Defending the Dinétah

Pueblitos in the Ancestral Navajo Homeland

RONALD H. TOWNER

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH PRESS

Salt Lake City

HP021629

Contents

List of Figures viii
List of Tables xi
Acknowledgments xiii

1. Introduction and Background 1

2. Laying a Foundation 21

3. The Dinétah Pueblito Sites 35

4. Temporal and Spatial Patterns of the Pueblito Site Occupations 129

5. Climate, the Navajo Occupation, and Abandonment of the Dinétah 171

6. A New Model of Navajo Ethnogenesis 193

Appendix. Pueblito Site Tree-ring Dates Used in the Analysis but Not Presented in the Text 217

References Cited 235
Index 257

HP021630

defense against such raids was pueblitos, both in terms of their locations and their construction. If the targets of the raids were hidden inside pueblitos located on boulders and near mesa edges, the attackers were forced to dismount in order to capture either slaves or goods—a strategy which eliminated the aspect of speed in the raid and left the attackers vulnerable to counterattacks.

Climate and the Abandonment of Dinétah

Several possible reasons for the Navajo abandonment of the Dinétah have been forwarded over the years. These "pushes" (Anthony 1990) have never been quantitatively defined but include drought and pressure from Ute and Comanche raiding. Drought has been assigned a significant role in the abandonment (Marshall 1995), and the drought of 1748 in particular (Reeve 1958) has been suggested as a cause. Ute and Comanche raiding has also been suggested as the reason for the abandonment (Schroeder 1965:59), as has a combination of both drought and raiding (Carlson 1965; Brugge 1972b). Finally, the shift to a pastoral economy and the need for better grazing and herding areas, precipitated by drought and Ute raiding, has also been proposed as both a cause and a result of the Dinétah abandonment (Haskell 1975).

The correlation between tree cutting and precipitation, and the correlation between pueblito construction and precipitation, suggest that drought had little influence on the abandonment of the area. Certainly, 1748 was a very dry year; indeed, in the Gobernador area precipitation reconstruction it is the driest year in the entire 1348-year chronology. However, two of the preceding three years, 1745 and 1746, were above-average years, and the succeeding year, 1749, was the wettest in almost thirty years. Thus, the "drought" of 1748, which supposedly made the Navajos "amenable to the missionaries' suggestion that they move south to the Cebolleta region" (Reeve 1959:20; Hester 1962a:77) was a single-year event. Other dry years, such as 1729 and 1735, have not been given such importance by those inferring climate as an abandonment push.

In addition to the climatic data, the archaeological data indicate that pueblitos were constructed after the supposed drought. At least seven construction episodes, and possibly several more, at as many as eight sites were completed in the years following 1748. Pueblito construction actually expanded into new areas, such as north of the San Juan River, during this time. Finally, those that advocate that a precipitation deficit was a

critical factor in the abandonment of the Dinétah must explain why the latest construction episodes occurred in 1754, the wettest year since 1720 and second wettest since the first pueblito was constructed in 1680. It is apparent from these data that climate was not one of the "pushes" behind the Navajo exodus from their homeland. Instead, Ute and/or Comanche raiding (Hester 1962a; Reeve 1958) and possibly free-lance Spanish slave raiding (Bailey 1964) appear to have been the primary push factors behind the Navajo emigration.

Before discussing the destinations of Navajo emigrants and the possible "pulls" that attracted them to various areas, it is necessary to discuss the nature of the Navajo occupation in the late 1740s and early 1750s. As discussed in the previous chapter, seven sites contain evidence of occupation in the late 1740s; four of these sites, including three in San Rafael Canyon, also show evidence of occupation in the early 1750s. Only three newly constructed sites, Rabbit House, Gould Pass, and Truby's Tower, were occupied in the early 1750s. Towner and Johnson (1998) indicate that Rabbit House was part of the Old Fort community in San Rafael Canyon; Gould Pass may have been part of the central Cereza community; there is no evidence of a community in the south near Truby's Tower or in the upper Largo. Thus, the final abandonment of the area after 1755 may have involved very few people—only those living in San Rafael Canyon, on top of Ensenada Mesa, and near the confluence of Tapacito Creek and Cañon Largo. If there was ever a "large" Navajo population in the area, a hypothesis that the episodic nature of building construction does not support, emigration must have begun long before the 1740s and 1750s. If, as indicated by the climatic data, drought was not one of the "push factors" (Anthony 1990; Ahlstrom et al. 1995) in the Navajo emigration, I suggest that Ute/Comanche raiding was the primary push factor, and that it began having an impact in the 1720s, if not earlier.

