

## Journal of the Southwest

---

The Origins of Navajo Pastoralism

Author(s): Marsha Weisiger

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of the Southwest*, Vol. 46, No. 2, Scholarship from the William P. Clements Center for Southwest Studies (Summer, 2004), pp. 253-282

Published by: [Journal of the Southwest](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40170290>

Accessed: 21/07/2012 19:47

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Journal of the Southwest* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Southwest*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## *The Origins of Navajo Pastoralism*

MARSHA WEISIGER

Long ago, when the Holy People still roamed the earth, Changing Woman created livestock to reward the Hero Twins for ridding the world of evil. She then traveled to her permanent home, an island in the Pacific on the edge of the earth and sky. And it was there that she created the Earth Surface People, including the Diné, whom their neighbors would later call Navajo. As the people multiplied, they grew too numerous for the tiny island, so Changing Woman sent them on a long migration to the land between the four sacred mountains. But she did not send them empty-handed; she gave them sheep and horses to take back with them so that they might prosper.<sup>1</sup>

Navajo pastoralism arose early in the eighteenth century from the semi-arid canyons of the Diné homeland—Dinétah—where women and men incorporated Spanish livestock into their world and gave them indigenous meanings. Before long, burgeoning flocks spurred families to spread out across the region and promoted the adoption of an ancient pastoral pattern known as transhumance, the seasonal migrations from one ecological zone to another that made herding in this arid land possible. They called their expansive landscape Diné Bikéyah.

Scholars over the years have attempted to explain the origins of the Navajos and their pastoral life, producing a largely speculative narrative that, through repetition, has resounded as truth. Some have offered suggestive, even inspired interpretations of events, but their evidence has been shadowy at best. Those seeking to substantiate even the existence of the Diné before the eighteenth century have faced formidable challenges, and traces of early pastoralism have proved elusive. Over the last two decades, however, archaeologists have unearthed new evidence of early Diné history and reexamined the old, allowing us to create a more nuanced understanding of a poorly illuminated era from the beginnings of the Diné pastoral economy in Dinétah, located in the Four Corners

MARSHA WEISIGER is assistant professor of history at New Mexico State University, Las Cruces.

region, to its spread south and west, eventually encompassing all of present-day Navajo country.

To trace the history of pastoralism and transhumance in this landscape, we must first step back to what we might call for lack of a better phrase the beginning of Diné time, when “the people” first appeared on the Colorado Plateau. This task is trickier than it might seem. Historians increasingly acknowledge that our picture of the past is only partial, and that observation is particularly true of Diné history. Written documents such as diaries, letters, government reports, and the like are the materials that most historians use to create their narratives, but this near fetish for ink on paper presents real problems when we try to uncover the beginnings of Diné pastoralism. Navajos first enter the written record in early Spanish documents, and yet these provide only fleeting glimpses. In fact, much of the earliest record consists of second- or third-hand accounts—rumors as it were—of settlements of farmers or bands of raiders who lived somewhere to the west beyond the pueblos.

Until the early seventeenth century, Spanish chroniclers wrote only vaguely about those living in the mountains or on the plains outside the familiar realm of the Rio Grande Valley, often referring to populations in terms that are unrecognizable today. Names such as “Querechos” or “Cocoyes” probably designated specific groups in some instances; at other times, they signified something more generic like “wild Indians,” much as “Chichimecas” came to mean “nomadic barbarians” in northern Mexico.<sup>2</sup> Some historians have speculated that the Querechos or Cocoyes were the same people who later came to be called Navajo, but we really have no way of knowing whether those terms indeed referred to Diné or to other groups living in or traversing the cultural crossroads of the Colorado Plateau.

Even after the Spaniards clearly recognized the Navajos, only fuzzy snapshots emerged from the pages of their reports. Diné moved on the margins of the Spanish Empire in a rugged terrain that the Europeans found difficult to penetrate. Encounters were few, unwelcome, and often marked by violence. On those rare occasions before the mid-eighteenth century when the two peoples actually saw each other with their own eyes—particularly on Diné turf—they met, more often than not, in the heat of battle. As Diné fled or fought off Spanish military expeditions and the slave raiders who captured women and children, or as they made their own forays against villages or herds, neither side saw the other quite clearly. The Spanish who recorded these events likely viewed Navajos

during the adrenaline rush of a guerrilla skirmish or glimpsed them from behind as they sped away. They developed blurry impressions of the Navajos in the fury and confusion of some sneak attack.<sup>3</sup>

The violence of these encounters is not the only factor that distorts our early picture of Diné history. Spanish soldiers and missionaries perceived Navajos through viewfinders shaped by their own world. And they manipulated their images—exaggerating this, minimizing that—in ways they hoped would bring approval from their superiors or patrons in Mexico City, not to mention increased military and monetary support. Even if they had tried to represent Navajos accurately, the few opportunities they had to observe them would still leave more questions than answers. It would still be like putting together a jigsaw puzzle with only half the pieces.

Archaeologists have tried to fill in parts of this puzzle, but here, too, the evidence remains elusive. By its very nature, archaeology—even more than history—can piece together only fragments of the past. Archaeology is essentially the study of rubbish and ruin, and only certain kinds of physical debris survive the ravages of the weather, sun, water, scavengers, insects, and microorganisms that eventually reduce much of the material world to dust. Even when remnants of the past defy the elements, the odds of an archaeologist stumbling onto them are fairly slim. Making matters worse, until only quite recently most Southwestern archaeologists kept their sights fixed on the prehistoric Anasazi, who mysteriously abandoned their dramatic cliff dwellings, pueblos, and ceremonial centers by the fifteenth century. Researchers often walked over the radial pattern of logs that marked the ruins of a Diné hogan without knowing or even caring that they had done so.<sup>4</sup>

Compounding the problem, the growing numbers of archaeologists who do care have found it difficult to identify and interpret the earliest Navajo settlements. Among the many obstacles, the most commonly used techniques for determining when people inhabited a particular place, including radiocarbon and tree-ring dating, are not nearly as precise as is popularly supposed. Both of these methods depend largely on wood specimens, and therein lies the snag. Native people in the arid Southwest commonly used and reused old wood that had been dead for many years—sometimes centuries—before they incorporated it into the framework of a dwelling or burned it in a hearth. Deteriorated wood and various forms of contamination can also dramatically skew the apparent age of a log or piece of charcoal.<sup>5</sup> More problematic still, archaeol-

ogists have difficulty distinguishing early Navajo sites from the remarkably similar camps inhabited by Utes. Both of these distinct ethnic groups lived in the San Juan River valley, built log-framed dwellings, and manufactured plain pottery, making it difficult to tell the two apart in the absence of culturally idiosyncratic evidence.<sup>6</sup> And there is at least one more significant complication: The Diné who migrated to the Southwest as hunters and gatherers likely came with a noticeably different set of cultural markers than those we think of as characteristically Navajo. If, for example, they initially lived in less permanent structures than hogans—such as portable tipis—when they moved on to the Colorado Plateau, and if they began manufacturing pottery only after they more or less settled down as farmers, early sites would be difficult to identify.<sup>7</sup> Archaeologists, then, probably continue to walk blindly over the oldest Navajo sites, even as they try their best to find them.

The fragmentary nature of the evidence, both archaeological and documentary, makes it difficult to know with any certainty just when Diné first entered the Southwest. While Diné oral traditions describe how Changing Woman sent the newly created Earth Surface People to Diné Bikéyah, those stories do not provide any temporal clues to tell us exactly when that migration took place.<sup>8</sup> Turning to the written record, we discover that Spanish sightings of Navajos were exceedingly few and far between until the mid-eighteenth century. Accounts of the initial Spanish *entrada* do not mention any people that we can clearly identify as Navajo. Nonetheless, it would be a mistake to assume, as some scholars have, that the omission of Navajos from these early accounts means that Diné were themselves very recent newcomers whose arrival coincided with or followed that of the Spanish.<sup>9</sup> It should come as no surprise indeed that the Spanish failed to note the presence of Navajos until fairly late. After the initial *entrada* of 1539–42, nearly two generations passed before any more Spaniards ventured into the area, and more than a half-century had come and gone by the time don Juan de Oñate brought the first actual European settlers up the Rio Grande. In 1599, soon after he established his headquarters on that stream, Oñate wrote that a large settlement of people dwelled in jacal huts and farmed at the river's source. He may well have been referring to a group of Diné.<sup>10</sup> Or maybe not. Either way, the early historical record tells us nothing concrete about the whereabouts of the Diné before the seventeenth century.

A growing body of archaeological evidence, however, suggests that Diné families lived in the uplands of the San Juan Valley at least by the

early 1500s, and they continued to make their homes there for another century or more. The remains of their conical hogans lie scattered along the arroyos draining into the La Plata River, north of its confluence with the San Juan. The people who lived here were not yet pastoralists, nor did they farm this area, apparently, although they may have cultivated corn and beans elsewhere, perhaps on the valley floor. They likely moved seasonally through this gently rolling terrain where sagebrush grasslands grade into juniper woodlands, harvesting the abundance of wild plants and hunting deer, antelope, rabbit, and an occasional bighorn sheep.<sup>11</sup> Moving from one place to another to exploit the land's bounty from one season to the next, Diné learned to value mobility in this arid land, a wisdom that would ultimately take shape as transhumance.

