hand combat (see Lutonsky 1998). These are contemporaneous with numerous depictions of pedestrian shield bearers with large body shields (Schaafsma 2000).

THE PECTOL SHIELDS: A BRIEF DESCRIPTION

The Pectol shields have been described in detail by previous consultants (see also Loendorf and Conner 1993).(1) I will not belabor this discussion, except to review the designs.

Pectol shield No. 11, with a concave face, is painted red with the perimeter left unpainted. Also one quadrant or pie-shaped section is unpainted (the base), but divided by four green bands, interspersed with brown that taper toward the center. Above this section is a half-circle unpainted at the top of the shield. The reverse side has been incised with two opposing triangular insets and there are some red paint smears as well. Loendorf and Conner (1993:219) suggest that this may once have been the front of the shield. Pectol shield No. 12 is convex and is decorated by vertical lines of negative circles. On one half the shield, the background for six lines of circle is black. On the other half, the circles occur in one black and three red stripes that are interspersed by green stripes bordered by black dashes, centered on 4 unpainted stripes. The black dashes also occur along the edges of the black and red stripes as well as around the edges of the negative circles within the red stripes. Pectol shield No. 191, also convex, is divided into quadrants. Three are painted in orange, red, and black, while the fourth is divided into green bands, that taper toward the center much like those of Shield No. 11. On shield 191, however, the green bands (on unpainted hide) are bordered with black dashes similar to those in shield 12. Further the black and white banded tips of these bands clearly suggest that we are dealing with a feather fan, much like tail feathers. A black field continues below the feathers to the circumference of the shield. In addition, a gently curved, wide unpainted band separates the red and black

quadrants. The inside edge of this band is painted with small neatly painted serrations that contrast with their adjoining fields of color--red serrations border the black quadrant; black serrations border the red quadrant.

The convexity of a shield may be formed during manufacture. Navajo shields may be convex, shaped over a heap of heated dirt. When not in use the concavity would be reversed (Kluckhohn et al 1971:369-370). This may explain the varied profiles of the Pectol shields, for which, however, a non-Navajo origin is postulated. When not in use, Navajo shields are said to have sometimes been folded (Underhill 1953:119). This is not the case with the Pectol shields.

**SHIELD DESIGNS A MEANS FOR DETERMINING FOR CULTURAL ATTRIBUTION:
THE CASE FOR DESIGNS AS AN ETHNIC FINGER PRINT:**

Both Loendorf (2001) and Lanford (2001) cite design elements and overall patterning to build a cases for Apachean ethnic affinities for the Pectol shields. Yet Lanford notes that historically the Apache, Comanche, and Ute shared design elements (Lanford 2001:25). Apache painting on rawhide is well-known for its use of serrations. In regard to the sawtooth elements on Pectol Shield 191, Lanford notes, however, that the Western Plateau and Kutenai "painted teeth as borders in parfleche motifs." And on page 35 (Lanford 2001:35) states that the Pectol shields resemble those in the Plains and Montane regions and not

those of Southwest origins.

Designs on prehistoric shields and on historic shields are both variable and repeated, the latter since the round field of the shield often dictates a predilection for certain solutions to decoration. Very few shield designs are exclusive to any one cultural or tribal group. This, in turn, makes evaluating designs, as a guide to cultural origins, if not useless, at best, frustrating.

A good example is a design commonly used on historic Rio Grande Pueblo shields. This characteristic pattern consists of a wide band, often decorated with three or so circles, that cuts the shield face in two horizontally. Above are buffalo horns, and below a fan-shaped element suggestive of eagle tail feathers (Wright 1976). This design, found on shields from Jemez, Taos, Santo Domingo, Santa Ana, and Isleta, does not occur in the protohistoric rock art. Thus its presence does indicate some chronological and cultural constraints. I was surprised, however, to find a similar layout-- with the feather fan in the lower half replaced by another motif-- on a northern Plains shield illustrated by Keyser and Klassen (2001:Fig. 13.16f), indicating that again, design, is never foolproof.

Wedge or pie-shaped elements (such as occur on Pectol shield 191) are a common way of dividing and decorating the circular field. The quadrant and pie-shaped segmentation of shield design layout is ancient on the Colorado Plateau, where it is found on Pueblo III and probably Fremont shields in rock art before c.

A.D. 1300 (Schaafsma 1978 Fig. 60; 2000:Figs. 2.4, 2.13); Tipps 1995, 27d). The Fremont culture ended significantly earlier--between A.D. 1250-1350 (Marwitt 1986:171)--than the earliest dates indicated for the Pectol shields. Wedge-shaped elements are also found on the Northern Great Plains (Keyser and Klassen 2001: Figs. 13.8, 13.16d, 13.24), and in the Rio Grande Valley during P. IV (A.D. 1325-1680) (Schaafsma 2000: fig. 4.5). It is also visible on the historic Navajo shield pictured in Kluckhohn et al. (1971:367).

Eagle tail feather fans, a common element on historic Pueblo and Pueblo IV shields are an elaboration of this same shape (Schaafsma 2000:Plate 8; figs. 3.7d; 3.9a,b; 5.3e)--see also Wright (1976 Figure 8) for an historic Acoma shield--to cite just a few examples of this widespread patterning. On Pectol shields 11 and 191, wedges are elaborated into motifs resembling tail feathers. The feather motif is particularly clear on Pectol shield No. 191.

Dots--often shown as small negative circles as on Pectol shield 12--occur occasionally on shields elsewhere and over a wide area. A shield with dots from the Northern Plains is pictured with a rifle (Keyser and Klassen 2001:Fig. 13.24 1700-1775; see also Fig. 13.30 from Castle Gardens, Wyoming; Wright 1976: Fig. 54 for yellow dots painted on a late historic Santa Ana Pueblo shield cover; and Schaafsma 1980 for a southern Apache shield with dots in rock art. Prehistorically, shields in a Fremont rock art panel from Davis Gulch include a spotted shield,

and another half striped and half spotted. A shield bearer painted in white from Peek-a-boo Arch in Canyonlands National Park carries a shield with lines of dots painted within vertical stripes, similar to Pectol shield No. 12. Although the Peek-a-boo figures have been considered to be Fremont (Schaafsma 1971:52, and fig. 55), it may also be possible they were painted by Utes.

The fact that shields were often obtained (as by the Navajo) from other tribes (Kluckhohn et al. 1971:369) is a major factor, accounting for a broad distribution of designs and other features of manufacture during the historic period. In addition, during the early historic and even Protohistoric period, designs were often widely shared between different tribal groups. This was especially the case, once the horse was introduced and communication became fluid over vast territories. Once horses were obtained early in the 17th century (see Clark 1966:7-8), intercommunication was such that design styles tend to be widespread and not particularly useful as a culturally diagnostic tool. The fact that the Pectol shields are constructed of buffalo hide in itself, suggests that they were made after trade between the Plains and mountain regions was facilitated by horseback travel, or after A.D. 1600. This is consistent with the C14 dates.

