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Abstract

Cruz, Patrick (M.A., Anthropology)

Landscape Memory and Authority:

How Perceptions of Landscape Played a Part in Pueblo Migrations to the Northern Rio Grande.

Thesis directed by Professor Scott Ortman.

This thesis provides a new perspective on the 13th century Pueblo migrations between the Northern San Juan region of Southwest Colorado and the Northern Rio Grande region of New Mexico. My perspective is based on several conceptualizations: of meaning of landscape; how landscapes of memory would have reinforced and reified social-political structures of authority; the role that these systems of authority would have played in affecting Pueblo people living in the Northern San Juan region; and how these systems were likely changed and restructured as a result of the migrations that gave rise to the Tewa Pueblos of today. This thesis takes a look at the role that conceptions of landscape might have played in reinforcing social-political legitimation of privileged members of society and how such systems can be altered or changed depending on the circumstances of the interactions people have with landscape. I argue that in such context we might not expect diagnostic cultural-material traits to manifest themselves in the destination lands, something that Southwest archaeologists have always assumed would exist. I presume the destination lands for these migrants to have been the Pojoaque area.

I look at the archaeology of the Pojoaque area which has one of the longest occupation histories in the Northern Rio Grande region and can be presumed to have been a contact place between migrants and locals. Ethnographically this area is remembered as being the place where Tewa people arrived following their migrations. I presume that this was a place where cultural identity, political systems, and ontologies were actively negotiated and forged between locals and migrants. I conducted research at a
site called the ‘Winter Village’, potentially identified in oral history as being part of this larger Tewa
migration narrative of “coming together” of peoples. I suggest that the site was part of larger regional
processes of Northern Rio Grande stylistic in-situ development which simultaneously rejected old signals
of identity from their previous homeland and active selection of new ways of being resulting from
processes of negotiation between migrants and local groups. I argue these processes were responsible
for the formulation that ultimately resulted in Tewa ethnic identity.
Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my committee members Scott Ortman, Catherine Cameron, and Art Joyce for all their help, guidance, and support for this project. I want to thank the Pueblo of Pojoaque, Bruce Bernstein, my parents, and all other family and friends for their support. In particular, I want thank Laura, my wife, for her endless support and encouragement without which this project would not have been possible.
# Table of Contents

1 Migration: A Time to Move ........................................................................................................................................... 1

2 The Northern Rio Grande Region and the Pueblo of Pojoaque .............................................................................. 7

   The Chronology .......................................................................................................................................................... 9
   Developmental period (400/600-1175 C.E.) ......................................................................................................... 10
   The Coalition Period (1175-1325 C.E.) ................................................................................................................ 11
   Classic Period (1325-1600 C.E.) .......................................................................................................................... 14
   The Historic Period (1600 C.E.-Present) ................................................................................................................ 15

A Change in Archaeological Philosophies .................................................................................................................. 16

Tewa Settlement History .............................................................................................................................................. 19

Language Distributions ................................................................................................................................................. 22

History of Pojoaque Pueblo .......................................................................................................................................... 25

3 Migration and the Authority of Landscape ............................................................................................................. 28

   Landscapes are Imbued with Memory ...................................................................................................................... 30
   Pueblo Authority Structures .................................................................................................................................. 33
   Why Some Traits Might Not Transfer .................................................................................................................. 42
   Migration and Land based Authority ...................................................................................................................... 43
   Migrants Arrive. Now What? .................................................................................................................................. 46
   Mapping Memory onto New Landscapes .................................................................................................................. 50
   Conclusions ............................................................................................................................................................. 52

4 Owóy wéhaé di: They Were Coming From Far Away ............................................................................................ 53

   The Pojoaque area in Tewa Tradition ...................................................................................................................... 57
   Some Contention ...................................................................................................................................................... 61

5 Walking the Grounds ................................................................................................................................................. 66

   The Winter Village (LA 12271) ............................................................................................................................. 70
   Old Pojoaque Village (LA 271) ............................................................................................................................... 79
   Comparative Analysis .............................................................................................................................................. 85
   The Camino Rincon Area ....................................................................................................................................... 85
   Cuyamungue (LA 38) .............................................................................................................................................. 87
   Tsama (LA 908) ....................................................................................................................................................... 90
   Summary on the Pojoaque Area .............................................................................................................................. 92

6 Conclusion: Bringing it all together .......................................................................................................................... 95

References ................................................................................................................................................................. 107
Tables