Archaeological evidence of their presence may date to the 1500s (or perhaps earlier), but not until 1627, did the Diné make a clear mark on the written record. That year, Fray Gerónimo de Zárate Salmerón, missionary to the Jemez, reported secondhand that the "Apaches de Nabajú" lived somewhere north of his pueblo, along the Chama River.<sup>12</sup> The name "Nabajú" came from the Tewa word "Návahúú," meaning a large arroyo with cultivated fields. This first definite appearance in the historic record revealed two important things about the ways in which outsiders viewed Navajos. First, the Spaniards recognized that Navajos were a branch of the Apaches (Zuni for "enemies"), all of whom spoke some variation of the Diné language that linguists label Athabaskan. And second, the Spaniards distinguished Navajos from other Apaches by virtue of their farming. Fray Alonso de Benavides confirmed this characterization three years later when he wrote that although the Navajos were indeed Apaches, they had a quite different way of life. "The Navajos," he wrote, "are very skillful farmers, for the word Navajo means 'large cultivated fields.'"<sup>13</sup>

According to Benavides, the Navajos lived some fifty leagues northwest of the southernmost pueblos, which would place them in the vicinity of the San Juan River. By the 1660s, Diné families had spread throughout the San Juan Valley between the La Plata and Navajo rivers, spilling into the rugged canyonlands that came to be called Dinétah. Here the land rises hundreds of feet from the narrow canyon floors in a series of benches that step up to the mesatops. Diné continue to remember this place as their ancestral homeland. It was here on Gobernador Knob where Changing Woman herself had been born. And it was here, near the place where the Rio de los Piños crosses the muddy San Juan, where her sons, the Hero Twins, went to live. For centuries

(until the Navajo Reservoir's waters inundated it in the 1960s) an ancient petroglyph of the two young men marked their home, enshrining them in living memory.<sup>14</sup> Dinétah signifies a mythic birthplace, but it is also a literal birthplace, for this region gave rise to the pastoral and farming people who call themselves Diné. It is fitting, then, that when viewed from above, the San Juan River resembles a thick rhizome winding through the earth, below which a series of canyons—La Jara, Frances, Gobernador, Largo, Blanco—extend southward like fibrous roots. From these roots, Diné pastoralism blossomed.

When viewed from the east, however, Dinétah once looked like a formidable stronghold, for a nearly impenetrable ridge—a part of the Continental Divide—shielded the area from the Rio Grande settlements. The Spaniards appropriately named the region beyond this *cordillera* Casa Fuerte, meaning fortified house or fortress.<sup>15</sup> The ridge rose up from the plain as a rampart, checking Spanish incursions while emboldening the people who lived behind its barrier. From Casa Fuerte, Diné men launched the raids on the villages and pueblos that made them infamous throughout northern New Mexico.

Raiding during this early period was far more complicated than the image conjured up by the phrase “Navajo raiders.” Certainly some raids involved small bands of young men bent on acquiring horses or proving their bravery, and nascent stock owners or hungry hunters tempted by the prospect of such docile prey as sheep. But just as often, raiders were avenging attacks on their kin and the capture of their wives and children. Indeed Diné lives entangled with those of their neighbors in the pueblos in ways that have often perplexed outsiders. From time to time, Diné traded with Puebloan peoples, established political and military alliances with them, offered refuge to slaves and servants fleeing Spanish masters, and forged intercultural bonds through marriage. And from time to time, they preyed on the pueblos, stealing livestock and taking captives.<sup>16</sup>

We should remember, too, that contrary to the popular image, raids were only one way in which Diné families acquired Spanish livestock. In the wake of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, fleeing Spaniards abandoned their stock, leaving behind thousands of animals for the taking. After the soldiers and missionaries returned more than a decade later, refugees from Jemez and other pueblos turned to the Diné for shelter, sometimes bringing their stock with them. Importantly, too, Diné acquired a good deal of their horses and sheep through trade. Yet there is little doubt that by the

early eighteenth century, Diné raiders had begun to intensify their assaults, enraging the Spanish and the people of the Rio Grande pueblos.<sup>17</sup>

Punitive campaigns against the Navajos in retribution for those raids give us our first images of life within Casa Fuerte. In 1675 and 1678, Juan Domínguez de Mendoza led three military invasions of these lands, seizing Navajo horses; taking men, women, and children captive; killing others; and burning their cornfields. Diné lived in a rich agricultural area in the latter half of the seventeenth century. The San Juan River valley offered deep soils for farming maize along its terraces and on alluvial fans. That was particularly true at the confluences of the San Juan's tributary streams, where a high water table provided enough moisture in this land of little rain to allow kernels to germinate.<sup>18</sup> Unfortunately for us, however, Domínguez's report of his assault on Navajo fields did little more than confirm that Navajo farmers lived in the canyonlands of Casa Fuerte. He left little record of his observations.

The first eyewitness account was not penned until 1705, when Antonio Alvarez Castrillón, secretary of war to Roque Madrid, created a detailed journal of a punishing campaign against the Navajos. His diary offers the first real picture of Navajos on their own ground, although certainly captured through his cultural viewfinder and filtered through the lens of conquest. *Maestre de campo* Roque Madrid had been among the soldiers who fled the upper Rio Grande during the Pueblo Revolt, and he had had the honor of leading the vanguard in the Spanish Reconquest of 1692. Now he penetrated the canyons of Casa Fuerte with as many as sixty presidial soldiers, forty militiamen, and three hundred native auxiliaries from San Juan, Picuris, Tesuque, Taos, and Jemez pueblos, men bent on avenging raids on their villages. This impressive force, accompanied by hundreds of horses, of course, did not take the Diné by surprise. Indeed, when Madrid's men entered these craggy lands, they found the *rancherías* and *casas* abandoned, for the Navajos had retreated to the mesas and cliffs. Riding through canyons and around isolated pinnacles that he called *peñoles*, Madrid and his men found clusters of *milpas*, or cornfields, which they systematically destroyed. The Navajos clearly farmed these lands, but if they had many sheep, Madrid's secretary did not record this. His men found and slaughtered only some thirty-two head.<sup>19</sup>

It is tempting to conclude, then, that Diné by and large were not yet pastoralists. After all, when they first began acquiring sheep, they likely butchered them right away, much as they did when they hunted bighorn

sheep or deer. It took some time before they transformed themselves from hunters to herders.<sup>20</sup> Still, this apparent scarcity of sheep may be misleading. Having been forewarned of impending attack, the Diné likely drove their flocks onto the mesas, which the Spaniards by their own accounts could not ascend. Nearly forty years later, Antonio de Ulibarri, a member of Madrid's force, intimated that he had seen several small herds of sheep during that campaign. True, he may have been mistaken; he may have conflated his memory of that trip with memories of his subsequent forays into Navajo country. And yet surely more than a handful of Diné maintained at least small flocks by the early 1700s. After all, Governor Francisco Cuervo y Valdez, writing in 1706, only one year after Madrid's first campaign, reported that Navajo women wove wool from their own sheep.<sup>21</sup> Navajo women, it seems, had already acquired a reputation as herders and weavers by the early years of the eighteenth century.

These women had begun to nurture small flocks as a reliable yet portable means of feeding and clothing themselves and their families. And yet this gradual shift toward pastoralism proved that security and fear were two sides of the same coin. Small herds of sheep and goats allowed families to flee enemies who threatened or burned their fields, and still eat. They were moveable feasts. And yet the same animals must have attracted hungry enemies, unable to resist passive prey.<sup>22</sup> Indeed, the maintenance of flocks may well have bred the nearly half-century of terror that reigned in Dinétah.

Beginning in the early 1710s and continuing through mid-century, a formidable alliance between Ute and Comanche bands pressured Diné to take an increasingly defensive posture. Continued Spanish assaults had already encouraged Diné to begin constructing masonry pueblitos in some of the canyons.<sup>23</sup> Now Utes and Comanches—both accomplished horsemen—began to swoop down on Diné camps, taking women and children as captives and slaves; seizing livestock; and making off with blankets, pelts, and other valued property.<sup>24</sup> Diné responded by building masonry fortresses designed to secure their families against sneak attack.

For much of the twentieth century, archaeologists surmised that these stone houses had been built by a large influx of refugees from the Rio Grande pueblos, who took flight in the early 1690s following the Spanish reconquest of New Mexico.<sup>25</sup> To be sure, Jemez refugees sought protection among the Diné after soldiers besieged their pueblo in 1694. Even today there stands the ruins of a house that was built in the

months after the siege, sitting on a mesa high above Canyon Largo near its confluence with Tapacito Creek. This structure, with four or maybe as many as seven rooms, especially thick stone walls, and a rooftop entry hidden behind a parapet wall, became home, perhaps, to one or two refugeec families. The locals must have befriended these escapees from Spanish oppression, for an extended Diné family apparently allowed the new arrivals to build within the bounds of their own homestead. It seems likely that the families already knew each other, that they had struck up a friendship in the course of trading or some other circumstance that we will never know. Indeed, the visitors may well have become family, for it appears that they continued to live among the Diné for quite some time. In 1705, Madrid encountered a pair of women, one Jemez, the other Navajo, who hailed from the canyonlands of Casa Fuerte. Who knows? Perhaps these two women lived together on the mesa near Tapacito Creek. It may well be, too, that these Jemez expatriates gave birth to the Coyote Pass clan, which traces its origins to a Jemez woman. In any event, it seems clear that at least a few refugeec families—or as one historian suggests, a few captives—moved to Dinétah, especially considering the obvious Puebloan influence on Diné ceremonies. And yet we have no concrete evidence of a particularly large population of refugees from the pueblos living in these canyons.<sup>26</sup> What we do know is this: These mesas and valleys were home to many Diné, who girded themselves for a half-century of warfare against horsemen armed with bows and arrows.