"The Utes were ethnologically classified as "Plains Indians" by early American anthropologists because of the historic reputation of the Utes as mounted horsemen raiding into the Great Plains and because of their

reputation as respected enemies of the Kiowas, Cheyennes, Arapahoes, Sioux, and Comanches, when these Plains tribes were first interviewed by ethnographers. But the Utes retained basically a Great Basin culture, even after the adoption of horses which allowed them to hunt buffalo on the Plains and transport meat and hides back into or over the Rocky Mountains to their traditional territories. The eastern Utes were probably the most important Indians in the spread of the horse from the Spanish settlements to northern tribes because they had learned horsemanship as slaves of Spaniards before 1680 (Stewart 1982:18-19).

Eagles, bison, and other symbolism selected for shield designs represent signs of empowerment and protection, and these emblems were widely shared between ethnic groups in the early and late historic periods. At the same time, otters, weasels, and bear paws tend to be more characteristic of northern Plains shield designs (see Keyser and Klassen 2001:Fig. 13.30. Bear paws however, are found on an historic Mandan shield (Lanford 2001: Fig. 4) and in a rare instance on a Protohistoric Rio Grande Pueblo shield (Schaafsma 2000:Fig. 3.13a).

Some design changes are, nevertheless, measurable in chronological terms at least in the Southwest. Certain differences between Proto-historic and historic shield designs can be documented in Pueblo case. At some point in recent

historic times, shield designs tend to be cluttered with small, busy, even fussy representational elements (see Lanford 2001). The Pectol shields are certainly exempt from such designs.

In summary, the designs on the Pectol shields lack culturally diagnostic patterns. Among the varied designs on shields pictured in late 19th century ledger art of Plains Indians, designs closely related to the paintings on all three Pectol shields are represented (Petersen 1988: Plates 130, 146 and 167). In addition, the fact that we are dealing with a sample of 3 shields, none of which bear designs specific to any cultural group, makes it difficult, if not impossible, to use the designs on these shields as a guide to their ethnic origins in a positive sense. In fact, selective "cherry picking" amidst a smorgasbord of shields of all ages from the Northern Plains to the Southwest allows building a case via designs for any cultural attribution one chooses!

CULTURAL ASSIGNMENTS

The Athapaskan Case

In his study of the Pectol shields, Lanford (2001:16) asserts that the leather objects found in Utah--not only the Pectol shields--but several buffalo robes, a parfleche from Nine Mile Canyon, and burden straps from the vicinities of Torrey and

Castledale, are Athapaskan in origin. An Athapaskan origin for any of these objects, however, is highly questionable on the grounds of provenience alone. His statement that Apaches were in east-central Utah in A.D. 1500 is not supportable (see Towner 1996). That this was Ute territory back to at least A.D. 1400 is well established (Reed 1988), and the distribution of the Numic-speaking Utes is considered in depth later on in this paper. Further, he considers that there is a close resemblance between the Pectol shield designs and those on historic leather objects of Apache origin. He compares the serrated designs on historic Apache leather objects (Lanford 2001:Figs. 9-12) to the serrations on Pectol Shield 191 to validate an Athapaskan assignment to the shield.

It is likely that these objects from Utah are of Ute manufacture. After ca. 1650 the Utes were interacting extensively with Plains groups (Tyler 1954:345), and the parfleche may indicate a general sharing of material culture items with the Northern Plains and Plateau from this point on. The quills in the parfleche would seem to support this. Quill work was common among Plateau and Plains groups, while used only rarely among the Navajo and Apache (Toby Herbst 2002: personal communication).

Other claims for Athapaskan origins of the shields are proffered by Loendorf (2001) who argues that the Castle Garden, Wyoming rock art shields were made by Athabaskans between A.D. 1100-1200, and that designs and techniques from this site can be found in much later (early 18th century or later) Apache and

Navajo rock art. He seemingly bases these proposed relationships on Baldwin (1997) who argues for a northern Plains origin for numerous elements in Southwest, including Navajo, rock art. While Plains elements such as bison and long feathered headdresses in Navajo rock art are not surprising, given their recent immigration into the Southwest off the High Plains (C. Schaafsma 2002), Athapaskan origins for specific northern Plains rock art sites is contestable. It is worthy of note that Keyser and Klassen in their detailed consideration of northern Plains rock art, including Castle Gardens, Wyoming that figures prominently in Loendorf's discussion, is not considered by them to be Athapaskan.

Loendorf states that Athapaskans in the Southwest left "examples of 'Castle Garden style shield warriors'" in the Dinetah region of the upper San Juan drainage of northwestern New Mexico (Loendorf 2001:32). The Dinetah includes the drainages of Blanco, Largo, and Carrizo Canyons that converge into the San Juan River valley near Blanco, New Mexico, east of Farmington. Loendorf's claim is made on the basis of the technical attributes of a single petroglyph--the horned shield-bearing personage from Blanco Canyon that appears on the cover of his report (see also Loendorf 2001: fig. 9). In the Castle Garden rock art and in the example from Blanco Canyon, New Mexico the shield shape was abraded into the sandstone and incised patterns were then added inside.

The Navajo figure under discussion here is the only known

shield figure, out of nearly two dozen shield figures in the Dinetah, that was manufactured in a manner similar to the Castle Garden shields. Secondly, the Dinetah was occupied by the Navajo from between A.D. 1670 and around 1760 (C. Schaafsma 2002:308; Towner 1996), leaving over a 450 year gap between the Castle Garden shields and those in the Dinetah, if Loendorf is correct in dating the former between A.D. 1100 and 1200. In addition, the comparison with the famous turtle shield from Castle Garden (Loendorf 2001:figure 8) is totally spurious, since the Dinetah shield, featuring serrations around the edge, is in the Southwest tradition of a sun shield. There is nothing about this figure that suggests turtle symbolism, although there are Navajo references to the use of turtle shells as armor (Reichard 1950:511,556). In spite of this, in contradiction to Loendorf (2001:24) who claims all the turtles he knows of in Southwest rock art are on Apachean shields, without citing chapter and verse, this is hardly credible. So far in my research in the Southwest, I have found no Athapaskan turtle shields.