Table 1. Feature Descriptions from the Winter Village (Hillcrest) ................................................................. 77

Table 2. Winter Village Ceramic Survey ........................................................................................................... 79

Table 3. Pasture and Old Pojoaque Ceramics Survey .................................................................................... 81

Table 4. North Midden area Ceramic Survey ................................................................................................ 83

Table 5. Flat Field Ceramic Survey ................................................................................................................. 84

Table 6. Pottery assemblages from the Camino Rincon site ........................................................................... 87
Figures

Figure 1. The Great Pueblo Migrations of the 13th century ................................................................. 2

Figure 2. The Tewa World .................................................................................................................. 8

Figure 3. Table depicting estimated populations. ............................................................................... 13

Figure 4. Graph depicting population trends in the northern Rio Grande ........................................... 14

Figure 5. Distribution of Linguistic Groups in the Northern Rio Grande .............................................. 24

Figure 6. Sand Canyon Pueblo .......................................................................................................... 37

Figure 7. H.P. Mera map of Cuyamungue area .................................................................................. 64

Figure 8. Ellis 1951 map of Pojoaque survey area. ............................................................................. 68

Figure 9. Winter Village survey using ground penetrating radar (Archaeological Geophysics and Consulting Archaeologists). ......................................................................................... 73

Figure 10. Archaeological Geophysics and Consulting Archaeologists interpretive map ..................... 73

Figure 11. Pojoaque area .................................................................................................................... 75

Figure 12. Camino Rincon site .......................................................................................................... 86

Figure 13. Cuyamungue (LA38) ......................................................................................................... 89

Figure 14. Map of Tsama Pueblo (LA908). ....................................................................................... 91
1 Migration: A Time to Move

The study of migration is the study of the movement of people from one region to another. It is the long-distance movement of individuals or groups of people leaving their home region and communities and striking out to settle new regions, often at considerable distance from their previous homeland. The distances involved can vary but, in my view, migration involves distances that are so great that return trips will not be feasible or practical on a regular basis. Cabana and Clark define migration as “a one-way residential relocation to a different “environment” by at least one individual” (2011:5). They go into further detail “(t)he movement of multiple individuals can occur in two fundamental ways: (1) as a series of individuals (or small groups) acting independently based on common motives; or (2) as a large social group whose actions are coordinated by a central authority” (2011:7). They mention that a migration event “also must be a residential relocation that is relatively permanent. Thus, visits (which by definition are temporary) and seasonal rounds that are cyclical are not migration” (2011:7). Further, migration is transgressive. “It is about crossing perceived and real boundaries that are socially, culturally, and/or linguistically constructed” (2011:9).

In this thesis I consider the large-scale migration that took place during the 13th century from the Northern San Juan region to the Northern Rio Grande in the US Southwest (Figure 1). This case of migration was inter-regional in that it involved the movement of people between Southwest Colorado and North Central New Mexico, distances that were too great to allow for frequent returns. Both push and pull factors must have been present for migration here to have taken place (Cameron 1995:111; Lipe 1995). When people migrate to locations where existing populations are present, new relationships will have to be formulated and negotiated between the locals and the migrants. These relationships can be either cordial or violent. Migrations can be conducted by small numbers of people or by entire populations. Migrations can be conducted by individuals, on a family scale, or by large organized
groups. Finally, migrations lead to the potential for group social and political reorganization as old authority groups lose power and are replaced by new authority groups or even by new political systems. I argue for this case with regards to the migration from the Northern San Juan to the Northern Rio Grande regions. Migrations have the ability to shake up old political and social systems of authority which are often tied to place and allow for new ones to develop in destination lands. Simply put, migrations can lead to revolutionary changes.

*Figure 1. The Great Pueblo Migrations of the 13th century leaving the Northern San Juan region of the US Southwest*

In this thesis I will be investigating the concept of migration with regard to the pre-migration and post-migration peoples and cultures of the Northern San Juan and the Northern Rio Grande geographical regions. I will specifically look at the social and political consequences of migration using the Tewa as the presumed migrant group. I will focus on a likely destination area to which many of these
people moved: the Pojoaque area north of Santa Fe. This area was a pre-migration population center and a likely place where early migrants would have arrived. I also address the lack of material culture continuity that has plagued archaeology’s search for connections between the Northern San Juan and the Northern Rio Grande in this model.