Their citadels still stand above canyon mouths, atop gigantic boulders and sandstone knobs, and along the rims of mesas, keeping watch over the approaches to the valleys of Dinétah. Among these fortresses, the complex of sandstone buildings positioned on the rim of a tributary of Frances Canyon is surely the most impressive. A four-story, triangular tower at the edge of the cliff kept lookout for those who took shelter within the substantial main structure, whose two-story walls eventually enclosed upwards of forty rooms. At the other end of the scale: a tiny sandstone room perches atop a house-sized boulder high above Pal-luche Canyon. Enemies approaching this hideout would have had to look very hard just to see it, so successfully does it blend, in both form and materials, with its natural base. They would have had an even more difficult time gaining entry, for even those who concealed themselves within its walls had to scale the gigantic rock using footholds and handholds carved into its face. On the cliff above this site is a second fortress, built

on a rock outcrop a decade earlier in the mid-1720s. Surrounding it, as at most of these defensive structures, are the remains of ordinary hogans, framed using wooden, forked-stick tripods, walled in with smaller poles, and covered with bark and a thick layer of earth. Most people probably actually lived in these hogans, using the fortified buildings as temporary refuges in the event of attack.<sup>27</sup>

The design and location of these structures were part of an ingenious defensive network, an advance warning system, as it were. When they peered through the loopholes in the upper walls, the people who hid within these rooms took in sweeping vistas of the landscape below, allowing them to anticipate the approach of enemies. Many of these structures offered a clear view of another fortification nearby or across the canyon, so that one family could signal the approaching threat to others.<sup>28</sup>

Remarkably, it was here amidst all this apparent strife that the Diné developed a distinctive way of life that would endure for generations. For many at least that life increasingly revolved around livestock. Certainly the Diné who lived in these canyonlands continued to support themselves with a combination of farming, hunting and gathering, and herding. But as the eighteenth century progressed, the importance of Diné flocks grew. One measure of this importance was the presence of weavers among the women living at Dinétah, who left behind wooden battens, spindle whorls, loom fittings carved into stone, and even hanks of wool. Physical evidence of sheep husbandry, nonetheless, remains extremely sparse, and we may never fully understand this early period in the development of Diné pastoralism. Small stone enclosures near many of their fortified houses, typically sited on cliff ledges, may well have been corrals or lamb pens, testifying to the care of breeding herds. And there are lots of rock shelters and box canyons where Diné shepherds could have created makeshift corrals shut off with branchwork fences, just as they did later on. It appears, too, that some families cooperated to build stock tanks with earthen dams.<sup>29</sup> Still, our picture of Diné pastoralism remains muddy.

If we are uncertain about the details, one thing is clear. By the middle of the eighteenth century, many Diné families indeed herded flocks of sheep and goats. Consider the recollections of the Spanish soldiers who invaded Navajo country in 1743, each called to testify before New Mexico Governor Joaquín Codallos y Rabal, who sought information on conditions in Navajo country. Antonio Montoya observed that “the natives

occupy themselves in raising their stocks and cultivating their farms.” He himself had seen a small flock of sheep and had heard that the people had holdings like these throughout the province. Juan Tafoya testified that he had seen a flock of some 150 head of sheep, and don Manuel Saens de Garbisu guessed that as many as 700 sheep had been milling about. These numbers, of course, were general impressions, not necessarily reliable accounts of livestock holdings. Yet one thing is absolutely certain. When sworn under oath, one soldier after another described the Navajos as shepherds.<sup>30</sup>

Within Dinétah, those shepherds likely moved their flocks from one place to another with the changing seasons, making the most of the canyons’ meager resources. From the bottomlands, where cottonwoods and willows sometimes shaded seeps and riparian grasses, to the sloping sagebrush grasslands, to the piñon-juniper woodlands of the mesatops, each zone offered fresh forage at different times of the year. Stock owners also made good use of the area’s water resources, which were more abundant than they seem at first glance. In some canyons, streams offered perennial sources of water, if not on the surface, then just below. To tap a makeshift well, a shepherd or a farmer had to dig only a foot or so into a streambed or arroyo. Flocks also quenched their thirst at small impoundments around springs, at stock tanks, or at natural pools carved in the slickrock—some capable of holding hundreds of gallons of rainfall.<sup>31</sup> Over centuries of observing the land as gatherers and hunters, Diné had learned to wring water from stone and glean sustenance for their flocks from stingy hills and desert plains.

Nonetheless, if Diné grazed their stock on these lands year-round, flocks necessarily would have had to remain fairly small.<sup>32</sup> As herd sizes began to grow, fresh grasses, forbs, and browse would have become increasingly hard to find. Goats would have fared especially well in this craggy sagebrush country, yet even they would have stripped the area soon enough. As far as we can tell, of course, as late as the 1740s, herd sizes were indeed small, if we can trust the Spanish soldiers’ testimonies. But once flocks did begin to grow—as they surely did—Diné herders eventually would have had to search for fresh forage, either by moving out of these canyons seasonally or by moving out altogether.

Sometime in the second half of the eighteenth century, the people abandoned Dinétah. We may never know exactly why. Perhaps they could no longer bear the constant threat of the Utes and Comanches, who increasingly came armed with guns. Madrid’s 1743 campaign may also

have taken its toll. Or perhaps a relatively extended droughty period beginning in 1752 drove families out.<sup>33</sup> Yet it may well be that the Diné left, in part, because these narrow canyons and mesas could no longer support a burgeoning population of sheep and goats. Growing flocks would soon have outstripped the capacity of this land to feed them. Indeed, in the face of declining forage, drought, and the continued goad of Ute and Spanish warfare, this storied homeland must have become downright inhospitable.

Even by the late 1730s, some families had already begun to move southwest from Dinétah, probably migrating down Largo Canyon and along Chaco Wash, up to the lower benches along Chacra Mesa, and eventually spreading out into Chaco Canyon. That canyon had once been a center of Anasazi civilization and encompasses the incomparable Pueblo Bonito, a sweeping arc of interlocking stone forming hundreds of contiguous apartments, ceremonial kivas, and terraces. Diné eschewed the canyon's western reaches where the ancient ruins stood, and lived instead in the eastern portions of the chasm and beyond. Here, fresh forage and relatively abundant waters likely nurtured expanding herds. Grama and galleta grasses covered much of the area, and four-winged saltbush dotted the canyon bottom and its floodplain. Box canyons cast deep shadows that slow evaporation and offer seeps, springs, and easily tapped groundwater. Importantly, a canyon passageway that Navajos called Long Gap allowed Diné to move their herds to fresh grasslands extending to the south. Chacra Mesa and Chaco Canyon offered an inviting environment for these nascent pastoralists, yet they found no peace. Ute raiders and Spanish soldiers continued to cloud the summer horizon, leading Diné families to erect fortifications like those they had left behind in Dinétah.<sup>34</sup> They could run, but with flocks and flocks of sheep, it proved awfully hard to hide.

Indeed only a handful of families moved from Dinétah to Chaco, perhaps because it remained too close to the Ute threat. When the diaspora took place in the 1750s, many sought refuge in the shadow of the sacred mountain Tsoodzi—Mount Taylor—on the western side of the San Mateo Mountains. In 1754, New Mexico Governor don Thomas Vélez Cachupín reported that most of the Navajos had abandoned their old province and taken shelter from Ute attack in lands far to the south and southwest. Big Bead Mesa, on an eastern spur of the San Mateo Mountains, became home to one of these new settlements. Scores of families clustered their hogans on this point of land, blocked off from the rest

of the mesa by a twelve-foot wall, complete with loopholes.<sup>35</sup> The surrounding lands offered ponderosa forests, piñon and juniper woodlands, river valleys, and thick, luxuriant grasslands, so they proved fabulous for farming, hunting deer, and grazing sheep.

Such abundance could be both a blessing and a curse. Even prior to the exodus from Dinétah, Diné families, probably attracted by the rich grasslands, had begun moving into the southern portions of the San Mateo Mountains, and still others settled to the west near the Zuni Mountains. In expanding south and west, they infringed on the Zuni and Laguna pueblos, whose sheep also grazed these lush lands. And yet it was not long before Diné settlers, too, began to feel encroached on, this time by Spanish shepherds and cattle ranchers, who secured grants of land from the Spanish crown, despite the fact that they impinged on native cornfields and pastures. Between 1754 and 1770, the provincial governor confirmed a dozen grants of land to Spanish settlers, who engaged in livestock grazing. In 1768, for example, Santiago Durán y Chaves received the right to graze 1,000 sheep, 800 mares, and some mules and cattle in the area, and the following year Luis Jaramillo also gained rights to graze 1,000 sheep. These two men were waves in a flood of Spanish stock owners pouring into the grazing lands around the San Mateo Mountains. Governor Fernando de Chacón granted some 200,000 acres of land smack in the middle of Navajo country to a group of settlers from Albuquerque, who established the village of Cebolleta. This was a deliberate effort not only to secure possession of New Mexico's western frontier, but also to divert the Navajos' attention from the settlements along the Rio Grande. Much later, Spanish officials acknowledged that Navajos had prior rights to the area and commanded Spanish stockmen to withdraw their flocks. But by then, governmental authority on New Spain's northern frontier was weakening, Spanish will wavered, and the proclamation went unheeded.<sup>36</sup>

The encroachment of thousands and thousands of Spanish sheep, and the lure that they held for young Diné seeking prestige and power, triggered a round of raiding. These assaults crescendoed after 1800, as the press of non-Navajo livestock intensified, climaxing in the mid-nineteenth century when New Mexico became United States territory. Half a century of these raids would eventually lead some military officials to characterize Navajos as marauders who acted from "a pure love of rapine and plunder," thereby justifying total war on Navajo country. This image of Navajos as wild predators has become such a trope in Southwestern nar-

ratives that it has gained an almost mythic quality, mingling in the popular imagination with familiar scenes from Western movies.<sup>37</sup>

And yet the image obscures the complicated motives underlying the attacks. Certainly for those Diné who wanted to acquire their own flocks or rapidly expand those they already possessed, the presence of large Spanish herds may simply have proved irresistible. More importantly, though, raids became the most effective means by which Diné could wrest control of grazing lands. If Spanish settlers and herders felt terrorized by Navajo raiders, it is likely because the Diné sought to terrorize them and drive them back to the Rio Grande. Spanish herds and their shepherds trespassed with apparent impunity, and seizing stock became one means by which Diné asserted and enforced their claim to pastures.