I have shown elsewhere that the Pueblo IV ceremonial system and art inspired the Navajo religious traditions that followed after ca. 1680 (Schaafsma 1963; 1980; 1992). Sun iconography featuring serrated patterns is common among the shield motifs of the protohistoric Pueblos (Schaafsma 2000:see especially Fig. 3.2). The Navajo figure is replete with sun symbolism. This includes the serrated design as well as the horns worn by the shield bearer (Reichard 1950:470). The sun and moon, not turtles,

are often shown wearing such horns in Navajo sandpaintings (see also Newcomb and Reichard 1937: Plate XVIII and others). The sun an empowering agent in warfare is part of the symbolic vocabulary the Navajo gained from their association with the Pueblos (Schaafsma 1963; 1980; 1992). In addition the diagonal zigzags may also have reference to lightning associated with the War Twin Monster Slayer. In other words, this shield bearer is totally distinct in its symbolic content from the Castle Garden shields. Any resemblance between them is superficial.

To return to the Pectol shields, a rock art shield with stenciled dots (small solid circles) from Weatherman, Montana, north of the Wyoming border (Loendorf 2001:fig. 4) superficially resembles another painted shield with dots in southern Arizona attributed to Apaches (Schaafsma 1980:fig. 282 and Loendorf 2001: figs.15-16). This resemblance is used by Loendorf, to support the idea that both the Weatherman and Pectol shield 12 are Athapaskan in origin. Lanford also illustrates the use of similar solid circles on another Montana shield (2001:fig. 28) and on an Apache shield cover (2001: Fig. 30). In the latter case, a line of circles borders the inner rim of the circumference. While dotted shields are not especially common, they are, on the other hand, widely distributed, cross-cutting cultural boundaries, historically as well as prehistorically, as outlined previously. However, and significantly for this discussion, there are no spotted shields in the Dinetah that would suggest a potential remote continuity--following Loendorf's line of argument--with

*Dave Brugge (pers comm, Dec 2002)
has seen one.*

the spotted shield in Weatherman, Montana.

Arguments have been presented against the usefulness of shield designs for determining cultural attribution in a positive sense. On the other hand, by comparing the Pectol shields with roughly contemporary shields represented in Navajo rock art of northwestern New Mexico and northern Arizona, it is possible at least to suggest what the Pectol shields are not. The Navajo shields are dated between c. 1670 and 1760. Important is the obvious fact that none of the Navajo rock art shields resemble the Pectol shields in any way (figures 1-8). The wedge or pie-shaped divisions found on two of the Pectol shields (nos. 11 and 191), historic Ute shields (figs. 21-22 and other shields for which Ute origins are proposed), Plains shields (for examples Keyser and Klassen 2001:figs. 13.16d or Fig. 13.30 from Castle Gardens), one historic Navajo shield dating from 1892-1893 (McCoy 1984:48 or Underhill 1953:Pl. 69) and occasionally on Pueblo shields, are lacking on Navajo rock art shields dated between 1670 and 1760.

The sun shield worn by the horned shield bearer in the Navajo petroglyph discussed above is the only shield with a significant interior design. The majority of the remaining 18 examples in the rock art lack interior patterning, although several have feathers, some of which are clearly eagle feathers, on the periphery (see figures attached). The two otherwise plain, white shields with red borders at the junction of the Pine and San Juan Rivers had the heads of figures painted on them (fig.

). This conjunction of imagery is still commonly used by the Navajo in sandpaintings, uniting supernaturals with the Sun or Moon, that can also be viewed as carrying shields. At least four Navajo rock art shields have concentric patterns: centered inner circles of different dimensions relative to the size of the shield. In one case, the band between the circumference of the shield and the inside circle has been divided into segments.

Plain white shields, or plain white shields with a red outline around the periphery together with perhaps one or more very narrow outlining color stripes are characteristic of Navajo painted rock art shields from the late 1600s and 1700s. Such shields closely resemble sun shields, sometimes pictured in the hands of combatants, in late prehistoric Hopi kiva murals (see Smith 1952:figs. 47a,b; 54a, b for some examples) The Chuska Mountain shields illustrated by Loendorf (2001:Figures 13 and 14) are right in line with those in the Dinetah. In sum, Navajo rock art shields produced during the late 1600s and early 1700 appear to have roots in Pueblo iconography and ceremonialism and do not resemble the Pectol shields. The Navajo shields do not provide any supporting evidence for Apachean, or more specifically Navajo origins, for the Pectol shields.

Although it might be argued that the Navajo rock paintings represent ceremonial sun shields with War God connotations (Schaafsma 1992:35), these attributes with supernatural power implications were, logically enough, carried over into actual shields used for defense. Importantly, the use of red on the

shield's perimeter was continued on later historic shields on which red flannel is attached to the border along with eagle feathers as in the rock art examples (figures 9 and 10). The undated Navajo shield in the MIAC/Lab collections(3) with its concentric design and red rim with eagle feathers is conceptually consistent with the late 17th-early 18th century rock art shields from the Dinétah. Thus from at least c. 1700 to the 20th century Apache and Navajo shields often have red on some point of the circumference at some point: top and bottom or all around. On real shields this may take form of a piece of red cloth fastened to edge or red cloth lacing (Ferg and Kessel 1987:Fig. 7.27). While the Pectol shields lack this seemingly important feature of a red border, a mid-19th century Ute shield illustrated by Wroth (2000:fig. 2x 6 or 7?) also had a narrow red segment across the top, an indication, perhaps, of a recent sharing of ideas.

In regard to historic shields, Underhill (1953:119) notes that: "The shield was painted black, the war color, and had magical decorations which might be bear's feet, sun, moon, lightning, snake, mountain lion, or the war god, Monster Slayer." She illustrates two shields, one (Underhill 1953:Plate 70) with a concentric pattern--small solid central circle and a narrow circular band near the perimeter--exactly like those in early historic Navajo rock art (see figures 1,3,6, this paper), and another that she says is undecorated. Quadrants made by pie-shaped elements separated by unpainted (?) bands are faintly visible, however, in the photo (Underhill 1953:Plate 69).

As for the technology of shields themselves: The Pectol shields were painted with a finishing glaze. This is well described by Lanford (2001) who asserts that it was part of the original finish and not a varnish added as a preservative in recent years as Loendorf and Conner suggest (1993:220). Glazing was a technique used on painted leather products historically by Plateau and Plains groups (Lanford 2001:12). There is no mention of glazing or sizing with cactus or other substance on Apache or Navajo shields (Ferg and Kessel 1987:140-142; Kluckhohn et al. 1971). The sizing on the Pectol shields is yet another argument against an Athapaskan origin. Furthermore, sizing was used by the Utes (see below). Lanford (2001:12) states specifically that sizing is not typical in Southwest leather or wood crafts. Southwest shields have a matte finish.

Also in regard to construction, Kluckhohn et al.(1971:371) mention that some Navajo shields were formed around a circular wooden frame and reinforced with crosspieces.