The distinction between inter-regional migration versus the intra-regional cyclical short distance movement across the landscape needs to be clarified. Short distance cyclical movements characterize traditional Tewa life ways, as best characterized by Swentzell who describes such intra-regional movements (2004:51). This idea has been further elaborated by both Cordell (1998:90-91) and Anschuetz (2006:67) who describe an essential traditional Tewa habitation practice, where people were free to move either as individuals, families or larger social groups, which cycled through the landscape within the region or cultural territory. Families were free to move from one settlement to another, or large numbers of people could move to found new settlements or could settle in current ones. Oftentimes this pattern leads to the reoccupation of places that had previously been inhabited. Thus, the Tewa region does not witness a break in occupation or cultural discontinuity despite the shuffling of people throughout the landscape. Old settlements are left for new ones, some settlements may cease to be occupied on a regular basis (Pueblo people would argue that villages are never truly abandoned in the Western conception of this term), new settlements can be established, but there is no great distance of movement beyond the cultural region. I would argue that in such cases of short distance movement there is little potential for substantial or revolutionary societal or political change. That is because the existing power systems remain coherent and in place.

In this thesis I focus on two specific aspects of migration: the process of negotiating with a new environment, and the subsequent interactions between locals and migrants. I must acknowledge for the reader that I accept, based on the many lines of evidence available, that a migration from the Northern San Juan to the Northern Rio Grande, which I refer to as the Great Pueblo Migration, did in fact take
place and was completed by the late 13th century. (Kohler et al. 2010; Ortman 2012). Although there is debate in the literature, the question for me isn’t whether or not such an event happened, but rather ‘why’ and ‘how’ it happened. Tewa people themselves claim the Four Corners as an ancestral home. To dismiss this oral history is to ignore their perspective outright. Tewa belief in the Great Pueblo Migration from the north is virtually universal across all the villages. To ignore this is to disenfranchise Tewa people from their own history. I do not claim that Tewa speakers were the only group to have come from the Northern San Juan region. Instead, I believe that the broader San Juan region was a point of genesis for multiple linguistic groups that became the different Pueblos of today and that the ancestors of the Tewa were among them.

I would like to explain my position here before going any further. I am Tewa, yet I also have an anthropology background. I bring with me my own interpretations of the Tewa past and lessons from multiple subfields of anthropology together in my own form of Indigenous archaeological perspective. My work is a bit of a synthesis between those two worlds. It is not strictly Tewa, but neither is it strictly archaeology. Nor is it merely a synthesis for that matter. By taking my own knowledge and interpretation of the Tewa perspective and marrying it with archaeological epistemologies, I am making hypotheses that are solely my own. I do not lay claim to Tewa knowledge as that belongs to Tewa elders and to traditional leaders, but neither am I ignorant of much of it. Nor am I as likely to dismiss or misinterpret Tewa conceptions and understandings as many non-Pueblo scholars have done in the past. My training in archaeological concepts and how archaeologists interpret the past has laid a foundation for what to look for, how to look for it, and how to understand processes of change. I am not an absolutist. I believe both indigenous and anthropological perspectives have much to contribute and that both are necessary for a holistic understanding of the past. Tewa oral tradition tells us what happened and why in the “big picture.” Archaeology on the other hand can show us the details. It is good at showing us how it happened.
In the past some archaeologists and anthropologists have been skeptical of this process or of the legitimacy of including an indigenous perspective. Some have argued that indigenous perspectives on history cannot and should not be used to provide evidence as they are oral histories passed down from generation to generation, are not based on Western or Cartesian conceptualizations of how the world works, are not easily testable, are prone to include flights of fancy or myth, and are often used to make moral points rather than a purely objective recording of events (Cameron 1995:104, 108; Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006: Location 320, 323; Mason 2000; McGhee 2008:594). This is tantamount to saying “let the “specialists” do the work of telling indigenous people their own history concerning where they came from and how they came to be. This perspective threatens to return us to the world of 1960’s New Archaeology where indigenous perspectives were generally ignored and considered useless in informing about the factual past. This archaeological perspective made it possible for Upham to refer to Pueblo ethnography as a “tyranny” which hampered archaeological interpretation (Upham 1987 as reported in Snead 2008:31). In this view there were always two narratives of the past concerning a single place and a single people: the indigenous story and the archaeological story, and they were understood to be at complete odds with each other or best kept separate. It was generally viewed as natural for scholars raised in Western ways of understanding the world to ignore counterpoints seemingly based on stories and myths. Yet, indigenous groups know their history. It only benefits archaeology to pay attention to these traditional oral histories. This allows the strength of archaeology to shine in that it provides a methodology and framework that when combined with oral history can provide a compelling and holistic understanding of the past.