But it was also in the late eighteenth century that pastoralism—that is, the breeding and herding of domesticated livestock—came to distinguish Navajos, just as much as their farming or even their raiding. In 1780, General Teodoro de Croix noted that the Navajos, “although of Apache kinship[,] have a fixed home, sow, raise herds, and weave their blankets and clothes of wool.”<sup>38</sup> Likewise, in 1795, before the wave of raids swept across northern New Mexico, Governor Chacón defended Navajos against the charge that they were stealing Spanish stock. Unlike Apaches, he wrote, the Navajos “do not want for sheep, for those that they possess are innumerable, and their horse herds have increased considerably.” In particular, he added, Navajo women had become well known for their weaving skills. “They work their wool with more delicacy and pleasure than Spaniards,” he admitted.<sup>39</sup> By the late eighteenth century, the Diné had clearly transformed themselves into weavers and herders.

Perhaps because growing sheep herds required large expanses of forage, Diné spread out across the land between the four sacred mountains in the late eighteenth century. Even by the 1750s, some were grazing as far west as Wide Ruin and Ganado, beyond the Defiance Plateau. Spanish officials took particular note of the extent of the diaspora. In 1786, Governor don Juan Bautista de Anza reported that Navajos lived not only in the area around the San Mateo Mountains and Cebolleta, but also in the Chuskas and Canyon de Chelly.<sup>40</sup> A decade later, Lieutenant Colonel don Antonio Cordero specified still more places where Navajos (whom he called Apaches) made their homes, including Chaco Canyon and the entire Chuska mountain chain.<sup>41</sup>

One of the most important of these areas was Canyon de Chelly, which together with Canyon del Muerto forms a deep chasm near the center

of Diné Bikéyah. Rio de Chelly and Tsaile Creek, both perennial streams, carved these canyons, whose eroded lower walls soon give way to straight-sided cliffs. Life in Canyons de Chelly and del Muerto followed the rhythms of the seasons. In summer, green patches of corn and beans and melons dotted the bottoms, and here and there stood small groves of peach trees, at least some of which had been planted by a Hopi clan that for a time took refuge here. Agriculture would always be far more important than livestock in these canyons, but Diné families raised stock here just the same. In winter, they moved up onto the rim, where sagebrush grasslands and piñon-juniper woodlands provided pasture and firewood. Here, stone hogans blended easily with the rimrock, and access to canyon trails afforded a quick retreat in the event of approaching enemies.<sup>42</sup> Or so it seemed, as long as the antagonists were poorly armed Utes.

Unfortunately, the canyons offered little protection against enemies with firearms. In 1805, the people of Canyon de Chelly became the target of an all-out war on Navajos, in retaliation for the previous summer's assault on Cebolleta. Although the assailants had likely been among those who lived around the San Mateo and Zuni mountains, where Spanish flocks impinged on Navajo pastures, Chacón ordered a two-pronged offensive on all of Navajo country, dispatching one column to Chaco and a second to Canyons de Chelly and del Muerto.<sup>43</sup>

In January 1805, Lieutenant Antonio de Narbona descended into Canyon del Muerto, accompanied by some three hundred troops, a small citizen militia, a company of Opatá auxiliaries from Sonora, and Zuni guides. Alerted to the threat by the sound of musket fire, Diné men, women, and children scrambled to take shelter in a fortified cave high on the canyon wall. This cave proved inaccessible to Spanish horsemen, but it was not out of the reach of their weapons. When the echoes of the fusillade ceased, more than one hundred Diné lay dead, and some thirty more were taken captive.<sup>44</sup> The soldiers celebrated their assault by feasting on 350 Navajo sheep and goats.

The massacre at Canyon del Muerto may well have driven survivors out of the canyons, across Beautiful Valley and toward Black Mesa, which rises high above the surrounding land. From the air, the mesa looks something like a gigantic hand, flexed back with its palm facing upward. At its heel, a two-thousand-foot escarpment poses a formidable barrier to intruders approaching from the northeast; its fingers slope down toward the southwest to form the Hopi mesas. Dividing those fingers are the entrenched, intermittent streams known as Moenkopi, Dinnebito, Oraibi,

Wepo, and Polacca washes. This rugged mesa made an excellent hideout for the ill-fated refugees from the canyons to the east. Since the early eighteenth century, Diné men had been coming here seasonally to hunt antelope and deer. But in the nineteenth century, whole families arrived, trailing their flocks. Shortly after Narbona's assault on Canyon del Muerto, at least by 1807, Diné families began establishing homesteads here, and still more families came between the 1820s and the 1860s, a period that witnessed almost relentless military incursions into Canyon de Chelly and the Chuskas.<sup>45</sup>

The mesa was an ideal place to live in several respects. It stood far from the Spanish settlements, and its sheer cliffs and few approaches discouraged incursions. Yet it was close to the Hopi villages, where the Diné traded wool, pelts, mutton, goat meat, and blankets for peaches, corn, melons, and other produce. High up on Black Mesa, the piñon-juniper woodland helped conceal flocks. Later on, after families returned from incarceration at Fort Sumner, the people began to spread out, establishing winter homes along the lower edges of the tree line, where sagebrush grasslands intermingled with wooded areas, and herding their flocks in the open, where grasses mixed with browse.<sup>46</sup>

Yet even in the early nineteenth century, as Diné spread out across the land, they began to move their flocks seasonally from one place to another in the ancient pastoral pattern of transhumance. These seasonal shifts from shrub-grasslands to piñon-juniper woodlands to highland meadows, a practice likely learned from Spanish or Puebloan herders but informed by generations of hunting and gathering, took advantage of each season's bounty and let grazing lands rest. At the same time, these moves reinforced important cultural values. Transhumance reenacted the ritual movements of the Holy People from one mountain to the next, the sacred movements that had shaped the land since time out of memory. It reproduced age-old migrations dating to Diné beginnings on the Colorado Plateau. And it brought distant relations together for a few months each year, reinforcing bonds of kinship.

Unfortunately, the genesis of Diné transhumance remains hazy. Perhaps it started with a few families wandering seasonally from Dinétah toward Chacra Mesa. We may never know. But by the 1740s, Diné living in the Chacra area were indeed following a seasonal loop, discernible in the archaeological record. By building their winter hogans along the wooded slopes of Chacra Mesa and on benches above the Chaco Canyon floor, they secured easy access both to firewood and hunting grounds

above, and to winter pastures below. In summer, they moved to benches along the base of the mesa, near cornfields.<sup>47</sup> But these seasonal shifts from canyon to mesa were only a harbinger of the far more substantial migrations that would come to characterize the annual round in search of forage.

The lush parks of the Chuska range eventually became the backbone of Diné transhumance. The ridge rises as much as eight thousand feet above sea level and captures a large volume of rain and snow, which saturates its sandstone cap and recharges the groundwater. Perennial streams, springs, seeps, marshes, and more than one hundred ponds and lakes create a highland oasis. At the highest elevations, luxuriant grasslands carpet the ground beneath ponderosa pines, Douglas firs, and aspens. Lower down on the slopes, sagebrush grasslands mingle with a woodland studded with piñons, junipers, and Gambel oak.<sup>48</sup> The Chuskas' rich forage attracted Diné herders each summer, just as the luxuriant Zuni Mountains farther south did. Indeed, by the late eighteenth century, this long spine through the middle of Diné Bikéyah had become a particularly popular grazing area in summer, when the flats turned brown. Diné families made long loops from winter homes at lower elevations to summer camps in the well-watered high country. In so doing, they mapped a pattern that they would trace again and again for generations to come.

Diné families trailed their sheep and goats from place to place, but they were not really nomads. Families returned to the same general area each year to establish their winter homesteads and their summer camps (although in a particularly dry year, they might summer in a different place than they would in a wet one). This movement from one place to another was no more nomadic than the annual migration of Chicagoans to Phoenix. Herding shaped Diné movements as they searched for forage, but most herders were also farmers, and their cornfields tethered them to the land. As snows melted and the days lengthened, Diné men sought out prospective cornfields in proximity to pastures, which generally became the family's first stop on their way to the highlands.<sup>49</sup> And in the fall, they returned for the harvest. So as much as anything, farming dictated the patterns of transhumance.

Their movements had important ecological purposes. By shifting from piñon-juniper woodlands to sagebrush grasslands and highland meadows, Diné could make use of the full variety of resources—grasses, browse, water, shelter, firewood—that the land offered, effectively transforming

a stingy environment into a land of plenty. At the same time, movement across space helped to manage the land, by resting plants for one or more seasons.

Over the course of two centuries, Diné families developed a pastoral culture that revolved around their flocks. From a time only dimly recalled by history, the Diné had sustained themselves with sheep and goats. Livestock pulled the Diné westward, drew them into conflicts with neighbors, and patterned their movements across the landscape. These animals provided food and produced the wool that women transformed into blankets for family use and for trade. Consumed during ceremonial feasts, sheep enmeshed with spiritual life. They entangled Diné in networks of economic reciprocity and webs of kinship. And importantly, they conferred wealth and prestige to the women and men who owned them.

For two centuries, Diné families maintained these flocks and managed their land through transhumance. By the early twentieth century, however, livestock populations boomed, transhumance no longer sustained vigorous forage, conflicts over grazing areas grew, and the consequences of overgrazing, especially when coupled with drought, loomed large. Pastoralism in this arid landscape proved unsustainable in the long run. It produced an oft-told story of waste and want. Yet it also fostered a metamorphosis from a relative small population almost invisible to Spanish observers to one of the most populous and powerful indigenous nations in North America. Metaphorically and materially, pastoralism enabled the Diné to emerge as a people distinct from their Apache forebears and to stake a claim to an expansive land between four sacred mountains. It marked the ethnogenesis of the Diné. ✦

## NOTES

1. I draw this composite narrative from the accounts related by Slim Curly, Frank Mitchell, and River Junction Curly, in Leland C. Wyman, *Blessingway* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1970), 239–40, 327–33, 447–48, 623–34, relying most heavily on that told by Slim Curly, of the Tsi'naajinii clan (Black-Streaked Wood People).