A Puebloan Attribution

Based on design, Loendorf (2001) assigns Pectol shield 191 to the Rio Grande Pueblos, most likely the Jemez. His argument for a Pueblo attribution lies in the patterned resemblance, again to a single example--a pre-1680 Piro Pueblo petroglyph shield located about 30 miles south of Socorro, New Mexico on the Rio Grande (figure 11).

Although the design of Pectol shield 191 resembles that of the shield in the petroglyph, and the Piro shield (figure 11) is somewhat unusual in that the feather fan is placed at the top of the shield, the quadrant layout is so general that it has little cultural significance. In summary, I propose that the evidence for a Pueblo origin of Pectol shield 191 is wholly inadequate. Unless the shield design conformed to a well established, commonly repeated Pueblo format, some of which do exist for both Pueblo IV (see Schaafsma 2000:Fig. 2.4) and historic shields (figure 12), a single example of similarity appears to be fortuitous.

It remains to be pointed out that while avian (especially eagle) motifs appear to be more prevalent on Pueblo shields than those of other cultural group, they are found occasionally on Plains shields from the historic period (Petersen 1988: Plates 108, 130, 168). Torrence (in Lanford 2001:26) states that Pectol shield no. 11 "particularly looks Plains." A Comanche shield cover illustrated by McCoy (1984:48), with a design very much like that one Pectol shield 11, reinforces this impression.

On a technical front, several historic Pueblo shields in the MIAC collection are reinforced at the outer rim with the addition of a strip of hide (figures 12-14). This reinforced edge is absent on the Pectol shields. Also none of the Pueblo or Navajo shields in the MIAC/Lab collection are glazed.

The Question of Different Ethnic Origins for the Pectol

Shields. While shields 11 and 12 do not resemble each other, shield 191 shares elements with both. Similar unusual painting details, shared between shields stashed together--notably the black dashes featured on Pectol shields 12 and 191, are an indication that these shields were painted by the same person or persons in a closely related situation. This interpretation stands in distinct contrast with Loendorf's (2001) proposal that Pectol shield 191 is Pueblo. These dashes were not present on any of the Pueblo shields I examined in the Museum Indian Arts and Culture Collection. I agree with Torrence (in Lanford 2001:26) who states that the black dashes on Pectol Shield 12 and 191 "seem almost by the same hand - a distinct pictorial convention . . . If not the same hand, they are in close proximity in time and/or cultural group. These guys were all sitting around together!" Technically and aesthetically these two shields are extremely close.

It remains to be pointed out that black dashes are employed in a similar manner on a Mandan shield illustrated by Lanford (2001:fig. 4, from Conner 1985). Thus while a similar style of painting does not actually prove a common origin, it seems to be suggestive of such, given the fact that these shields were found together. On balance, all indications are that the shields share a common cultural origin.

The Argument for Ute Origins

In my opinion, Lanford's (2001) and Loendorf's (2001:21-36) involved attempts to establish Apachean (and Pueblo) origins for the Pectol shields can be easily challenged. Further, I take issue with Loendorf's (2001:36) statement that: "the absence of pre-horse examples of rock art shield-bearing warriors that can be assigned to the Ute suggests they did not use large shields between A.D. 1550 and A.D. 1650, when the Pectol shields were made. Ute rock art does depict pedestrian warriors with body shields, as well as pedestrian warriors with body shields engaged in actions scenes involving horses and guns. Thus the Pectol shields could easily date to post horse days, and as noted early in this paper, they may date as late as 1750.

The Pectol shields, based on the original C14 dates, may date between A.D. 1650 and 1750. While the Pectol shields are too large to have been used by equestrian warriors, the argument has been made previously that their size cannot be used to fine-tune their age.

Shield bearers in Rock Art in western Colorado and eastern Utah. Loendorf suspects, that Ute pedestrian warriors did not use large shields, claiming that there are few representations of pedestrian Ute warriors carrying body shields (2001:17). On the contrary, however, pedestrian warriors with large body shields are widely documented in rock art in western Colorado and eastern Utah.

Cole (1990:pl.101; 106; figs. 85, 93-95, 100, 101)

illustrates pedestrian shield bearers in Colorado from the lower Gunnison north to the Yampa (figures 15,16). The Yampa work she designates as possibly of both Eastern Shoshone and Ute origin. Thus there is some degree of ambiguity in knowing which Numic group did the rock art, although she favors an eastern Shoshone origin for the more complex figures (Cole 1990:216; 229). Cole (1990:Map 10) draws the northern boundary of the Ute at the Yampa, consistent with boundaries shown by Stewart (1982: Map 2). Other scholars commonly show the Yampa as falling within Ute territory, adjoining the southern boundary of the Shoshone closer to or even north of the Wyoming line (map 1; see also Fowler and Fowler 1971:Map 2). Thus the many pedestrian shield bearers that she illustrates could all be Ute. Regardless, Numic speakers, including the Ute were representing pedestrian warriors with body shields in their rock art.

In addition, Buckles (1971:1083-1084) notes that the Ute Prehistory Project recorded both non-historic and historic shield figures, that he estimates date from the earliest horse acquisition (early in the 17th century, see p. 9, this ms.) to 1830. Buckles (1971:Fig. 146) designates shield figures at the Dry Fork Site (5DT1) in western Colorado as early historic Ute, although Cole (1990:193) refers to these as possibly Fremont. The large feathers hanging over the face of on of these shields (Cole 1990:Fig. 85) strongly suggests to me that they are Ute, as the indicated feathers resemble those on historic shields, and I have never seen them represented in this manner in prehistoric art.

Buckles (1971: Fig. 153) illustrates other pedestrian warriors with shields at Cushman Creek (5MN64). He notes (1971:1083) that shields are individualistic in pattern and few repeat each other.

In addition, he points out that the Huschers recorded a site with three shield figures "including an unmounted one in a historic battle scene," in an unpublished manuscript (Department of Anthropology, at the University of Colorado, Boulder). Huscher (1939: Pl. 1) illustrates, however, pedestrian shield bearers in a historic battle scene (note the rifles) from the Uncompaghre Plateau.

Also of interest is a painting from Westwater Creek of the Book Cliffs area of east central Utah of a large shield bearer with a headdress of tightly curved bison horns (figures 17, 18). The figure is in motion with long legs and feet moving to the left. The possibility that this shield bearer is a Ute production is strongly suggested by the fact that it is stylistically unlike the static, characteristic of Fremont productions with legs parallel and proportionately shorter, the fact that this figure was used on Wormington's A Reappraisal of the Fremont Culture notwithstanding. Cole notes, however, that it appears to be older than the brighter figures of Ute origin above and to the left on this rock face. However, in an earlier photograph of this painting in Wormington in 1955 (Fig. 51, upper) the shield bearer and elements lack the weathering and attrition visible in Cole's photograph, and all of the paintings appear to be equally as bright. Thus a Ute origin for this figure is implied. Other

Westwater shields illustrated by Wormington (1955:Figure 62f-1) may be Ute as well, some of which are rayed as if they were feathered.