Although no sites in the Dinétah heartland date between 1760 and Bosque Redondo (1860s), a very interesting and potentially significant group of sites northeast of Aztec, New Mexico, deserves mention. Fetterman (1996) reports a 1762v date from a roasting pit at LA 81172. Three Navajo Land Claim sites, N-SJ-LA-D, E and J have yielded noncutting dates ranging from 1530++vv to 1775vv; the earlier dates are obviously dead wood, but the later dates suggest a post-1760 Navajo use of the area, possibly centered on NLC site N-SJ-LA-J (Figure 45), known locally as the "Navajo Fort." Unfortunately, the only dates from this site are 1530++vv, 1576++vv, and 1627++vv. Only N-SJ-LA-E has yielded a

HP021631

Figure 45. Pueblito site NLC-SJ-LA-J (The Navajo Fort)

cutting date, 1746v, but N-SJ-LA-D has yielded two noncutting dates (1771vv and 1775vv) that suggest an occupation in the last few decades of the eighteenth century. This is one area where additional dendrochronological, archaeological, and oral traditional data could contribute significant new information regarding the depopulation of the Dinétah.

If the Navajo had depopulated the Largo-Gobernador area by the 1760s primarily because of raiding, two questions remain. First, what were the destinations of the migrants, and second, what "pull" factors enticed them to new areas? Hester (1962a:84) indicates movement to the south and west, toward the Cebolleta Mountains and Canyon de Chelly. Although I agree with this general trend, the timing, number, and variety of destinations need to be revised.

South of the Largo-Gobernador area, there are three major concentrations of known Navajo archaeological sites, the Big Bead Mesa (Keur 1941), Cebolleta Mesa (Carroll 1979), and Chacra Mesa areas (Brugge 1986; Vivian 1960). Big Bead Mesa has been known for many years and was the type site of the Cabezon Phase (Hester 1962a). Big Bead Mesa itself contains tree-ring dates from the last half of the eighteenth century

Table 22. Non-Dinétah Navajo Sites in New Mexico with Pre-1800 Tree-ring Dates

Site Name or Number	Number of Dates	Earliest Cutting Date	Latest Date	Number of Date Clusters
NLC-S-ULC-CZ-A	20	1510	1834	0
NLC-S-AS-AC-T	1	1628	1628	0
NLC-S-ULC-CZ-C	9	1655	1764	0
NLC-S-ULC-EM-Z	9	1701	1850	0
NLC-S-AS-AM-B	6	1704	1800	0
NLC-S-ULC-UP-MM	4	1721	1762	0
SITE CM-18	3	1725	1745	0
NLC-E-C-UC-N	1	1725	1725	0
SITE CM-38	19	1738	1972	1
STAR LAKE	1	1739	1739	0
LA 5228	2	1747	1752	0
NLC-S-ULC-UP-LL	14	1755	1764	1
BIG BEAD MESA	33	1766	1856	1
NLC-E-RP-MP-W	5	1787	1787	0
NLC-E-RP-CM-K	3	1793	1863	0
NLC-S-ULC-ZR-DD	5	1793	1857	0
NLC-S-ULC-UP-JJ	3	1794	1802	0
NLC-S-AS-AC-BB	5	1796	1797	0
NLC-E-RP-CM-C	1	1796	1796	0

(Table 22). The site has often been considered in isolation; however, a recent analysis of site survey forms of the Anasazi Origins Project and other small projects in the area, lead me to conclude that at least 29 sites near Big Bead Mesa predate A.D. 1800 (Towner 1994). Unfortunately, the data are currently inadequate to refine the temporal association of most of these sites, and the survey coverage is spotty at best. I have no doubt that more, and probably earlier, Navajo sites are located in the area. LA 5228 is one site that certainly predates the abandonment of the Largo-Gobernador area.

A portion of the Cebolleta area near Mount Taylor was surveyed in the late 1970s (Carroll 1979). The survey encompassed approximately 8.45 square miles; 105 Navajo sites were recorded, including at least 299 hogans of various types. Carroll suggests that many of the sites postdate A.D. 1800, but Marshall's (1979) ceramic analysis indicates that at least 11 predate 1750 and two may predate A.D. 1700. Tree-ring data from these sites are limited and include no cutting dates.