2. In the 1580s, Diego Pérez de Luxán used the terms Querechos or Corechos interchangeably with Chichimecos. See “Diego Pérez de Luxán’s Account of the Antonio de Espejo Expedition into New Mexico, 1582,” in *The Rediscovery of New Mexico, 1580–1594*, ed. George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1966), 182, 189. For a more general discussion of the use of “Chichimeca” as a generic term for nomadic peoples in northern Mexico, consult Thomas D. Hall, *Social Change in the South-*

west, 1350–1880 (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1989), 63–65. My critical stance toward the standard ways in which historians have interpreted the historical record is shared by Klara B. Kelley and Peter M. Whiteley, in *Navajoland: Family Settlement and Land Use* (Tsaile, Ariz.: Navajo Community College Press, 1989), chapter 2.

3. I am not the first scholar to make this observation. See Ronald H. Towner and Jeffrey S. Dean, “Questions and Problems in Pre-Fort Sumner Navajo Archaeology,” in *The Archaeology of Navajo Origins*, ed. Ronald H. Towner (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1996), 4; Towner reiterates this point in *Defending the Dinétah: Pueblitos in the Ancestral Navajo Homeland* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2003), 5. The classic accounts of warfare between the Spanish and Navajos are Frank McNitt, *Navajo Wars: Military Campaigns, Slave Raids, and Reprisals*, rev. ed. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990); Frank D. Reeve, “Seventeenth-Century Relations,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 32 (1957): 36–52; and idem, “Navaho-Spanish Wars, 1680–1720,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 33 (1958): 204–31. Also see Elizabeth A. H. John, *Storms Brewed in Other Men’s Worlds: The Confrontation of Indians, Spanish, and French in the Southwest, 1540–1795*, 2nd ed. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996). While surely Spanish and Puebloan captives observed their Navajo captors up close, no eyewitness account of captivity has surfaced in the historical record, nor do official records allude to captives’ observations.

4. Steadman Upham points out that archaeologists have ignored less sexy Anasazi sites as well, in “Archaeological Visibility and the Underclass of Southwestern Prehistory,” *American Antiquity* 53 (1988): 245–61. The relative randomness of archaeological discoveries stems in part from their funding sources. Most archaeological investigations in the Southwest are essentially salvage operations paid for by federal agencies or by energy companies, building contractors, and others using government subsidies or requiring federal permits for their mines, transmission lines, roads, logging operations, or other land-disturbing activities. Under the terms of the American Antiquities Act and the National Historic Preservation Act, these corporations and agencies must determine whether significant archaeological resources will be adversely affected. If so, they must “mitigate” those effects, which generally involves excavating those sites that may yield substantial information about the past. On the Navajo Reservation and its environs, archaeologists have extensively investigated Black Mesa for the Peabody Coal Company and Gallegos Mesa for the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project, thereby enriching our understanding of the Diné past. Additionally, concerted efforts by the United States Bureau of Land Management and the Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department have deepened our knowledge of early eighteenth-century Diné history. At the same time, large expanses of the Navajo Reservation and its surrounding lands remain largely unexplored archaeologically, their stories untold.

5. I do not mean to imply that dendrochronology, or tree-ring dating, is never accurate; far from it. In those instances where multiple logs with their final rings intact yield tightly clustered dates, we can assume that the end of the tree’s life represents the cutting date and that the logs were used soon after

they were cut. Indeed, archaeologists have obtained many clusters of cutting dates from sites in the Diné'tah region, providing firm data on the construction of masonry pueblitos, including the season when the timber was cut. Outside of Diné'tah, however, most Navajo sites have yielded problematic evidence. Throughout my own analysis in this paper, I have taken a conservative path, trusting only clusters of tree-ring dates that specialists have clearly determined to be cutting dates. For discussions of the problems with radiocarbon and tree-ring dating techniques, consult especially Gary M. Brown, "Old Wood and Early Navajo: A Chronometric Analysis of the Diné'tah Phase," in *Diné Bikéyah: Papers in Honor of David M. Brugge*, ed. by Meliha S. Duran and David T. Kirkpatrick (Albuquerque: Archaeological Society of New Mexico, 1998), 42–46. Also see Jerry Fetterman, "Radiocarbon and Tree-Ring Dating at Early Navajo Sites: Examples from the Aztec Area," in Towner, *Archaeology of Navajo Origins*, 71–78; Gary M. Brown and Patricia M. Hancock, "The Diné'tah Phase in the La Plata Valley," in *Cultural Diversity and Adaptation: The Archaic, Anasazi, and Navajo Occupation of the Upper San Juan Basin*, ed. Lori Stephens Reed and Paul F. Reed (Santa Fe: Bureau of Land Management, New Mexico State Office, 1992), 85–88; Meade F. Kemrer, "An Appraisal of the Piedra Lumbre Phase in North Central New Mexico," in *History and Ethnohistory along the Rio Chama*, ed. Frank J. Wozniak, Meade F. Kemrer, and Charles M. Carrillo (Albuquerque: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1992), 69–88; and Patrick Hogan, "Diné'tah: A Reevaluation of Pre-Revolt Navajo Occupation in Northwest New Mexico," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 45 (Spring 1989): 61–63. But also note Kemrer's conclusions on the use of old construction wood in "The Dynamics of Western Navajo Settlement, A.D. 1750–1900: An Archaeological and Dendrochronological Analysis" (Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona, 1974), 49–65; and Ronald H. Towner and Byron P. Johnson, *The San Rafael Canyon Survey: Reconstructing Eighteenth Century Navajo Population Dynamics in the Diné'tah* (Farmington, NM: Western Cultural Resource Management, 1996), 9–11, 29–34, 43–52, where the authors offer a sophisticated analysis of tree-ring data. In *Defending the Diné'tah*, 212, Towner discusses the archaeological biases toward dating pueblitos while neglecting less architecturally impressive hogans, perhaps distorting our understanding of the antiquity of hogans.

6. On the difficulty of assigning ethnicity to early sites, consult Curtis F. Schaafsma, "Ethnic Identity and Protohistoric Archaeological Sites in Northwestern New Mexico: Implications for Reconstructions of Navajo and Ute History"; Gary M. Brown, "The Protohistoric Transition in the Northern San Juan Region"; and David M. Brugge, "Navajo Archaeology: A Promising Past," all in Towner, *Archaeology of Navajo Origins*, 19–69, 257–60. Also see Kemrer, "Appraisal of Piedra Lumbre Phase," 100–1; and Gary M. Brown et al., *Archaeological Data Recovery at San Juan Coal Company's La Plata Mine, San Juan County, New Mexico* (Albuquerque: Mariah Assoc., 1991), 64–65.

7. Morris E. Opler offers a similar argument in "The Apachean Culture Pattern and Its Origins," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 10, *Southwest*, ed. Alfonso Ortiz (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1983), 381.

8. Wyman, *Blessingway*, 239–40, 327–33, 447–48, 633–34.

9. See, for example, Schaafsma, “Ethnic Identity,” 44. Archaeologist David Wilcox has posited a widely accepted hypothesis that Diné entered the Southwest via the High Plains of Texas after Francisco Vázquez de Coronado made his famous quest for Cíbola. I find Wilcox’s argument ultimately unpersuasive. He depends largely on negative archaeological evidence, a groundless interpretation of the identity of the “Querechos” whom Coronado saw on his journey to Quivira, and a good deal of speculation. See Wilcox, “The Entry of the Athabaskans into the American Southwest: The Problem Today,” in *The Protohistoric Period in the North American Southwest, A.D. 1450–1700*, ed. David Wilcox and W. Bruce Masse, Anthropological Research Papers No. 24 (Tempe: Arizona State University, 1981), 213–56. But also consult David M. Brugge’s “Comments on Athabaskans and Sumas” in the same volume, 291–320. J. Loring Haskell offers a competing but equally speculative and even more problematic theory in *Southern Athapaskan Migration, A.D. 200–1750* (Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1987). Ronald F. Towner summarizes and critiques the dominant migration hypotheses and offers his own in *Defending the Dinétah*, 194–216.

10. “Don Juan de Oñate to the Viceroy of New Spain, 2 March 1599,” in George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey, eds., *Don Juan de Oñate, Colonizer of New Mexico, 1595–1628*, Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, 1540–1940, vol. 5 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1953), 485. My understanding of the Spanish period draws heavily on David J. Weber’s extraordinary synthesis and interpretation, *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), especially chapters 2, 3, and 5.

11. Brown et al., *La Plata Mine*, 144–54, 213–20, 238–302, 306–19, 337–38, 729–31; idem, “Protohistoric Transition,” 56, 63, 66–67; idem, “Old Wood,” 46–50; Hogan, “Dinetah,” 53–65; Fetterman, “Radiocarbon,” 80–82; Brown and Hancock, “Dinetah Phase,” 71–75, 85–87; Alan D. Reed and Jonathan C. Horn, “Early Navajo Occupation of the American Southwest: Reexamination of the Dinetah Phase,” *Kiva* 55 (1990): 293. The La Plata Mine sites remain the subject of lively debate among archaeologists. Some scholars argue that Navajos lived in the La Plata Valley as early as 1350, based on radiocarbon dating. Those dates may however have been produced by old construction wood that predated the actual occupation of the site. The 1500–1600 dates come from the charred remains of juniper berries that clung to the boughs used in hogan construction and are, thus, more reliable. I have elected to follow this more conservative interpretation but recognize that future investigations could push Diné presence in the area back further. Other archaeologists argue that these are not Diné sites at all—that they are Ute. However, their reasoning is unpersuasive, since it relies on historical evidence dating two centuries after the fact. See Schaafsma, “Ethnic Identity,” but cf. Brugge, “Navajo Archaeology,” 258–59.