Here I recognize that my perspective is at odds with that of Upham (1987). I am not arguing for a return to the direct historical approach exactly, but rather a synthesis of traditional oral histories with archaeology. It is possible for them to work together as long as neither side is dismissive of the other. Again, I just want to clarify that although I bring a Tewa perspective to this investigation, I speak only for
myself and my hypotheses are my own. I don’t presume to, nor is it my place to, speak for Tewa people as a whole. At the same time, I come from an archaeology background, but my perspectives are often different from those of non-indigenous archaeologists. How could they not be? My personal background and lived experiences cannot help but act and influence my own understandings and conceptualizations of the world and my own anthropological perspectives. Rather than being an outsider studying another group, I have “a foot in both worlds”. It is unconventional, but I don’t believe it to be necessarily contradictory. If nothing else, I wish to at least offer some food for thought about the Great Pueblo Migration for other scholars to consider. Even if these hypotheses might later be disproven I hope they will contribute to new thinking about how these events might have happened.

In this study I develop the concept of ‘landscape as memory’ which in turn grants authority to residents. Then I lay out a hypothesis on how migration from the Northern San Juan to the Northern Rio Grande might have played out. I acknowledge that testing this hypothesis might be difficult, but I believe it provides a feasible explanation for cultural changes that likely occurred among the migrants, and it is a view that has not yet appeared in the literature as far as I am aware. That is, I believe it provides a plausible explanation for why there is so much cultural discontinuity between the Northern San Juan and the Northern Rio Grande, even as other lines of evidence suggest a strong relationship (Blinman 2017; Cameron 1995:110; Lakatos 2007:33; Ortman 2012).

In Chapter 2 I look at the chronology and history of the Northern Rio Grande and take a closer look specifically at the Pojoaque area which I propose was a center of negotiation between locals and migrants. I also take a brief look at the development of archaeology in the Southwest. In Chapter 3 I present my own perspective and hypothesis concerning the Great Pueblo Migration and suggest an alternative way to look at the longstanding problem of the apparent lack of continuity between the origin homeland and newly established homeland cultures. Evidence suggests that the Pojoaque area was home to one of the earliest concentrations of people in the Northern Rio Grande region and thus
may preserve traces of the processes by which 13th century migrants negotiated with people who had settled the region previously. In Chapter 4 I look at the oral history of the region and indigenous interpretations of this history. It will also include a discussion of the Tewa arrival in their new homeland and what this might have meant for the regional culture. In Chapter 5 I present the results of an archaeological survey project at a site called the Winter Village which lies immediately northeast of the present village of Pojoaque Pueblo and compare and contrast my results with materials recovered by Florence Hawley Ellis during her 1951 field school in Pojoaque Pueblo as well as other recently recorded sites in the area. Finally, in Chapter 6 I synthesize all of the information presented here to develop a perspective on how interactions between migrants and locals might have shaped or impacted the character of Tewa society. I will conclude with observations and suggestions for future research.

Through this work, I will propose that we need to return a sense of agency to Pueblo people regarding their own history; and that traditional oral histories can be used to study the past, despite feelings to the contrary. I do not propose an absolutist perspective of strict observance of one side or the other, that is whether ancestral Tewa society was exclusively one of migrants or that it was the result of local in-situ developments during the 13th century. Instead I propose that both were involved.

2 The Northern Rio Grande Region and the Pueblo of Pojoaque

The area of focus for this study is the southern region of the Espanola Valley, or what Harrington once referred to as ‘Tewa Valley’ (Harrington 1916:103). It is broken down into the Espanola Valley proper to the north and the Tesuque Basin to the south which itself is north of the city of Santa Fe. The valley/region extends from the town of Velarde in the north to Santa Fe in the south and from the town of White Rock in the west to Chimayo in the east and encompasses the majority of the historic Tewa homeland. Tewa traditional lands extend beyond this valley into the surrounding mountains and
foothills and have traditionally been bounded in the north by Canjilon Peak or Kay P‘in (some sources cite San Antonio Peak Tse Shu P‘in instead) (Ortiz 1969:140), Chikomo peak or Tsikumu P‘in (in the Jemez Mountains) in the west, Sandia Peak or Oku P‘in in the south, and Truchas Peak or K‘u Sehn P‘in (in the Sangre de Cristo Mountains) in the east. These peaks bound the traditional historic Tewa homelands in the Rio Chama Basin, the Espanola Valley, and the Galisteo Basin and define that which is considered Tewa and that which is considered foreign or non-Tewa (Figure 2). Historically the Tewa have been recognized as belonging to two regional areas: the northern Tewa belonging to the lands north of Santa Fe where Tewa communities continue to reside today, and the southern Tewa, often referred to as Thano, who resided in the Galisteo Basin south of Santa Fe where no Tewa communities remain today.