The best dated post-Revolt pre-1750s Navajo occupation outside the Largo-Gobernador area is on Chacra Mesa. Through the work of both Vivian (1960) and Brugge (1986), it is obvious that several of the pueblito

HP021632

Table 23. Navajo Sites in Arizona with Pre-1800 Tree-ring Dates

Site Name or Number	Number of Dates	Earliest Cutting Date	Latest Date	Number of Date Clusters
NLC-W-LLC-TS-E	1	1666	1666	0
ARIZONA D:7:4166	8	1691	1890	0
NLC-W-LLC-NJ-B	1	1703	1703	0
NLC-W-LLC-P-F	1	1710	1710	0
NLC-W-LLC-OP-T	1	1711	1711	0
ARIZONA D:11:361	11	1713	1941	0
ARIZONA D:7:276	6	1719	1777	0
NLC-W-LLC-MJ-SSS	9	1720	1882	0
NLC-W-LLC-J-J	1	1723	1723	0
ARIZONA D:7:4163	5	1726	1926	0
NLC-W-LLC-UO-O	2	1728	1817	0
NAZLINI CANYON	18	1751	1762	1
NLC-W-LLC-C-OO	29	1756	1830	2
KINNAZINDE	16	1759	1760	1
NLC-S-MLC-LP-O	8	1762	1764	1
NLC-W-LLC-C-F	5	1765	1809	0
NLC-W-LLC-SM-X	2	1766	1860	0
ARIZONA D:7:228	30	1768	1962	2
NLC-W-LLC-DO-G	2	1772	1788	0
NLC-W-LLC-MJ-DD	4	1772	1806	0
CC 351 (NPS)	45	1773	1773	0
ARIZONA D:7:504	4	1775	1865	0
ARIZONA D:12:213	7	1775	1891	2
NLC-S-ULC-UP-R	4	1777	1802	0
ARIZONA D:7:534	8	1782	1812	0
NLC-W-LLC-C-B	11	1793	1803	1
ARIZONA D:12:215	12	1793	1862	1
NLC-W-LLC-UO-Q	1	1795	1795	0
NLC-W-LLC-C-CC	2	1795	1828	0
NLC-W-LLC-MJ-III	1	1797	1797	0
NLC-S-ULC-UP-P	1	1798	1798	0
NLC-W-LLC-C-E	8	1798	1839	0

sites in the area were occupied before the Largo-Gobernador area was abandoned. The Shepherd site, variously recorded as NLC-E-C-UC-L, CM-38, and CH-K5, was clearly built in the fall of 1739 (Vivian 1960) with both freshly cut and stockpiled timbers (LTRR files). It contains the largest number of pre-1750 cutting dates of any site outside the Largo-Gobernador area, but other sites such as CM-18, also were contemporaneous with Dinétah area pueblitos. One site on Chacra Mesa that has not been tree-ring dated, the Doll House Site (29SJ1613), contains a ceramic assemblage typical of eighteenth-century pueblitos and was probably occupied prior to 1750 (Brugge 1986). In addition to those on Chacra and

Figure 46. Pueblito site NLC-LLC-UO-DD in Upper Oraibi Wash

Big Bead Mesas, undated pueblitos that were probably occupied at the same time as or slightly later than those in Dinétah are located near Chaco Wash (Reher 1977:54) and on Lobo Mesa (Winter et al. 1993:81).

Navajo sites in areas to the west tend to date later than 1755 (Bannister, Dean, and Gell 1966; Bannister, Hannah, and Robinson 1966), but there is still evidence that some were occupied prior to that time (Table 23). Twelve sites contain pre-1755 cutting dates, but most cannot be analyzed because of the lack of provenience and assemblage information. Gilpin (1996) discusses probable pre-1800 sites near Canyon de Chelly, on the Defiance Plateau, in the Black Creek Valley, and on Black Mesa. Although most of the pueblitos and fortified crags near Canyon de Chelly (James 1976) postdate 1755, several forked-pole hogans sites, including the Lone Tule Wash and the Sheep Dip Creek sites, contain ceramic assemblages suggesting pre-1770s occupations (Gilpin 1996:185–86). Interestingly, pueblito site NLC-LLC-UO-DD in Upper Oraibi Wash, appears very similar to boulder-top pueblitos in the Dinétah (Figure 46). Tree-ring samples from the site yielded only one near-cutting date 1790+G, and the site description is somewhat meager.