12. *Documentos para servir a la historia del Nuevo Mexico, 1538–1778*, Colección chimalistac de libros y documentos acerca de la Nueva España, 13 (Madrid: Ediciones José Porrúa Turanzas, 1962), 194–95. Historians generally

have incorrectly given the date of Zárate Salmerón's publication as 1626, following the lead of Charles F. Lummis, who published the first English translation in the 1899 and 1900 volumes of *The Land of Sunshine*. However, Alicia Ronstadt Milich points out that the priest could not have written it before 1627. See Gerónimo de Zárate Salmerón, *Relaciones*, trans. Alicia Ronstadt Milich (Albuquerque, NM: Horn & Wallace, 1966), 16–17, 93–94. For general information on Zárate Salmerón, consult Joe S. Sando, "Jemez Pueblo," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 10, *Southwest*, 418.

Archaeologist Curtis F. Schaafsma maintains that a series of sites along the Chama River around the present-day Abiquiu Reservoir are the Navajo sites to which Zárate Salmerón referred. These date from about 1650 to 1710 and consist of scattered clusters of rectangular and circular stone dwellings, similar to those found in the canyons of Dinétah, along with stone corrals and lamb pens. If so, these sites represent the earliest evidence of Diné pastoralism. Other archaeologists have argued that these sites are Tewa shepherders' camps, an interpretation supported largely by the abundance of Tewa and Peñasco pottery. Schaafsma demonstrates, however, that there is no historical evidence that the Tewas settled this far up the Chama. It is unlikely that a Tewa settlement here would have escaped Spanish hegemony, and the structures seem too substantial for a seasonal camp. Unfortunately, the documentary evidence that this was home to Diné pastoralists is only circumstantial, and distinctive Diné cultural traits such as forked-stick hogans (found in association with similar masonry structures in the Dinétah area), sweat lodges, and Diné-manufactured pottery are absent. The Navajos to whom Zárate Salmerón referred may have lived farther up the Chama, closer to the San Juan River. After all, Fray Alonso de Benavides, only three years later, wrote that the population center for the "Apaches de Navajó" was some fifty leagues northwest of the Piros pueblos, which would indicate the San Juan River. He did, however, note that the Navajos' "rancherías" could be found scattered along the way. By the mid-1690s, when don Diego de Vargas reconquered the pueblos, at least some "Navajo Apaches" neighbored the Jemez and Cochiti pueblos, and it is possible that others lived in the Abiquiu Reservoir area. Additional archaeological investigations in the Abiquiu area and along the Chama may help resolve this debate. See Schaafsma, *Apaches de Navajo: Seventeenth-Century Navajos in the Chama Valley of New Mexico* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2002); idem, *The Cerrito Site (AR-4): A Piedra Lumbre Phase Settlement at Abiquiu Reservoir* (Santa Fe: School of American Research, 1979); idem, *Archaeological Survey of Maximum Pool and Navajo Excavations at Abiquiu Reservoir, Río Arriba County, New Mexico* (Santa Fe: School of American Research, 1976). But cf. Frank J. Wozniak, "Ethnohistory of the Abiquiu Reservoir Area," in *History and Ethnohistory along the Rio Chama*, ed. Frank J. Wozniak, Meade F. Kemrer, and Charles M. Carillo (Albuquerque: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1992); Kemrer, "Appraisal of Piedra Lumbre Phase," 88–107. For Benavides's and Vargas's admittedly vague locational information, see Fray Alonso de Benavides, *The Memorial of Fray Alonso de Benavides, 1630*, trans. Mrs. Edward E. Ayer, ed. Frederick Webb Hodge and Charles Fletcher Lummis (Chicago: Edward E. Ayer, 1916), 43–44; idem, *Fray Alonso de Benavides' Revised Memo-*

rial of 1634, trans. and ed. Frederick Webb Hodge, George P. Hammond, and Agapito Rey (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1945), 85; John L. Kessell, Rick Hendricks, and Meredith D. Dodge, eds., *Blood on the Boulders: The Journals of Don Diego de Vargas, New Mexico, 1694–97* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998), 67.

13. Benavides, *Memorial, 1630*, 137–38. Although some scholars, following the lead of archaeologist Edgar Lee Hewett, suggest that “Nabajú” referred to a particular locale, John P. Harrington, a linguist and specialist in Tewa geographical terminology, maintains that “Nabajú” refers more generally to arroyos with cultivated fields, rather than to a specific place. Anthropologist Edward H. Spicer later observed that modern Tewa speakers construed the meaning of the word as “to take from fields.” Nonetheless, the Spanish certainly understood their Jemez informants (who were themselves Tewa, not Tewa, speakers) to mean that the Nabajú were farmers. See Harrington, “Southern Peripherical Athapaskawan Origins, Divisions, and Migrations,” in *Essays in Historical Anthropology of North America*, Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, vol. 100 (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1940), 518, and Spicer, *Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533–1960* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1986), 211. Schaafsma offers a thorough discussion of the debate in *Apaches de Navajo*, 241–46.

14. Benavides, *Memorial*, 43–44; idem, *Revised Memorial*, 85; S. Lyman Tyler and H. Darrel Taylor, “The Report of Fray Alonso de Posada in Relation to Quivira and Teguayo,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 33 (Oct. 1958): 304. While it is unclear just how many Diné lived along the San Juan River—Benavides’ estimate of 30,000 was most certainly hyperbole—archaeologists examining the Navajo Reservoir area discovered 140 sites dating from approximately 1700 to 1750, a period when population in the area boomed. See Frank Warren Eddy, “Culture Ecology and the Prehistory of the Navajo Reservoir District” (Ph.D. diss., University of Colorado, 1968), 370; James Schoenwetter and Frank W. Eddy, *Alluvial and Palynological Reconstruction of Environments, Navajo Reservoir District*, Museum of New Mexico Papers in Anthropology, No. 13 (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1964), 22. On the images of the Hero Twins, see Polly Schaafsma, *Rock Art in the Navajo Reservoir District*, Papers in Anthropology, No. 7 (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1971), 37, 39, 60; idem, *Early Navaho Rock Paintings and Carvings* ([Santa Fe]: Museum of Navaho Ceremonial Art, 1966), 24, 29; Version III, in Wyman, *Blessingway*, 624.

15. As part of his diligent effort to retrace Roque Madrid’s military route, archaeologist John P. Wilson identified the mountain ridge extending from Dulce to Llaves, New Mexico, where it merges with an even higher *corderilla*, as the most likely meaning of the enigmatic location known as Casa Fuerte. I have followed his lead here. Wilson notes that this long, steep ridge is broken by only five easily guarded passes, making it such a natural line of defense that the Spanish called it impregnable. See Rick Hendricks and John P. Wilson, *The Navajos in 1705: Roque Madrid’s Campaign Journal* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996), 68.

16. James F. Brooks offers a brilliant interpretation of the contradictions of conflict, captivity, and consanguinity in *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

17. My understanding of raiding owes much to McNitt, *Navajo Wars*, especially chapter 1, and Reeve, "Navaho-Spanish Wars," *passim*.

18. Reeve, "Seventeenth-Century Relations," 49–50; Hendricks and Wilson, *Navajos in 1705*, 137–38, n. 2; Eddy, "Culture Ecology," 280, 283; Schoenwetter and Eddy, *Alluvial and Palynological Reconstruction*, 58, 120–24.

19. In relating the account that follows, I have relied on Hendricks and Wilson's translation of the journal. See especially, *Navajos in 1705*, xvi, 3–4, 13–14, 19, 24–33, 93, 112–18.

20. My thinking on this subject has benefited from Klara B. Kelley, *Navajo Land Use: An Ethnoarchaeological Study* (Orlando, FL: Academic Press, 1986), 16.

21. Ulibarri, Alvarez Castrillón, and several other soldiers mentioned seeing livestock during this campaign in their testimony before Governor Joaquín Codallos y Rabal in 1745. All of those who testified had also campaigned against the Navajos in 1743, however, and it is not clear whether they conflated their earlier observations with those of the 1740s; see W. W. Hill, ed., "Some Navaho Culture Changes during Two Centuries (including testimonials sent by Governor Codallos y Rabal to the Viceroy in the year 1745)," in *Essays in Historical Anthropology of North America*, 408–10, 413. For Cuervo, see "Report of Francisco Cuervo y Valdez, 18 Aug. 1706," in *Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773*, vol. 3, ed. Charles Wilson Hackett (Washington, DC: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1937), 381–82; Reeve, "Navaho-Spanish Wars," 217.

22. Lynn R. Bailey's *If You Take My Sheep: The Evolution and Conflicts of Navajo Pastoralism, 1630–1868* (Pasadena: Westernlore Publications, 1980) originally stimulated my thinking about the origins of Diné pastoralism, although my analysis has deviated somewhat from his. Also see McNitt, *Navajo Wars*, 23.

23. Hendricks and Wilson, *Navajos in 1705*, 6–7, 116; testimony of Alfonzo Rael de Aguilar, in Hill, "Navaho Culture Changes," 41; Towner, *Defending the Dinétah*, 137.

24. Juan Tafoya testified in 1743 that the Navajos lived on the mesatops in houses of stone and mud to protect themselves from the Comanches and Yutas. Alfonzo Rael de Aguilar provided even more detail: The Navajos, he said, live in the valleys during peaceful times and move to their dwellings on the tops of the mesa when the Yutas attack. Hill, "Navaho Culture Changes," 404, 411. Also consult Virginia McConnell Simmons, *The Ute Indians of Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico* (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2000), 32–33.

25. Patrick Hogan offers a fascinating (and sobering) discussion of how conjecture can become accepted as fact through scholarly misinterpretation and repetition in "Navajo-Pueblo Interaction during the Gobernador Phase," in *Rethinking Navajo Pueblitos* (Albuquerque: Bureau of Land Management, Farmington Resource Area, 1991), 1–22. Also consult A. V. Kidder, "Ruins of the Historic Period in the Upper San Juan Valley, New Mexico," *American Anthropologist* 22 (1920): 327–29.