Figure 2. The Tewa World bounded by Canjilon peak (N), Tsikumu peak (W), Sandia peak (S), and Truchas peak (E). Note the peak with a “1” is San Antonio peak which has been argued to be the north peak instead of Canjilon.

The study area is confined to the foothills of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains north of Santa Fe and east of the Rio Grande. The landscape and ecozones of the area are quite diverse with mountain alpine areas, aspen, spruce and fir mountain forests, juniper pinon forested canyon lands down to semi-
arid rolling hills of juniper-grasslands and riparian environments along the rivers and streams (Shapiro 2008:10). The Rio Grande runs from northeast to southwest through the valley bisecting the region into west and east halves, with numerous small tributaries that generally run west and east into the Rio Grande. Elevation is varied from 13,000 to 5500 feet and moisture is highly localized and variable, generally ranging from 10 to 20 inches of precipitation per year (Luebben and Brugge 1953:2) and with most moisture falling between May and October. Temperatures generally range on average from 19 to 85 degrees Fahrenheit (Shapiro 2008:8).

The Chronology

The archaeological sequence for the Northern Rio Grande was defined by Wendorf (1954) and has been utilized and modified ever since. The version I cite is that used by Shapiro (2008:23). It consists of the Archaic (around 6000 to 400/600 C.E.), Developmental (400/600 -1175 C.E.), Coalition (1175-1325 C.E.), Classic (1325-1600 C.E.), and Historic (1600 C.E. to present) periods. The dates associated with these periods are somewhat subjective in that they are defined by material culture traits and should not be considered as bounded absolute dates. Also, not all sites experienced the transition from one cultural period to the next at the same time. As such these time periods should be looked upon as a general guide rather than as concrete chronological stages. Wendorf (1954) and Reed (1949) came up with this system as an alternative to the better known Pecos Classification which, despite the name, is most often applied to the San Juan/Four Corners region. This latter system is organized into Basketmaker II (1 C.E. - 499 C.E.), Basketmaker III (500-699 C.E.), Pueblo I (700-899 C.E.), Pueblo II (900-1099 C.E.), Pueblo III (1100-1299 C.E.), Pueblo IV (1300-1599 C.E.), and Pueblo V (1600 to present). As before, these are also to be viewed as abstractions. Transitions between periods should not be viewed as definite and in some places transitions between periods happened sooner than in others.
Developmental period (400/600-1175 C.E.)

The Late Developmental Period (after 900 C.E.) is the first period that is generally associated with Puebloan occupation in the Northern Rio Grande. Prior to this, archaic hunters and gatherers likely moved through the region and utilized its resources but there appears to have been only limited habitation. These were people who were part of a larger tradition of archaic peoples that roamed the greater Southwest. With the onset of the Late Developmental Period there appears to have been an uptick in population growth, but this has tended to garner only limited attention since it is overshadowed by much more dramatic population trends during the Coalition Period. Northern Rio Grande Late Developmental peoples, despite sharing a general Pueblo cultural affiliation, seem to have been less influenced by events taking place in the Chacoan region during the Pueblo II period than was the case for other areas. This is surprising considering the proximity of the two regions as well as the proximity of the Northern Rio Grande to the Cerrillos turquoise mines just to the south near Albuquerque which furnished turquoise to Chaco Canyon (Wiseman and Darling 1986:115). Chaco Canyon was the major regional center of the Pueblo world during its heyday between 1040-1100 C.E. (Lekson 2006) and played a key role in Pueblo cultural development. North, west, and south of Chaco, communities were drawn into the Chacoan sphere of influence and participated in its system, at least in part related to supplying the Canyon with valuable materials. This was accompanied by sweeping changes in Pueblo culture including the development of large scaled multi-storied architectural units, a greater emphasis and reliance on maize agriculture, and strong evidence for the development of stratification and hierarchy. Examples of the latter include elite burials, changes in settlement patterns, monumental architecture, and evidence of Chaco as a regional networked trade hub with macaw and cacao remains being found at Pueblo Bonito (Brown et. al. 2008:231-250; Crown and Hurst 2008; Harrod 2012; Lekson 2006: 29-32; Plog and Heitman 2010; Mahoney and Kantner 2000:9; Saitta 1997:19; Van Dyke 2009). The emergence of large aggregated villages with homes in close proximity required...
disparate kin groups to interact and cooperate in new ways to ensure that larger communities could remain intact and thrive. None of these changes seem to characterize the Northern Rio Grande, which remained on the Chacoan periphery both geographically and culturally during this time. Inhabitants of the region seemed to have ignored the great changes happening in the rest of the Puebloan world, and it could be argued that social development in the Northern Rio Grande was internally driven.