Navajo and Hopi oral traditions indicate that Hopis fleeing the destruction of Awatovi in 1700 joined an extant Navajo community in

HP021633

Canyon de Chelly; oral traditions also indicate that the Navajo Taachii'nii Clan is descended from Awatovi survivors who settled at Tachii, a spring at the eastern edge of Black Mesa (Gilpin 1996:171). Navajo oral traditions also suggest a pre-1700 occupation of the Grand Canyon area (Begay and Roberts 1996). Thus, it is highly probable that at least some sites west of the Chuska Mountains were occupied prior to 1755 and the abandonment of Dinétah.

The "pulls" that attracted the Navajos to various areas outside the Largo-Gobernador area have yet to be identified. Climate, which was "improving" in the mid-1750s in the Largo-Gobernador area, was also improving in the Big Bead Mesa, Cebolleta Mesa, Canyon de Chelly, and Black Mesa areas (Dean and Robinson 1977). Thus, there was no environmental gradient (cf. Ahlstrom et al. 1995) that made any of these areas more attractive, from a climatic standpoint, than the Largo-Gobernador area.

The idea that the Navajo were seeking better pastures for their expanding herds (Haskell 1975) has not been seriously tested. Historical references (Hill 1940) indicate that a few small herds were present, but their importance in the Navajo economy is still unknown. Bailey and Bailey (1986) indicate that sheep herding did not become important until after the abandonment of Dinétah. Although Marshall (1991:249) suggests that sheep corrals and lamb pens are present near some pueblitos, surveys around other pueblitos (Dykeman and Wharton 1996; Towner and Johnson 1998) have failed to locate any features related to pastoralism. There is simply no solid evidence that sheep and the desire for good pastures were a pull factor in the abandonment. There is more evidence that sheep herding grew *after* the Navajo left Dinétah, but that cannot be cited as a pull factor in the decision to leave the area.

Another factor that has not been examined, but that deserves close scrutiny, is the possibility of overhunting. There are references throughout the historical period to the Navajo trading buckskins to the pueblos (cf. Hammond and Rey 1966). The faunal remains at pueblito sites (Brown and Brown 1995) routinely include deer bones, but the overall numbers are relatively small. There is archaeological evidence of antelope procurement in substantial quantities (Reynolds et al. 1984). It remains to be seen whether the overexploitation of deer and pronghorn contributed to the Navajo decision to emigrate, but this may be a fruitful line of investigation in the future. Historical records, including procurement documents such as supply orders or bills of sale, may be particularly important in this regard.

HP021634

If Ute and Comanche raiding was the primary push factor in the emigration from Dinétah, security from such raids may have been the primary pull factor. The movement south toward Big Bead Mesa and the nearby Spanish settlements suggests that protection from raids was important. Indeed, some Navajos requested Spanish protection from Ute predation (Reeve 1959), and such requests may have been a factor in the establishment of missions at Cebolleta and Encinal in 1749 (Hackett 1937). Spanish military force may have been a factor in the decision for those Navajos who moved south, but cannot account for movements to the west. Brugge (1986:142–43) suggests that while Dinétah was occupied, the Chacra Mesa area was unattractive to raiders. One might infer that distance from the Dinétah, and the bases of raiders, was a factor in deciding where to move—provided there was an extant Navajo population willing to incorporate the migrants. Distance, however, may not have provided enough security, and other conflicts may have developed. That security was important is evidenced by the construction of several pueblitos west of the Chuskas, such as Kinnazinde, Ganado Crag, and Nazlini Pueblito in the early 1760s (Gilpin 1996). Battles with the Ute have also been documented as far west as Bidahochi in northeast Arizona (K. Kelley, personal communication). Thus, whereas security from Ute raiding seems adequate as a pull factor into the Big Bead Mesa and Cebolleta Mesa areas, it remains suspect for areas west of the mountains.

SUMMARY

Climate has certainly had an impact on the Navajo entry into, occupation, and abandonment of the Dinétah. The relationships between climate and these processes, however, are sometimes not what could be expected. The archaeological data are still too sparse to unequivocally determine when the first Navajos moved into the Dinétah; we do know that when some Navajos were living in forked-pole hogans near the San Juan River, climate was relatively favorable for agriculture (Hancock 1997; Sesler and Hovezak 1996). We also know that climate, or at least precipitation, fluctuated during the occupation of the pueblito sites. The positive correlation between tree-cutting, pueblito construction, and above average precipitation seems to be more related to Ute raiding than to environmental stress on the Navajos. I infer that it was Ute security in above-average years that prompted them to attempt slave raids against the Navajo, who responded by building boulder-top pueblitos as a defensive measure.