Other Ute shields occur as petroglyphs in San Juan County, Utah (figures 19, 20). The shield bearer has a horned headdress nearly identical to the Book Cliff figure. Since the San Juan petroglyph is unequivocally Ute in origin, the headdress adds support to the Ute attribution of the Book Cliff painting.

Although hardly diagnostic in form, it is worth pointing out that the design on the Book Cliffs shield employs pie-shaped divisions, not unlike those on Pectol shields 11 and 191. Other rock art shields, unequivocally Ute, have wedge or pie-shaped divisions similar to those on the Pectol shields. One of these is a second shield in the 1858 Ute Raid panel in Canyon del Muerto, Arizona (Loendorf 2001:figure 6, center) where an equestrian Ute warrior holds such a shield (figure 21). The other is at the well-known site at Thompson, Utah (figure 22)--cut off in Loendorf's Figure 7, right. This shield has faint, but nevertheless clearly present, incised pie-shaped designs, as well as painted areas in red that slightly taper toward the center. Pectol shields 11 and 191 have a similar kind of patterning.

Closer in provenience to the Pectol shield stash, Wellmann (1979:Fig. 588) illustrates a figure holding a lance and a large shield lacking an interior design from Capitol Reef National Park. Horsemen and a bison accompany the man with the shield.

Finally circular motifs among the petroglyphs at the

Newspaper Rock site in Indian Creek are thought to be shields. These include a concentric design, one shield divided into four parts and another with wedge-shaped divisions looking something like a wagon wheel. There are no shield bearers in this clearly Ute panel.

To summarize the rock art evidence, in spite of the ambiguities regarding cultural origins previously considered, we can conclude, nevertheless, that there are numerous instances of Ute rock art in which pedestrian shield warriors are pictured, thus lending support to the Ute authorship of the large Pectol shields from central Utah. While designs are so variable that only rarely, if ever, can they be used as determining factor in regard to ethnicity, the designs on the Pectol shields certainly are not inconsistent with a Ute attribution. Historic Ute shields and rock art shields are similarly patterned as are Pectol shield 11 and 191.(4) These similarities stand in contrast to the substantial number of Navajo rock art shields described earlier that are close in date to the presumed age of the Pectol shields, and for which the designs are totally unlike those on the Pectol shields.

Material Culture. One of the problems in evaluating Ute origins for the Pectol shields is that there is a scarcity of Ute material culture for comparison, in contrast with large numbers of material cultural items of the Apache, Navajo, and various Plains groups. This in itself may erroneously bias any

investigation against Ute cultural origins for the shields.

In a recent statement, Craig Bates (2000:149) notes that "As with other Ute arts, there are few examples in museum collections known to have been collected from the Ute," citing Torrence (1994:157). Bates refers to parfleches that the Ute acquired from the Sioux or other tribes, including some collected from the northern Ute, that "appear so similar to those of Plateau groups, that they must have been made in that style by the Ute, or more likely obtained by trade or purchase from Plateau people." Further he goes on to say that many Ute parfleches are painted with designs that resemble those of the Jicarilla Apache or other Plains groups.

In addition, Bates describes the "probably prehistoric pieces" found north of Price. This implies that these have not been dated and are not necessarily prehistoric. Most importantly he notes that "Like Apache, Comanche, and some Ute parfleches, these patterns are indeed similar to Western Columbia River Plateau painted parfleches." He also notes (2000:149) that Ute parfleches are painted with patterns that often resemble those of their Jicarilla Apache neighbors and those of Southern Plains groups.

In addition, Pectol shield 11 has triangular patterns incised on the reverse side. Lanford (2001:11; 25) states that the removal of epidermis to create a design on the reverse side of the shield is a Plains practice and that Plateau tribes used incising on parfleches and other objects. Kluckhohn et al.

(1971:369) describes incised figurative motifs on Navajo shields. Although this technique does not reveal the ethnic identity of the makers of the shield, the fact that it was widespread, make it likely that the Utes would also have utilized it.

Again, in regard to the painting of rawhide objects, Bates (2000:148-149) clearly states that the Utes mixed their paints with glue. It will be recalled that the Pectol shields are covered with a kind of sizing that Lanford recognizes as part of the original product, and not a later "preservative." To quote Bates: "After the hide with its painted pattern had dried, a varnish-like coating, most commonly of prickly pear cactus juice, was applied to make the pattern water resistant." In contrast, sizing was not used on Pueblo or Apache shields. Thus this finish is an argument for the Pectol shields being Ute in origin, as opposed to Apachean or Pueblo.

An additional source for a discussion of Ute material culture is Wroth (2000) who also discusses the use of sizing on rawhide painted objects. Wroth (2000:Figures 27 and 28) illustrates two Ute shields. One of these, dated between 1840 and 1865, is green with a red circle in the center and red top edge, while the remainder of the shield is green. The second shield has a quadripartite pie-shaped division painted in green and yellow around a small central circle.

Ethnographic data gathered between 1936 and 1937 further confirm the use by the Utes of buffalo hide shields:

"The buffalo-hide shield was used by all three Northern Ute

groups. It was round and about 2 feet in diameter. It was made by cutting a disk from a buffalo hide, placing this in a dish-shaped hole dug in the ground, and covering it with hot rocks to shape and harden it. . . . Buckskin thongs were attached to the center of the shield, both front and back to hold it with. When not in use, it was carried on a man's back (Smith 1974:113)."

Smith (1974) also describes a variety of paint sources and colors used by native (pre-contact) northern Ute: Red - iron ore; black - hard black mud from southwestern Utah, green - from soaking leaves of willow, cottonwood, and other plants, blue - from berry juice, white from lime mud, and yellow from earth sources. Most of these colors are represented on the Pectol shields, so that these colors are not inconsistent with what is known about Ute craft practices.

The Territory: Archaeological/Historical Contexts of the Pectol Shields.

One of the most reliable means of determining the ethnicity of the Pectol shields--whose cultural origins may be ambiguous in their own right--is to identify who occupied this region of Utah between A.D. 1500 and 1700. In this case, the evidence is straightforward, as this was exclusively Ute territory in the early historic period and probably earlier (see below) (maps 1 and 2; see also map in C. Schaafsma 1996: Fig. 2.1; 2002:Fig. 9.5; Stewart 1982:Map 2).