The Coalition Period (1175-1325 C.E.)

A second, far more dramatic spike in population occurred during the Coalition Period. Material culture continuity with Developmental populations seems to have remained in the Pojoaque area although there was a spike in both cultural and population change on the Pajarito Plateau, where the number of new settlements is suggestive of large-scale influx of peoples from outside the region (Van Zandt 2005). There does remain tantalizing evidence, subject to much debate, that suggests a Northern San Juan source for these immigrants. This debate has been ongoing since Wendorf and Reed’s dismissal of Northern Rio Grande connections with the Mesa Verde region in the 1950s (Wendorf 1954:221). It is very possible that Coalition peoples were an amalgamation of arriving Northern San Juan peoples and local Developmental populations as discussed throughout this paper.

There has been much debate regarding the role of migration for the Coalition Period Northern Rio Grande. Some archaeologists see this population growth as generally self-contained intrinsic growth and are dismissive of any major contribution by migration processes (Boyer et al. 2010). The lack of a “complete assemblage” of clearly diagnostic cultural materials identifiable with the Northern San Juan supports this view (Shapiro 2008:93; Lipe 2010). This position has also been aided by a general lack of evidence for a break in material culture between the Developmental and Coalition Periods as one might expect if there was an influx of large immigrant groups. All changes are presumed to be local developments. Others have suggested that despite an apparent lack of material culture evidence, there
are other equally valid lines of evidence including biological, linguistic and ethnographic, which do suggest significant in-migration. In general, both the migration model and the intrinsic growth model are demonstrable. Ortman, for example, suggests that there are indeed traces of Northern San Juan material stylistic continuations present in the Northern Rio Grande that have generally been overlooked by scholars (2012). Perhaps this is a methodology problem where modeling the origins of populations has been a difficult task and has been hotly debated within archaeology.

Much of this controversy has also been based on the suggested notion of a lack of evidence for overt material culture discontinuity or a cultural break between Developmental and Coalition Period peoples or clear evidence for the arrival of an intrusive group. However, Ortman (2012) demonstrates that the ethnographic, ethnohistoric, linguistic, and physiological evidence for Tewa people, the primary peoples of the Espanola Valley, all support Tewa origins in the San Juan drainage. Sam Duwe has placed himself squarely in the middle of this debate by supporting BOTH sides of the argument suggesting that substantial immigration into the region joined an already growing indigenous Espanola Valley population (2011). To be fair, Ortman has also suggested this same point as a possibility for Tewa origins but this point has often been eclipsed by those who characterize his argument as more absolutist. The question Ortman attempted to tackle (2012) was how large numbers of biologically distinct peoples with a different language and with origins in the northern San Juan could have integrated into already present indigenous communities in the Northern Rio Grande and adopted the material culture traits of the locals from this region, thus explaining the lack of material culture discontinuity that would have accompanied the boom in population during this period (Ortman 2012). For my part, I believe the multiple lines of evidence (biological, oral history, and linguistics) provided by Ortman (Ortman 2012; Kemp et. al. 2017) and his analysis that in fact there are cultural material indications of immigrants in the Northern Rio Grande seems very suggestive that Northern San Juan peoples were indeed in the region.
Figure 3. Table depicting estimated populations (Ortman 2016). Note the Pojoaque area falls under the ‘Santa Fe’ category. Of primary concern is the ‘total momentary population’ at the bottom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>900-</td>
<td>1050-</td>
<td>1150-</td>
<td>1200-</td>
<td>1250-</td>
<td>1280-</td>
<td>1315-</td>
<td>1350-</td>
<td>1400-</td>
<td>1425-</td>
<td>1450-</td>
<td>1515-</td>
<td>1550-</td>
<td>1600-</td>
<td>1625-</td>
<td>1650-</td>
<td>1700-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use-life</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Houses and hamlets in the database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velerde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajarito</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extrapolated momentary population of houses and hamlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velerde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajarito</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages and towns in the database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velerde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajarito</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total momentary population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velerde</td>
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Figures 2 and 3 come from Ortman’s 2016 published analysis on population estimates for the Tewa Basin. His methodology was based on ‘uniform probability density analysis’ of ceramic types. The method allows for modulation using Baye’s Theorem which in turn give us a window into probable population histories of an area. His method when cross checked against actual stratigraphic and documentary information at Cuyamungue (LA 38) and is suggestive that this method is a viable means for providing estimates for population.