Climate appears to have played a minor role, if any, in the depopulation of the Dinétah. The factors driving the Navajo emigration, therefore, are unlike those postulated for the migrations of earlier occupants of the Colorado Plateau (Ahlstrom et al. 1995). The Navajo migration, however, was similar in that it was a long, complex process, not a sudden catastrophe precipitated by an environmental crisis.

HP021635

CHAPTER 6

A New Model of Navajo Ethnogenesis

> The significant question, in my mind, is not whether there has been Puebloan introgression, but when it took place, the rate of incorporation, and the conditions under which it took place (Brugge 1996:256).

The dendrochronology of the pueblitos and earlier forked-pole hogans in the Largo-Gobernador area has profound implications for reconstructing early Navajo history and development. Previous models of when the Athapaskans/Navajos entered the area, when, how, why and by whom the pueblitos were built, the nature of the relationships between masonry structures and forked-pole hogans on pueblito sites, the degree of mobility of the pueblito site occupants, and the rate of abandonment of the area all must be reevaluated in light of these data. The reevaluation presented here proposes important changes in the way we interpret Navajo culture history and development, as well as shows the relevance of these data for broader issues of culture processes that may not be as obvious in fully prehistoric contexts.

Two generalized models of the Athapaskan entry into the Southwest and subsequent development of Navajo culture have provided much of the theoretical basis for interpreting Navajo archaeological materials (Towner 1997). These models of Navajo origins and ethnogenesis, which I term the "Late Entry, High Plains–Refugee Hypothesis Model" and the "Early Entry, Mountain Route–Refugee Hypothesis Model" are summarized below and shown in Figures 47 and 48. I should emphasize that no single individual has espoused all the positions indicated. Indeed, there

Both models are relatively silent on the issues surrounding other Athapaskan-speakers in the Southwest. Although some efforts have been made to trace the development of the Western Apache, the models have generally relied on historical (Forbes 1960; Schroeder 1963, 1965, 1974), linguistic (Hoijer 1971; Opler 1983) and ethnographic data (Basso 1971; Goodwin 1942). This reliance is due primarily to the lack of comparable archaeological remains for the Apache (Gregory 1981), but also reflects the relatively spectacular nature of the Navajo sites in the Largo-Gobernador area. Unfortunately, I am forced to follow this trend and discuss only the Navajo.

Migration into the Dinétah

After decades of relative inattention, migration has again become a topic of interest in archaeology (Anthony 1990; Cameron 1995; Herr and Clark 1996). Thought of as a "nonexplanation" and "culture-history" by the New Archaeology of the 1970s (Cameron 1995), migration has recently been revived as a structured human behavior amenable to study by archaeologists (Anthony 1990). Two aspects of the Navajo occupation of the Dinétah are relevant to discussions of migration: immigration into the area by the initial Navajo/Athapaskan population, and the proposed immigration of the Puebloan "refugees" fleeing the Reconquest.

The immigration of the initial Athapaskan/Navajo people into the Dinétah has been characterized as (a) a slow filtering of Athapaskan-speaking "proto-Navajo" into the area in the late prehistoric and protohistoric periods (Schaafsma 1996; Wilcox 1981) and later, a massive and sudden immigration of Puebloans into the area following the Spanish Reconquest or (b) a sudden and massive immigration of Athapaskans and Puebloan refugees from the east into the area following the Reconquest (Schaafsma 1996). The differences depend on whether or not a particular researcher believes that a small population of Athapaskan/Navajo lived in the area prior to the Pueblo Revolt and was joined by a substantial number of Puebloans (Bailey 1964; Bailey and Bailey 1986), or that the Navajo were living elsewhere and moved into the area with the Puebloans (Schaafsma 1981, 1996). Support for the first immigration of a small preexisting Navajo population generally has been based on negative evidence—that is, the paucity of well-dated prehistoric Navajo sites in the area and historical references to Querechos on the Plains. The second

episode of immigration, (The Refugee Hypothesis) has been viewed as a "site-unit intrusion" (Hester 1962a) that fundamentally altered Athapaskan culture to create a unique Navajo culture. This hypothesis has been based primarily on historical documents, although the architecture and ceramic assemblages at pueblito sites have been used to support the historical accounts (Hogan 1991, Towner 1996).