Archaeological data, including point types and Uncompaghre Brown ware ceramics, after A.D. 1400 are thought represent a Numic presence in eastern Utah and western Colorado by that date or even earlier. There is a growing consensus among archaeologists working in eastern Utah and western Colorado (Buckles 1971; Nickens 1982; Reed 1988; C. Schaafsma 1996, among others) that the Numic speaking ancestors of the historic Ute were occupying that region from about A.D. 1350 until they were first described by European explorers in the 1760s (Auerbach 1943; Cutter 1977; Jacobs 1992) and 1770s (Warner and Chavez 1976). "Overall, the historical documents and

Miera and Pacheco's maps are solid enough to allow us to extend Callaway's, Janetski's and Stewart's map of Ute country [1986:fig. 1] back to the 1680s with a high degree of confidence and to begin to take the position that the country north of the San Juan/Navajo Rivers had been Ute territory since A.D. 1400 or 1500. General summaries of Ute archaeology for western Colorado (Buckles 1971; A.D. Reed 1988) and southeastern Utah (Black et al. 1982; Nickens 1982) place the Utes in those parts of their historic range by A.D. 1300-1400" (C. Schaafsma 1996:38).

In addition, C. Schaafsma (1996:38) maintains that all of the country north of the San Juan was Ute territory after c. 1400.

In a later publication, Reed proposes that Numic populations lived alongside the Fremont after A.D. 1100 (Reed 1994; 1988:91).

Fremont termination dates, probably around A.D. 1300 have been widely debated, but archeological evidence indicates that around that time that the Fremont were replaced by Numic populations, or ancestral Utes. In summary, the Utes have a long history in east-central Utah.

While Lanford (2001:16) claims that Athapaskans were in Utah by A.D. 1500, this is not substantiated by archaeology. There is no archaeological evidence whatsoever that Apacheans ever occupied east central Utah. Lanford, while making a strong assertion for an early Apachean presence in central Utah uses the circular argument that the leather pieces he describes are so certainly of Apachean origin that they in themselves prove the point - that Apacheans were present! Theories of Athapaskan migrations are well summarized in this quote from C. Schaafsma (1996:27):

Buckles, working in western Colorado, considered the Athapaskan route of migration and ". . . concluded that it was through the Plains and the Prairie regions rather than the montane or intermontane region" (1971:1327-28). He also proposed the theory that Athapaskans occupied areas such as Navajo Reservoir as the result of historic migrations from the east "and that perhaps northwestern New Mexico was occupied earlier by the Utes" (Buckles 1971:1329-30).

Nickens (1982:37) summarized the prehistory and protohistory of southeastern Utah north of the San Juan River and regarded the presence of Navajos in that area as the result

of a northward expansion into southeastern Utah from northwestern New Mexico. As far as generalized Apacheans or Apaches as such are concerned, he took the position that "the presence of Apache groups in southeastern Utah has not been documented and probably never occurred" (Nickens 1982:37). By 1984 it seemed extremely unlikely that the Southern Athapaskans came south via the intermontane route. As Wilcox maintained in 1988 "the most plausible route for early Apachean migration continues to be the High Plains" (Wilcox 1988:275).

Although a hotly contested subject at the moment, archaeological evidence backed by historical documents, indicate that Navajos were not in northwestern New Mexico and adjoining parts of southern Colorado until after A.D. 1680 (C.Schaafsma 2002). Both archaeological evidence and historic documents show that Apacheans entered the Southwest from the Great Plains around A.D. 1500 (C. Schaafsma 2002). Subsequently, Navajo and various Apachean groups became differentiated, moving west and south into New Mexico, West Texas, and Arizona. There is no substantial evidence for a Navajo presence in northern Arizona until after 1700, and probably in no significant numbers until after 1750 (C. Schaafsma 1996).

In conclusion, lacking any evidence on the basis of technology or design that these shields are Southwestern (ie. Apachean or Pueblo), and given the strong evidence for central

Utah being uncontested Ute territory during the late protohistoric/early historic period from which the Pectol shields date, it is only reasonable to believe that these shields are Ute and that other caches of hide objects in north-central are also Ute in origin.

ORAL TRADITION

In today's archaeological arena, oral tradition has been given a place alongside more traditional historical and archaeological data to address problems concerning the past. Oral tradition has played a role in trying to establish the cultural origins of the Pectol shields (Federal Register: Dec. 7, 2001 (vol. 66(236)).

There are two claims at stake here. The first is the statement "that Navajo oral tradition places Navajo ancestors in the park area prior to Euro-American settlement" (Fed. Register 66(236). This is insupportable archaeologically. As discussed previously, the archeological evidence indicates an ancestral Ute presence in central Utah back to A.D. 1300 or earlier. There is no Navajo archeology in central Utah.

Secondly, is the claim described in the same Federal Register document regarding the battle with the Spanish and the making of the shields by Many Goats White Hair and others. As previously described the technology of and the designs on the shields do not support a Navajo origin for the shields.

Oral Tradition as Data. Although NAGPRA regulations specify the need to take oral traditions into account in repatriation situations, there are numerous problems with this that I would like to point out here. The validity of oral tradition used in the context of western historical paradigms has been addressed at length by Mason (2000; and Schaafsma and Schaafsma 1996). This is contentious issue, and a recent *American Antiquity* (65(2):239-290), has sponsored two opposing views: those of Mason (pp. 239-266), who questions the use of oral tradition as data and that of Echo-Hawk (pp. 267-290) who supports it.

To quote from Mason (2000:263): " Like religion, you believe oral tradition or you don't. And although, as with religion, there may be pieces of history embedded in particular oral traditions, they must be teased out by adherence to the rules of rational inquiry."

Further he concludes (Mason 2000:264):

As stated elsewhere . . . archaeologists, like scientists, generally are charged with truth-seeking, however elusive it may be and however displacing or not of "other ways of knowing." While the purveyors of the older wisdoms are to be respected as people, their recountings of ancientness are challengeable when they are thought of as data roughly on a par with, say, dendrochronology, seriation, or site distribution maps. Current calls for cross-cultural historiographic

integration notwithstanding, it is the conclusion of this essay that oral traditions are more often than not roadblocks than bridges to archaeologists aspiring to "know what happened in history."

Native oral traditions and western history do not share the same goals and values, and thus a mix of the two is fraught with problems. In the context of trying to identify the cultural origins of the Pectol shields and the use of oral tradition, I would like to draw attention to the testimony--oral tradition, if you will--of Bishop Pectol and the Mormon church. While the Mormon church has not made a claim for the shields, it very well could, given the current political environment. Included in the literature on the Pectol shields is Bishop Pectol's reading of the meaning of the designs on the shields (Pectol manuscript 1926). Bishop Pectol was a knowledgeable member of the church, and his interpretation of the meanings in the designs is integrated and detailed. If his interpretation were to be thought credible--which lacks articulation with the history of this continent as reconstructed by the scientific community--Pectol's statements could become the "basis" for yet another claim, on equal footing with any other story. We need to remind ourselves that the need to justify the whole archeological data base for the New World in order to counter Mormon mythology is positively ludicrous!