Classic Period (1325-1600 C.E.)

The Classic Period is one that saw the expansion of Tewa peoples into the Rio Chama, followed eventually by their withdrawal from that area to fully occupy the Espanola Valley itself. Settlement aggregation picked up throughout the region, with settlements coalescing into what may have been multi-village communities. The increase in community sizes would seem to suggest greater emphasis on alliance building, the creation of new socio-political identities, and more sophisticated political systems. This is when the largest settlements were constructed and occupied. There remains a question of why
this form of clustered settlement began to show up. Although variability exists throughout the Tewa Basin, site size increased dramatically in the Classic period with villages of over 1,000 ground-floor rooms becoming commonplace. While in some areas such as the Rio Chama watershed, population continued to increase, the southern basin and the Pajarito Plateau (Orcutt 1991) actually witnessed a dramatic decrease in population as people coalesced to other areas of the Tewa Basin. Not only was population dramatically expanding in the Rio Chama during the early Classic period, it also signaled a shifting or reshuffling of populations within the entire region. Populations from the Pajarito Plateau appear to have shifted into the Rio Chama joining Coalition period settlements there (Duwe 2011), but there seems to have also been reduced settlement in other areas, including the Pojoaque area. By the late Classic Period, populations from the Rio Chama shifted from expansion to depopulation with a shift in population density back towards the Espanola Valley. By the time of the Spanish arrival in 1598 these processes had been mostly completed with the Rio Chama likely no longer containing permanent settlements. The coalescence of populations appears to have continued right up to first Spanish contact at the end of the sixteenth century when all Tewa occupation was restricted to colonial era Tewa villages along the Rio Grande (Barrett 2002; Duwe 2011:219). To sum up, there appears to have been a reshuffling of Tewa populations that possibly drew populations away from the Pojoaque and Pajarito Plateau areas northward into the Rio Chama to join already existing settlements there. Later there was a reshuffling back into the Espanola Valley.

The Historic Period (1600 C.E.-Present)

The Historic Period encompasses Spanish colonization, which started with the arrival of Onate in 1598, the Spanish territorial period including the intervening period during the Pueblo Revolt, the Mexican period, and lastly the American territorial periods. This period is characterized by population decline of the Pueblos, loss of Pueblo traditional lands, dramatic changes in overall demographics in the
region, and drastic technological changes, especially after the arrival of the Railroad to New Mexico. Pueblo populations (from all linguistic groups) had been dwindling since the arrival of the Spanish for a multitude of reasons, and it finally bottomed out at around 7000 people during the mid-19th century, after which populations began to recover (Dozier 1970:104-107).

A Change in Archaeological Philosophies

During the time of Harrington’s survey of Pueblo lands in the early 20th century, archaeology was characterized by the cultural-historical/direct historical approach which was open to the inclusion of ethnohistory. Scholars who followed the direct historical approach suggested that past archaeological cultures could be studied through the direct observation of current descendants or culturally related peoples and that these observations could be extrapolated as representations of the past. These theories led scholars like Harrington to believe that a true understanding of pre-contact Pueblo peoples could be obtained by studying Pueblo communities and then filtering out all aspects that were obviously gained through contact with Hispanic peoples and their colonization experience. This approach put great emphasis on what Pueblo “informants” could contribute. While this process heeded indigenous peoples’ voices, it was never done on a level playing field. Indigenous knowledge was still seen as a resource to be mined for information before it disappeared (Fowles 2010). The common view of the day among many anthropological practitioners was that indigenous cultures all across the U.S. were dying out and that their cultural knowledge and traditional ways were quickly deteriorating and in danger of going extinct. There was a great rush to learn as much as possible about indigenous societies before they vanished for good.