The Immigration into the Dinétah and Development of Pre-Revolt Navajo Culture

Schaafsma (2002) has recently reiterated his support for the Late Entry, High Plains Model and its relationship to the Piedra Lumbre phase sites. Six forked-pole sites in the Dinétah area, however, clearly demonstrate a Navajo occupation of the area prior to the Pueblo Revolt (Table 24). The sixteenth-century tree-ring dates from LA 55979, LA 74723, LA 74243 and LA 72746 indicate Navajo presence near the San Juan River in the mid- to late 1500s (Hancock 1997; Sesler and Hovezak 1996; Towner 1997). LA 55979 was built in the year of Coronado's Entrada (Hancock 1997), and LA 72746 appears to have been occupied at about the same time as Oñate began colonization of the Rio Grande (Hovezak and Sesler 1995). The other sites, LA 72767 and LA 72747 were occupied in the seventeenth century. All of these sites conform to Brown's (1996) criteria for distinguishing Navajo from Ute sites and structures; all contain Dinétah Gray ceramics, forked-pole hogans with excavated and prepared floors, interior hearths, and formal site layouts. In addition, LA 55979, the earliest dated hogan, is located south of the San Juan River and by Schaafsma's (1996) own definition cannot be a Ute site.

Although it is possible that these sites represent "some wandering Navajos . . . beginning to explore and possibly live in the San Juan drainage" (Schaafsma 1996:43), I find it unlikely that archaeological research would have located the only such sites. Furthermore, potentially earlier Navajo sites, such as Grassy Canyon (Brown et al. 1992) are located farther north, near the La Plata Mountains. Although not tree-ring dated, the other chronometric data for sites such as Grassy Canyon suggest a substantial sixteenth- or seventeenth-century Navajo occupation near the La Platas (Brown 1996).

The seventeenth-century tree-ring dates, particularly cutting dates, from hogan sites LA 105483, LA 16209, LA 72747, and LA 72767 demonstrate a Navajo occupation near the confluence of the San Juan and

HP021636

Table 24. Pre-Revolt Tree-ring-dated Forked-pole Hogan Sites in the Dinétah

Site	Feature Type	Sample Number	Species	Inside Date	Outside Date	Outside Symbol	Comment
LA 55979	FE 136 Hogan	NMB-382	JUN	1453+/-p	1540r	comp	
		NMB-364	JUN	1474+/-p	1540B	comp	
		NMB-363	JUN	1464p	1541r	inc	
	Surface	NMB-374	JUN	1270+/-	1394vv		
		NMB-367	JUN	1282+/-	1522+vv		
		NMB-366	JUN	1443	1541r	inc	
	FE 124 Cist	NMB-368	PNN	1465p	1541rB	inc	
		NMB-379	PNN	1381p	1496++vv		
LA 12609	FE 1 Hogan	LPM-3	JUN	996	1303++vv		dead wood (?)
		LPM-12	JUN	1458	1559vv	inc	
		LPM-5	JUN	1383+/-p	1582+vv	inc	
		LPM-20	JUN	1423+/-p	1595+vv	inc	
		LPM-14	JUN	1390+/-	1597vv	inc	no sapwood
		LPM-7	JUN	1442+/-	1597+vv	inc	
		LPM-9	JUN	1545+/-	1600+vv	inc	
		LPM-19	JUN	1417+/-	1602vv	inc	
		LPM-2	JUN	1436+/-p	1609+vv	inc	
		LPM-18	JUN	1406+/-p	1612vv	inc	
		LPM-11	JUN	1403+/-p	1615+vv	inc	no sapwood
		LPM-8	JUN	1452+/-	1620vv	inc	ca. 30 sapwood rings
		LPM-1	JUN	1421+/-	1621+vv	inc	ca. 25 sapwood rings
	FE 2 Hogan	LPM-31	JUN	692	1111vv	inc	
		LPM-38	JUN	721+/-p	1126+vv	inc	no sapwood
		LPM-37	JUN	936	1149vv	inc	
		LPM-35	JUN	960	1211+vv	inc	
		LPM-40	JUN	986	1240+vv	inc	
		LPM-28	JUN	982	1326++vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-29	JUN	1435+/-p	1544vv	inc	ca. 47 sapwood rings
		LPM-27	JUN	1328+/-	1583++vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-36	JUN	1320+/-	1609vv	inc	
		LPM-22	JUN	1321+/-p	1611vv	inc	
LA 74243	FE 1 Hogan	NMB-112	PNN	1505	1580+vv	inc	
		NMB-119	PNN	1380p	1569v	inc	
LA 72746	FE 1 Hogan	LPM-328	PNN	1453	1546+vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-329	JUN	NO DATE			
	FE 2 Hogan	LPM-333	JUN	1426p	1593++vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-334	JUN	1406p	1596+v	inc	
	FE 4 Hogan	LPM-335	PNN	1380+/-p	1518++vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-319	JUN	1306p	1543++vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-325	JUN	1273+/-p	1547++vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-337	JUN	1479	1571++vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-324	PNN	1356p	1582++vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-323	JUN	1376p	1599+rB	comp	
	FE 5 Hogan	LPM-337	JUN	1479	1571++vv		dead wood (?)
LA 72747	FE 2 Hogan	LPM-66	JUN	1253+	1550++vv		dead wood (?)
		LPM-64	JUN	1441p	1621rB	comp	same as LPM-65
		LPM-65	JUN	—	—		same as LPM-64