How does one give priority to one oral tradition or the

other, given the total lack of archaeological evidence on either side of the question?

In turn, it follows that the lack of oral traditions by a tribe filing a claim for the shields should in no way influence or weigh the arguments against cultural affiliation. The fact that the Navajo have an oral tradition that works to substantiate their claims of ownership of the shields should not weigh the case in their favor, as the validity of such claims is highly questionable in the first place. In this environment, the lack of Ute oral traditions in regard to the shields means nothing. As one tries to solve the problem of the cultural origin of the shields, and one is again thrown back on the material data themselves and geographic context in which the shields were discovered, the weight of the evidence supports Ute origins for the Pectol shields.

CONCLUSIONS

This investigator's conclusion regarding the cultural affiliation of the Pectol shields is grounded in a combination of factors: the radio carbon dates, and most importantly the known cultural provenience out of which they came. Translations of Spanish documents only recently available (see C. Schaafsma 2002) provide no evidence that this was Athabaskan territory at any time in Utah's history. East-central Utah was clearly Ute

territory during the late Protohistoric and historic centuries within which the shields are dated. Therefore without strong alternative evidence for another cultural attribution that was necessarily intrusive, one cannot escape the conclusion that the shields are Ute, since they were found well within territory that has been in Ute hands since c. A.D. 1300.

A case has been made against the reliability of oral tradition. As for the shields themselves, they display no formal attributes that can convincingly be marshalled for any particular cultural affiliation. Given the widespread sharing of designs on painted leather goods in the early historic period, the patterns on the Pectol shields are not a reliable means for determining ethnic origin of these shields. Yet there is nothing about these designs that argues against a Ute origin. In fact I have shown that a number of rock art shields attributed to the Utes are similarly patterned. Furthermore, a strong case can be made that there is no resemblance whatsoever between these shields and Navajo shields from approximately, or better yet, the very same age. Finally, the presence of sizing on the face of the shields argues against Navajo or Pueblo manufacture.

NOTES

- 1 Loendorf and Conner (1993) reference Pectol shield No. 11 as 191, No. 191 as 11

- 2 A common Pueblo IV (A.D. 1325-1680) shield design that seems to be exclusive to the Pueblos of this period is one in which the shield is divided two-thirds of the way up and from this line hang large triangular motifs (see Schaafsma 2001:Fig. 3.8a and b).
- 3 MIAC stands for the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture.
- 4 Loendorf states that the designs are unlike those on Ute shields. To quote (2001:1) "Ute shield designs and colors correspond to some degree with those on the Pectol shields, but Ute rock art shield figures do not exhibit designs such as those found on the Pectol specimens." He does not specify what he means by this, although he may be referring to the crescent shaped elements on a Ute shield from Thompson Wash (Loendorf 2001: fig. 7). He claims this design occurs on another Ute shield in the Ute raid panel in Canyon de Chelly dated 1858, although the latter is smudged and difficult to fathom (Loendorf 2001:figure 6, left). Regardless, it is impossible to disprove the Ute origin of the Pectol shields on the basis of the observation that one clear example of a Ute rock art shield differs from the patterns on the Pectol shields.

REFERENCES CITED =

Auerbach, H. S.

1943 Father Escalante's Journal with Related Documents and Maps.
Utah State Historical Society XI (1,2,3,4):1-142.

Baldwin, Stuart J.

1997 Apacheans Bearing Gifts: Prehispanic Influence on the Pueblo Indians. Arizona Archaeologist 29. Arizona Archaeological Society.

Bates, Craig

2000 An Artistic Style Uniquely Their Own: Baskets, Parfleches and Beaded Clothing of the Ute People. In Ute Indians Arts and Culture: from Prehistory to the New Millenium. edited by W. Wroth, pp.142-178. Taylor Museum, Colorado Springs.

Berger, Rainer, and W. F. Libby

1968 UCLA Radiocarbon Dates VII. Radiocarbon 10:149-160.

Buckles, William

1971 The Uncompahgre Complex: Historic Ute Archaeology and Prehistoric Archaeology on the Uncompahgre Plateau in West Central Colorado. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of

Anthropology, University of Colorado, Boulder.

Callaway, Donald, Joel Janetski, and Omer C. Stewart

1986 Ute. In The Handbook of North American Indians 11. Edited by Warren L. D'Azevedo, pp. 336-367. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Clark, LaVerne Harrell

1966 They Sang for Horses. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Cole, Sally J.

1990 Legacy on Stone: Rock Art of the Colorado Plateau and Four Corners Region. Johnson Books, Boulder, Colorado.

Conner, Stuart W.

1985 Shield Design Comparison: Pectol et al. Report submitted to Capitol Reef National Park.

Cutter, D. C.

1977 Prelude to a Pageant in the Wilderness. The Western Historical Quarterly. 8(1):5-14.

Echo-Hawk, Roger C.

2000 Ancient History in the New World: Integrating Oral Traditions and the Archaeological Record in Deep Time. American Antiquity 65(2):267-290

Ferg, Alan, and William B. Kessel

1987 Ritual. In Western Apache Material Culture: The Goodwin and Guenther Collections, Alan Ferg, editor, pp. 109-152. The Arizona State Museum. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Fowler, Don D., and Catherine S. Fowler, eds.

1971 Anthropology of the Numa: John Wesley Powell's Manuscripts on the Numic People of Western North America, 1868-1880. Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology, No. 14, Washington, D.C.

Grant, Campbell

1967 Rock Art of the American Indian. Crowell Publishers, New York.

Hotz, Gottfried

1970 Indian Skin Paintings from the American Southwest. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Huscher, Harold A.

1939 Influence of the Drainage Patterns of the Uncompaghre Plateau on the Movements of Primitive Peoples. Southwestern Lore 5:22-40.

Jacobs, G. C.

1992 The Phantom Pathfinder: Juan Maria Antonio de Rivera and his

Expedition. Utah Historical Quarterly. 60:200-223.

Keyser, James D., and Michael A. Klassen

2001 Plains Indian Rock Art. University of Washington Press,
Seattle and London; UBC Press, Vancouver and Toronto.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, W.W. Hill, and Lucy Wales Kluckhohn

1971 Navajo Material Culture. Belknap Press of Harvard University
Press, Cambridge.

Kruetzer, Lee Ann

1994 The Pectol Collection, Capitol Reef National Park, Utah.
Utah Archaeology 7(1):104-116.

Lanford, Benson L.