26. Malcolm F. Farmer first suggested that Navajos themselves built the defensive structures at Dinétah in "Navaho Archaeology of Upper Blanco and Largo Canyons, Northern New Mexico," *American Antiquity* 8 (1942): 69. For current scholarship, consult Towner, *Defending the Dinétah*, 29–46, 203–4; Ronald H. Towner, "The Pueblito Phenomenon: A New Perspective on Post-Revolt Navajo Culture" in *The Archaeology of Navajo Origins*, ed. by Ronald H. Towner (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1996). Ronald H. Towner and Jeffrey S. Dean, "LA 2298: The Oldest Pueblito Revisited," *Kiva* 57 (1992): 315–29; Margaret A. Powers and Byron P. Johnson, *Defensive Sites of Dinétah*, Cultural Resources Series No. 2 (Albuquerque: Bureau of Land Management, 1987), 27–28; Michael P. Marshall, "The Pueblito as a Site Complex: Archeological Investigations in the Dinétah District: The 1989–1990 BLM Pueblito Survey," in *Rethinking Navajo Pueblitos*, chapter 5; idem, *A Chapter in Early Navajo History: Late Gobernador Phase Pueblito Sites of the Dinétah District* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, Office of Contract Archaeology, 1995), 8, 60–69; Brugge, "Navajo Archaeology," 262; John P. Warren and A. H. Warren, "LA 2298: The Earliest Pueblito?" *Awanyu* 2 (1974): 23; Hendricks and Wilson, *Navajos in 1705*, 20, 85–86. Ronald F. Towner argues that the refugees abandoned the Tapacito house shortly after 1705, but that does not necessarily preclude continued coresidence between that family and their Diné hosts. Lori Stephens Reed and Paul F. Reed suggest the development of relationships between Puebloan peoples and Diné in "The Protohistoric Navajo: Implications of Interaction, Exchange, and Alliance Formation with the Eastern and Western Pueblos," in *Cultural Diversity and Adaptation*, 103. As to clans, many originated with Puebloan ancestresses, some of whom may have come to live in Dinétah as refugees or captives; see Gladys A. Reichard, *Social Life of the Navajo Indians*, 1928, reprint (New York: AMS Press, 1969); Brugge, "Navajo Archaeology," 262.

Most scholars concur that Tapacito Pueblito was constructed in the fall of 1694, shortly after the July conquest of Jemez, based on numerous intact tree-ring samples. Nonetheless, archaeologist John Wilson (whose work ironically helped confirm the 1694 date) disputes this finding. Wilson has recently argued that the building did not yet exist in 1705, because Madrid and his men did not take notice of it (in Hendricks and Wilson, *Navajos in 1705*). I find this negative evidence unpersuasive.

Archaeologists have concluded that Puebloan refugees built the Tapacito structure based on three lines of evidence: the difference in masonry techniques from the area's eighteenth-century pueblitos, the coincidence of the dates of construction and the attack on Jemez, and the presence of a small amount of Puebloan pottery. Some archaeologists point to Tapacito Pueblito as evidence contradicting a large Puebloan influx into Dinétah. This building stands out from most of the other structures in the area, which were erected decades later. Well-regarded ethnohistorian and anthropologist David Brugge, by contrast, remains a stalwart proponent of the pueblo refugee hypothesis. In light of recent scholarship, he now concedes that the so-called pueblitos were built largely by Diné, yet he continues to hold that a fairly good-sized population of Puebloan people came to live among the Diné, whom they taught religious

stories, weaving, herding techniques, and other cultural knowledge, thereby engendering the hybrid Athabaskan-Puebloan-Hispanic culture that we recognize as Navajo. Circumstantial evidence, especially the presence of Puebloan elements in Diné ceremonies, lends credence to Brugge's hypothesis. And of course, as he points out, the Puebloan influx did not necessarily come solely in the aftermath of the Spanish reconquest. Some people may have fled to Diné-tah well after the reconquest period or joined the Diné as captives. I remain unconvinced, however, that the sharing of ideas necessarily reflects a large immigration of Puebloan people. There were many other opportunities for Diné to appropriate useful knowledge: when Diné women and children escaped from their captivity in the pueblos; when Diné captured Puebloan peoples; when occasional intermarriage forged bonds of kinship; and when trading excursions brought Diné to the pueblos, where they could make friends, observe, and learn. Conversations with Patrick Hogan and Jim Copeland helped to confirm and clarify my thinking on this subject; also consult Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*, 95–97, and Hogan, "Navajo-Pueblo Interaction," 16–22.

27. The construction of Frances Canyon Pueblito took place incrementally between 1710 and 1743. Towner, *Defending the Diné-tah*, 101–12; Powers and Johnson, *Defensive Sites of Diné-tah*, passim; Marshall, "Pueblito," passim; idem, *Early Navajo History*, 17–28 and chapter 2; LouAnn Jacobson, Stephen Fosberg, and Robert Bewley, "Navajo Defensive Systems in the Eighteenth Century," in *Cultural Diversity and Adaptation*, 110; Roy L. Carlson, *Eighteenth Century Navajo Fortresses of Gobernador District*, University of Colorado Studies, Series in Anthropology, No. 10 (Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 1965), 2, 100–1; Laboratory of Anthropology, Museum of New Mexico Archeological Site Survey Form for Foothold Ruin, courtesy of Jim Copeland, Bureau of Land Management. On the contemporaneity of the hogans and pueblitos, and the development of pueblito communities, see Towner, *Defending the Diné-tah*, 139–41, 161–69. I am indebted to the generosity of Doug Dykeman and Jeff Wharton, of the Navajo Nation Archaeology Department in Farmington, and especially to Jim Copeland, of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, all three of whom guided me in experiencing a number of these defensive structures firsthand.

28. Towner offers the most complete discussion of the defensive use of these structures in *Defending the Diné-tah*, 154–57, 161–69. Also consult Farmer, "Navaho Archaeology," 66; Jacobson, Fosberg, and Bewley, "Navajo Defensive Systems," 130–36; Powers and Johnson, *Defensive Sites of Diné-tah*, 9 and the individual site descriptions contained in this report.

29. Powers and Johnson, *Defensive Sites of Diné-tah*, 12, 16–17, 19, 21, 43, 52, 56, 90; Marshall, "Pueblito," 15, 16, 39, 83, 120, 246–47, 249–50, 281; idem, *Early Navajo History*, 12, 32, 34, 37, 39, 56–58, 133, 145, 213–19; Towner and Johnson, *San Rafael Canyon Survey*, 55–57, 71, 166, 168–70; Dorothy L. Keur, "A Chapter in Navaho-Pueblo Relations," *American Antiquity* 10 (1944): 81; Carlson, *Eighteenth Century Fortresses*, 36, 38, 42, 102, 113; Hill, "Navaho Culture Changes," 400, 404, 406, 410, 412. For an example of the use of natural enclosures in the nineteenth century, see Walter Dyk and Ruth Dyk, *Left Handed: A Navajo Autobiography* (New York: Columbia

University Press, 1980), 4–6. So far, Marshall is the only archaeologist to document corrals or lamb pens as evidence of livestock husbandry, and other scholars question the validity of his interpretations (Jim Copeland, personal communication; Towner, *Defending the Dinétab*, 190). Direct evidence of agriculture is also scarce, however, and—considering the firm documentation of farming and stock ownership offered by Madrid and his men—that paucity should remind us of the dangers of negative archaeological evidence. Possible documentary corroboration of the presence of stock tanks comes from the testimony of don Bernardo de Bustamante and Antonio de Ulibarri, both of whom reported to Rabal that they saw ponds of rainwater that do not appear to have been in arroyo beds.

30. Hill, “Navaho Culture Changes,” 400, 402, 404, 407. Antonio Montoya and Blas Martín specifically mentioned goats in their testimony before Rabal. For background on the hearing, see David M. Brugge, “Eighteenth-Century Fugitives from New Mexico among the Navajos,” in *Papers from the Third, Fourth, and Sixth Navajo Studies Conferences*, comp. Alexandra Roberts and Jenevieve Smith (Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department, 1993), 279.

31. Here I draw on the site descriptions in Marshall, “Pueblito,” passim (for descriptions of water, see pp. 16, 88, 109, 183, 211) and on my own observations in the area.

32. Whether Diné lived in the area only seasonally or year-round is unclear. In those few instances in which archaeologists have reported the construction season, building activities occurred in summer, and Madrid’s assaults likewise took place in summer. It is entirely possible that the residents of these canyons lived elsewhere in winter and migrated here seasonally. On seasonal construction, consult Towner, *Defending the Dinétab*, 56, 74–75, 210–11; Towner and Johnson, *San Rafael Canyon Survey*, 36–37, 52–53; also see John Loring Haskell, “The Navajo in the Eighteenth Century: An Investigation Involving Anthropological Archaeology in the San Juan Basin, Northwestern New Mexico” (Ph.D. diss., Washington State University, 1975), 161, 176.

33. Juan Joseph Lobato to Gov. don Thomas Vélez Cachupín, 17 Aug. 1752, quoted in Alfred Barnaby Thomas, *The Plains Indians and New Mexico, 1751–1778: A Collection of Documents Illustrative of the History of the Eastern Frontier of New Mexico*, Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, vol. 11 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1940), 117. The incentives for outmigration were likely multiple. Musket parts found at Frances Canyon Pueblito, along with musket balls and their impact marks at Shaft House in Largo Canyon, hint at why the Diné may have left. Drought, too, may have played a part, although scholars disagree on this issue. A Kiowa man named Bentura, who had lived a year and a half among Navajos, reported that a 1748 drought brought crop failure to Navajo country; some archaeologists have suggested that this event encouraged families to abandon the area. Archaeologist Ronald F. Towner, however, argues that the following year, 1749, was a rather wet one, and that the Diné were perfectly capable of weathering one bad year; moreover, Diné built new pueblitos and added on to old ones after that drought. Still, construction in Dinétab dropped precipitously in the 1750s. The droughty

period after 1752 may have so depleted forage that only a few families could hold on. Consult Towner, *Defending the Dinétah*, 158–61, 184–85; Towner and Johnson, *San Rafael Canyon Survey*, 183–84; Jacobson, Fosberg, and Bewley, “Navajo Defense Systems,” 107, 122; Brugge, “Eighteenth-Century Fugitives,” 279–80; idem, “The Navajo Exodus,” Supplement No. 5 (Las Cruces: Archaeological Society of New Mexico, 1972); J. Lee Correll, *Through White Men’s Eyes: A Contribution to Navajo History: A Chronological Record of the Navajo People from Earliest Times to the Treaty of 1868*, 3 vols. (Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Heritage Center, 1979), 57.