Table 24 (Cont). Pre-Revolt Tree-ring-dated Forked-pole Hogan Sites in the Dinétah

Site	Feature Type	Sample Number	Species	Inside Date	Outside Date	Outside Symbol	Comment
LA 72747 (Cont.)	FE 3 Hogan	LPM-76	PNN	1384p	1495+vv		
		LPM-69	PNN	1403	1546++vv		dead wood (?)
		LPM-71	PNN	1430p	1576+v	inc	
		LPM-75	JUN	1358+/-	1586vv	inc	
		LPM-67	JUN	1313+/-	1591vv	inc	
		LPM-80	JUN	1487+/-	1610vv	inc	
		LPM-73	JUN	1447p	1614+r	comp	
		LPM-70	JUN	1483p	1615r	comp	
		LPM-74	JUN	1510p	1615r	comp	
		LPM-77	JUN	1511	1618vv	inc	
		LPM-78	JUN	1502+/-	1619v	comp	
		LPM-72	PNN	—	—		same as LPM-76
	FE 4 Hogan	LPM-91	JUN	1403	1482++vv	inc	dead wood (?)
		LPM-107	JUN	1329+/-	1484vv	inc	
		LPM-92	JUN	1384	1489vv	inc	
		LPM-100	JUN	1413	1527vv	inc	
		LPM-105	JUN	1424+/-	1540vv	inc	
		LPM-103	JUN	1394+/-	1560vv	inc	
		LPM-94	JUN	1430	1562vv	inc	
		LPM-106	JUN	1331+/-	1574vv	inc	
		LPM-82	JUN	1485	1591vv	inc	
		LPM-98	JUN	1419+/-	1610vv	inc	
		LPM-83	JUN	1509	1611vv	inc	
		LPM-101	JUN	1425+/-	1616r	inc	
		LPM-97	JUN	1550+/-	1620vv	inc	
		LPM-85	JUN	1573+/-	1621r	comp	
		LPM-89	JUN	1450+/-	1622+v	comp	
		LPM-90	JUN	1466	1622r	inc	
		LPM-81	JUN	1411+/-	1622+rB	comp	
		LPM-104	JUN	1482+/-	1622vv	inc	
		LPM-102	JUN	1438+/-	1622r	comp	
LA 72767	FE 1 Hogan	LPM-137	JUN	1441P	1592++vv		dead wood (?)
		LPM-138	JUN	NO DATE			
		LPM-139	JUN	NO DATE			
	FE 2 Hogan	LPM-117	JUN	748	984++vv		dead wood (?)
		LPM-141	JUN	1539	1641vv	inc	
		LPM-132	JUN	1428+/-P	1655+vv		
		LPM-142	JUN	1420+/-P	1676+r	comp	
		LPM-121	JUN	1524P	1676+rG	inc	
		LPM-122	JUN	1580+/-P	1677rG	inc	
		LPM-128	PNN	1618P	1677B	inc	
		LPM-135	PNN	1595P	1677rB	comp	
		LPM-136	PNN	1597P	1677rG	inc	
		LPM-133	PNN	1578+/-P	1679G	comp	

Key: NMB= Tree-ring Lab Collection; LPM= La Plata Mine Collection; JUN= Juniper; PNN= Pinyon; inc= incomplete; comp= complete