2001 Tribal Attribution of the Pectol Shields, Capitol Reef
National Park, Utah. Manuscript on file, Capitol Reef
National Park.

Lanford, Benson L., and Pamela W. Miller

2000 Late Prehistoric Painted Rawhide and Leather Artifacts from
Utah. American Indian Art Magazine, Summer 2000.

Loendorf, Lawrence

2001 The Pectol Shields: A Repatriation Study. Manuscript on
file, Capitol Reef National Park, Utah.

Loendorf, Lawrence, and Stuart Conner

1993 The Pectoral Shields and the Shield-Bearing Warrior Rock Art Motif. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 15(2):216-224.

Lutonsky, Anthony F.

1998 Implements of Close Encounter: Shock Weapon Systems of the Pre-Historic Southwest. Paper presented in the symposium "Archaeology and Architecture of Tactical Sites." Meeting of the Arizona Archaeological Council, Flagstaff.

Marwitt

1986 Handbook of North American Indians. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Mason, Ronald J.

2000 Archaeology and Native American Oral Traditions. American Antiquity 65(2):239-266.

McCoy, Ronald

1984 Circles of Power. Plateau 55(4): . Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff.

Newcomb, Franc J., and Gladys A. Reichard

1937 Sandpaintings of the Navajo Shooting Chant. J.J. Augustin, New York. (Dover edition 1975).

Nickens, P.R.

1982 A Summary of the Prehistory of Southeastern Utah. In Contributions to the Prehistory of Southeastern Utah, assembled by S. G. Baker, pp.xxxx, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, Salt Lake City.

1988 Introduction. In Archaeology of the Eastern Ute: A Symposium, edited by Paul R. Nickens, pp. 1-4. CCPA Occasional Papers No. 1. Colorado Council of Professional Archaeologists, Denver.

Pectol, Ephraim P.

1926 The Shields. Manuscript on file, Capitol Reef National Park, Utah.

1926 Wonders of Wayne's Wonderland Manuscript on file, Capitol Reef National Park, Utah.

Petersen, Karen Daniels

1988 American Pictographic Images: Historical Works on Paper by Plains Indians. Alexander Gallery and Morningstar Gallery. Village Craftsmen, Inc./Princeton Polychrome Press, New York.

Reed, Alan D.

1988 Ute Cultural Chronology. In Archaeology of the Eastern Ute: A Symposium, edited by Paul R. Nickens, pp. 79-101. CCPA Occasional Papers No. 1. Colorado Council of Professional

Archaeologists, Denver.

- 1994 The Numic Populations of Western Colorado and Eastern Utah During the Prehistoric and Protohistoric Periods. In Across the West: Human Population Movement and Expansion of the Numa, edited by David B. Madsen and David Rhode, pp. 188-199. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Reichard, Gladys A.

- 1950 Navaho Religion: A Study of Symbolism. vols. I and II. Bollingen Series XVIII, Pantheon Books, Bollingen Foundation Inc., New York.

Schaafsma, Curtis F.

- 1996 Ethnic Identity and Protohistoric Archaeological Sites in Northwestern new Mexico: Implications for Reconstructions of Navajo and Ute History. In The Archaeology of Navajo Origins, edited by Ronald H. Towner, pp. 19-XX. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
- 2002 Apaches de Navajo. University of Utah Press.

Schaafsma, Polly

- 1963 Rock Art in the Navajo Reservoir District. Papers in Anthropology 7, Museum of New Mexico Press, Santa Fe.
- 1971 The Rock Art of Utah. Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology 65, Harvard University, Cambridge. (Reprinted by the University of Utah Press 1994).

- 1978 Rock Art in the White Canyon Basin. In An Archaeological Survey of the Upper White Canyon Area of Southeastern Utah, by Philip M. Hobler and Audrey E. Hobler, pp. 66-72. Antiquities Section Selected Papers 13. Department of Development Services, Division of State History, Salt Lake City.
- 1980 Indian Rock Art of the Southwest. School of American Research and the University of New Mexico Press, Santa Fe and Albuquerque.
- 1992 Rock Art New Mexico. (2nd Edition). Museum of New Mexico Press, Santa Fe.
- 2000 Warrior, Shield, and Star. Western Edge Press, Santa Fe.

Schaafsma, Curtis F. and Polly Schaafsma

- 1996 Traditional Narratives and Archaeology. In La Jornada: Papers in Honor of William F. Turney, edited by Meliha S. Duran and David T. Kirkpatrick, pp. 171-178. The Archaeological Society of New Mexico: 22. Albuquerque.

Smith, Anne M. Cooke

- 1974 Ethnography of the Northern Ute. Museum of New Mexico Papers in Anthropology 17. Santa Fe.

Smith, Watson

- 1052 Kiva Mural Decorations at Awatovi and Kawaika-a. Papers of

the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 37.
(Reports of the Awatovi Expedition No. 5), Harvard
University, Cambridge.

Stewart, Omer C.

1982 Indians of the Great Basin: A Critical Bibliography.

Published for the Newberry Library, Indiana University
Press, Bloomington.

Tipps, Betsy L.

1995 Holocene Archaeology Near Squaw Butte, Canyonlands National

Park, Utah. Selections from the Division of Cultural
Resources 7, Cultural Resources Report 411-14-9102, Rocky
Mountain Region, National Park Service, Denver.

Towner, Ronald H., ed.

1996 The Archaeology of Navajo Origins. University of Utah

Press, Salt Lake City.

Tyler, S. Lyman

1954 The Spaniard and the Ute. Utah Historical Quarterly 22:343-
361.

Underhill, Ruth

1953 Here Come the Navajo! Department of the Interior, Bureau of
Indian Affairs, Branch of Education. Haskell Institute,

Lawrence, Kansas.

Warner, T. J., and A. Chavez

1976 The Domínguez-Escalante Journal. Brigham Young University
Press. Provo.

Wellmann, Klaus

1979 North American Indian Rock Art. Graz, Austria.

Wilcox, David A.

1988

Wormington, H.M.

1955 A Reappraisal of the Fremont Culture. Proceedings of the
Denver Museum of Natural History, No. 1. Denver.

Wright, Barton A.

1976 Pueblo Shields: From the Fred Harvey Fine Arts Collection.
Heard Museum, Phoenix.

2001 Professional Evaluation of Cultural Affiliation of Three
Buffalo Hide Shields from Capitol Reef National Park, Utah.
Manuscript on file, Capitol Reef National Park.

Wroth, William

2000 Ute Indian Civilization in Prehistory and the Spanish
Colonial Period. In Ute Indians Arts and Culture: from

Prehistory to the New Millenium. edited by W. Wroth, pp.

53-72

xxxxxx. Taylor Museum of Colorado Springs, Fine Arts Center.