34. This discussion of Diné movement into the Chaco area draws largely on David M. Brugge, *Tsegai: An Archeological Ethnohistory of the Chaco Region*, Publications in Archeology 18C, Chaco Canyon Studies (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1986), 5–11, 14–24, 77–84; and Alden C. Hayes, David M. Brugge, and W. James Judge, *Archeological Surveys of Chaco Canyon, New Mexico*, Publications in Archeology 18A, Chaco Canyon Studies (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1981), 36–37, 69–71, 99–100. Also consult R. Gwinn Vivian, “The Navajo Archaeology of the Chacra Mesa” (M.A. Thesis, University of New Mexico, 1960); Bailey, *If You Take My Sheep*, 79–82; Spicer, *Cycles of Conquest*, 212–13; John, *Storms Brewed*, 116–17, 232–33. For a general overview of the Chaco Anasazi, consult David Hurst Thomas, “The World as It Was,” in *The Native Americans: An Illustrated History*, ed. Betty Ballantine and Ian Ballantine (Atlanta: Turner Publishing, 1993), 64–77.

35. Instruction of don Thomas Vélez Cachupín, 12 Aug. 1754, in Thomas, *Plains Indians and New Mexico*, 138; Dorothy L. Keur, *Big Bead Mesa: An Archaeological Study of Navaho Acculturation, 1745–1812* (Menasha, WI: Society for American Archaeology, 1941), passim. Also see Eleanor B. Adams, ed. and trans., *Bishop Tamarón’s Visitation of New Mexico, 1760*, Publications in History 15 (Albuquerque: Historical Society of New Mexico, 1954), 67.

36. Frank McNitt discusses the Navajos of Cebolleta at length in *Navajo Wars*, chapter 2. James Brooks, however, offers a most compelling interpretation of this community, which eventually became known to other Diné as Diné Ana’áii (Enemy Navajos), in *Captives and Cousins*, 103–16. Also consult Frank D. Reeve, “The Navaho-Spanish Peace: 1720s–1770s,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 34 (1959): 29–36; Correll, *Through White Men’s Eyes*, 1: 95, 108, 116. Also see Petition of Joaquin Mestas, in *The Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, vol. 2, trans. Ralph Emerson Twitchell (1914; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1976), doc. 557.

37. See, for example, Marc Simmons, *New Mexico: An Interpretive History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988), 82. For accounts of the first wave of raids in the nineteenth century, see Fernando Chacón to Nemesio Salcedo; Diary of Events, 16 May 1804; José Manuel Aragón to Joaquín Real Alencaster, 6 Dec. 1805; and Investigation of Complaints, 25 May–9 July 1808, all in Twitchell, *Spanish Archives*, vol. 2, docs. 1730, 1929, and 2105, and folios 2–3 and 21. The catalog of depredations compiled in Correll, *Through White Men’s Eyes*, 1: 144–55, is also illuminating. The depredation claims, however, particularly after the 1840s, may well have been exaggerated. Sometimes the

raiders were actually Apaches or Utes, and in at least some instances, New Mexican herders and stock owners blamed Navajos even when they lost their animals to negligence or coyotes. See, for example, Correll, *Through White Men's Eyes*, 1: 378; 2: 34, 272, 295; 3: 177. The quote is from James S. Calhoun to William Medill, 1 Oct. 1849, in James S. Calhoun, *The Official Correspondence of James S. Calhoun*, ed. by Annie Louise Abel (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1915), 32. Also consult Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*, 113–14, and McNitt, *Navajo Wars*, 247.

38. Teodoro de Croix to Joseph de Gálvez, 23 Feb. 1780, in Alfred Barnaby Thomas, trans. and ed., *Forgotten Frontiers: A Study of the Spanish Indian Policy of Don Juan Bautista de Anza, Governor of New Mexico, 1777–1787* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1932), 144. Also consult “An Account of the Events Concerning the Dissolution of the Gila-Navajo Alliance, 1785–1786,” in *ibid.*, 350.

39. Fernando Chacón to Pedro de Nava, 15 July 1795, in Twitchell, *Spanish Archives*, vol. 2, doc. 1335. Also see Daniel S. Matson and Albert H. Schroeder, “Cordero’s Descriptions of the Apache—1796,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 32 (Oct. 1957): 356.

40. Dennis Gilpin, “Early Navajo Occupation West of the Chuska Mountains,” in Towner, *Archaeology of Navajo Origins*, 179–83; “Account of the Dissolution of the Gila-Navajo Alliance,” 350.

41. Quoted in Matson and Schroeder, “Cordero’s Descriptions of the Apache,” 356. This translation is based on a transcript of Cordero’s field report, incorporated into Manuel Orozco y Berra’s geography, written in 1864. These references, like so much in the Spanish record, give us only sketchy ideas about the spread of the Diné across the southern Colorado Plateau. Although Cordero wrote the first descriptive reference to Canyon de Chelly, don Bernardo de Miera y Pacheco depicted it even earlier, in 1778. On a map of the “Provincia de Nabajoo,” Miera drew “Sierra de Chequi” as a noteworthy locale between the Chuskas and the Hopi mesas. However, his map did not indicate that any Spaniards had actually confirmed the presence of Navajos in these canyons. See the map in Herbert E. Bolton, “Pageant in the Wilderness: The Story of the Escalante Expedition into the Interior Basin, 1776, Including the Diary and Itinerary of Father Escalante, Translated and Annotated,” in *Utah Historical Quarterly* 18 (1950). With regard to the Chuskas, a letter from Chacón to Nava, 18 Nov. 1799, confirms that Navajos were using the ridge at least intermittently by the turn of the century.

42. My discussion of Canyons de Chelly and del Muerto draws on the work of Pamela Carroll Magers, “Navajo Settlement in Canyon del Muerto” (Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona, 1976). She provides a summary of her findings on pp. xii–xiii. Also consult *idem*, “Navajo Settlement in Canyon del Muerto,” in *The Canyon del Muerto Survey Project: Anasazi and Navajo Archeology in Northeastern Arizona*, ed. Patricia L. Fall, James A. McDonald, and Pamela C. Magers, Publications in Anthropology, No. 15 (Tucson: Western Archeological Center, 1981). I am indebted to Scott Travis for the insights he provided on the history of the Diné in this canyon during an extraordinary tour in 1996.

43. McNitt, *Navajo Wars*, 39–44.

44. My account of this event draws on McNitt, *Navajo Wars*, 39–44; David Brugge's translation of Narbona's report in that volume, Appendix A; and a Diné oral tradition reported in Magers, "Navajo Settlement in Canyon del Muerto," 57–58.

45. Kemrer offers a generally persuasive analysis of the waves of early settlement on Black Mesa in "Dynamics," 62, 77–78, 127–28, 133–36. Also see Deborah L. Nichols and F. E. Smiley, *Excavations on Black Mesa 1982: A Descriptive Report*, Research Paper No. 39 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, Center for Archaeological Investigation, 1984), 414. For reports on the military incursions made between 1823 and 1860, see David M. Brugge, ed., "Vizcarra's Navajo Campaign of 1823," *Arizona and the West* 6 (1964): 223–44; and J. H. Simpson, *Navaho Expedition: Journal of a Military Reconnaissance from Santa Fe, New Mexico, to the Navaho Country, Made in 1849*, ed. Frank McNitt (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964). I draw my imagery of Black Mesa from Shirley Powell and George J. Gumerman, *People of the Mesa: The Archaeology of Black Mesa, Arizona* (Tucson: Southwest Parks and Monuments Association, 1987), 6–8, confirmed by my aerial survey in 2002; also consult James M. Goodman, *The Navajo Atlas: Environments, Resources, People, and History of the Diné Bikeyah* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982), 30–31.

46. Correll, *Through White Men's Eyes*, 1: 294; Peter P. Andrews et al., *Excavations on Black Mesa, 1980: A Descriptive Report*, Research Paper No. 24 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, Center for Archaeological Investigations, 1982), 201–2, 205–13, 215; Nichols and Smiley, *Black Mesa 1982*, 443–45, 469; Andrew L. Christenson and William J. Parry, *Excavations on Black Mesa, 1983: A Descriptive Report*, Research Paper No. 46 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, Center for Archaeological Investigations, 1985), 272, 274, 277–78; Kemrer, "Dynamics," 144–47.

47. Brugge, *Tsegai*, 15–24, 77–84; and Hayes, Brugge, and Judge, *Archaeological Surveys of Chaco Canyon*, 36–37, 69–71, 99–100.

48. Goodman, *Navajo Atlas*, 26; Linda Popelish and Russell T. Fehr, *Archaeological Investigations in the Northern Chuska Mountains: The N-13 Road Survey at Red Rock and Lukachukai, Navajo Nation*, Navajo Nation Papers in Anthropology 18 (Window Rock: Navajo Nation Cultural Resources Management Program, 1983), 9, 13–21.

49. See, for example, Walter Dyk, *Son of Old Man Hat: A Navaho Autobiography* (1938; reprint Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), 178–79. Also consult Cosmos Mindeleff, *Navaho Houses*, in Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1895–1896*, Pt. 2 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1898), 484.