HP021637

Los Pinos Rivers during the 1600s (Hovezak and Sesler 1995; Sesler and Hovezak 1996). LA 72747 in particular indicates that much of Navajo culture had developed by the early 1600s. The forked-pole hogans are typical of later sites as well, and suggest that this structure type may have a long history (Hovezak and Sesler 1995). Dinétah Gray ceramics were developed either before the Navajo moved into the area or during the initial years of the occupation. The structure of these pre-1680 hogan sites suggests that nuclear family or small extended family groups were the first to settle near the San Juan (Sesler and Hovezak 1996). Subsistence data, although limited, indicate that the Navajo included hunting, gathering, and agriculture in their subsistence base; maize, beans, and squash have all been identified at these sites, as well as at some of the La Plata area sites (Farrell 1995; Hancock 1997; Sesler and Hovezak 1996).

These sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sites clearly establish a Navajo presence in the area long before the Pueblo Revolt and suggest a northern intermountain, not Plains, route for the "Athapaskan" entry into the Southwest. They also support some Navajo oral traditions that suggest a Rocky Mountain origin (Zolbrod 1984). More importantly, perhaps, they indicate that, with the exception of painted pottery and masonry architecture, much of Navajo culture had developed prior to *extensive* contact with either Puebloans or the Spaniards. That a Navajo culture distinct from that of other Athapaskans existed in the early seventeenth century is known from Father Salmerón's use of the term "Apaches del Nabaxu" (Lummis 1900). If Salmerón was indeed referring to groups living in the Chama drainage (Schaafsma 1996, 2002), the extent of the Navajo occupation is much broader than previously thought and supports some references that the Navajo were a relatively large group who occupied much of northern New Mexico. Espejo's contact with Querechos near Mt. Taylor in 1583 may also be relevant. In both March and June of that year, Espejo encountered Querechos, first as peaceful traders and later as enemies. If these Querechos were Navajos (Hammond and Rey 1966; Reeve 1956; but see Schroeder 1963), they were living in the mountains near Acoma and probably growing corn. Likewise, it is possible that the "Cocoyes" living in the mountains near Jemez in 1598 were Navajo (Schroeder 1963).

Thus, the archaeological and historical data indicate that the Navajo occupied a relatively large area in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. At a minimum, they were living near the confluence of the San Juan and Los Pinos Rivers, near Jemez, possibly in the Big Bead Mesa

area, and near Mt. Taylor, probably around Cebolleta. A small community may have been present in Canyon de Chelly as well (Fall et al. 1981; Gilpin 1996). These data indicate that early Navajo culture, including plain ware ceramics, maize agriculture, hunting, gathering, and trade with the Pueblos, was relatively well developed and distinct from other Apachean groups. I believe that the Querechos seen by Coronado on the Plains were not ancestral to the Navajo, but more likely developed into Plains Apache groups who continued to hunt bison and trade with the Eastern Pueblos. Their connection with other Querechos may have been nothing more than linguistic affinity or cultural similarities in the eyes and words of the Spanish recorders.

Only additional research in those areas will be able to substantiate or refute an early Navajo presence distinct from that of other groups. The tremendous expansion of contract-related archaeological research in the Dinétah has been responsible for many of the changes in Navajo archaeology in the past decade or two. A similar effort is needed in other areas, particularly around Mt. Taylor and near Cebolleta (Carroll 1979). The chronometric underpinnings of such research, however, must include the wood-use model developed in the Dinétah to properly interpret any dates derived from Navajo structures (Towner, 1997).

Puebloan Immigration and the Pueblito Occupations

It is clear from the tree-ring and other data that the majority of pueblitos were not built by Puebloan refugees fleeing the Reconquest. Although some of the early pueblito sites in the north, including the Cabresto Mesa Tower Complex, Los Peñoles, parts of Three Corn Ruin, and storage rooms at Frances Canyon Ruin, may have been built in response to Roque de Madrid's campaigns against the Navajo, they were still built by Navajos. The complete lack of pueblito construction and paucity of evidence for tree-cutting activities between the failed revolt of 1696 and 1705 contradict the hypothesis of a large influx of people into the area. Most Puebloan refugees who fled the Rio Grande undoubtedly went to other pueblos, such as Zuni and Hopi (Hogan 1991), and those who did not probably moved to large Puebloan "refugee" sites, such as Astialakwa, Kotyiti, Boletsakwa, and Rowe Mesa (Dougherty 1980; Elliot 1982; Kulishek 1996).

Only Tapacito Ruin contains the proper temporal and architectural attributes to be labeled a "refugee" site, and it was built by Puebloan

HP021638