In the 1960s New Archaeology and processualism in which entirely environmental or ecological evolutionary processes were given priority and weight of authority replaced the direct historical approach, thus shifting archaeology to a stance that was dismissive of indigenous perspectives. This
view suggested that cultures and people themselves had little agency to affect change. Instead people and cultures could only respond to changes in their environments. The emphasis of this method was on creating hypotheses and testable models that archaeologists could use to predict and explain the archaeological record. It was more interested in the big picture of universal human processes such that any study generally had to applicable to the understanding of humanity on a grand scale as well as provide commentary on current societies. Less emphasis was placed on individual or specific research sites or cultures as unique or of importance in and of themselves. This shift de-emphasized any one particular culture. A desire for a broader global perspective had little use for the specifics of individual indigenous cultural perspectives. Stories, beliefs, or specific histories were considered untestable and ephemeral. Essentially archaeologists stopped listening to indigenous peoples. Archaeologists could now study past indigenous cultures and traditions without the need to pay attention to the perspectives the descendants of those cultures which they studied.

Cartesian mindsets completely discounted ethnohistory as make-believe, something that was made up and untrustworthy. Although Lowie (1917:166-167) predates the theoretical developments of processualism, I believe his arguments sum up the general attitudes of the day. Lowie states: "(i)t is not based, in the first instance, on a universal negative unjustifiably derived from a necessarily limited number of instances, but on the conviction that aboriginal history is only a part of that hodgepodge of aboriginal lore which embraces primitive theories of the universe generally, and that its priori claims to greater respect on our part are nil. Such claims must be established empirically, if at all; but, so far as my experience extends, the empirical facts are diametrically opposed to such claims. (W)e cannot substitute primitive tradition for scientific history. Our historical problems can be solved only by the objective methods of comparative ethnology, archaeology, linguistics, and physical anthropology." This perspective worked its way into Southwestern anthropology, eventually killing cooperation and interaction between archaeologists and indigenous peoples. This philosophy presented archaeologists
as the experts and sole authority of the Puebloan past, and simultaneously dismissed Pueblo people as knowledgeable about their own past. The emphasis on local landscapes as the prime builder of cultures and traditions was also intra-regional in focus, with a general rejection of migration as a suitable explanation for culture change in the archaeological record. Migration became unfashionable to talk about in archaeology and was generally dismissed out of hand. Suddenly archaeologists could dismiss Pueblo oral histories and traditions as well as any suggestions that migration could have ever played any significant role in their histories. This was despite the nearly universal views of migration as a defining character for nearly all Pueblo groups including the Tewa.

Around the 1990s and coinciding with the passage of NAGPRA, there was a move to post-processual archaeology in the Southwest which challenged and rejected the strict view that the scientism of processualism was the only way of knowing the past. It opened up the field, allowing for a wider inclusion of other forms of anthropological thought that didn’t rely wholly on creating models and testing hypotheses. This is not to say that processual processes were rejected entirely. This was not the point. Instead of being a paradigm, the processual emphasis on testability and strict adherence to methodology continued, but it became more of a tool rather than a dogma. The tenets of processualism lived on as methodology, as a tool for understanding the past, but it was now one of many tools for understanding the past. Post-processualism has recognized that archaeological approaches do not have to maintain the old Western dichotomy of human vs environmental emphases. Rather, they can attempt to bridge these different approaches, and recognize that processual methodologies remain useful as a tool set. I personally view post-processualism as the archaeological framework for approaching questions from a holistic perspective. Post-processualism was about returning people back into the picture and giving them agency. Post-processual archaeology allows for the inclusion of multiple voices including indigenous voice and creates the framework for collaboration, partnership, and eventually indigenous archaeology. It allows for a legitimate return to the use of ethnographic data and recognition
that indigenous epistemologies and other ways of knowing the world are just as valid as Western ones. It is hoped that this process will continue such that Western and indigenous ways of knowing can someday be integrated into a new more holistic way of understanding the past. It has benefitted archaeology by opening up new avenues by which to explore old questions of how to learn about past societies. It also helped to repair some of the damage done in the past by archaeology. For the first time, it has allowed for native people who possess traditional knowledge to have an equal place at the table with archaeologists. Today there is much cooperation between archaeology and indigenous communities. It is no longer a one-way street. Indigenous peoples are not merely a source of information about the past, but are partners, co-equals. At the same time archaeologists today often contribute to the tribes by assisting them with legal matters and sovereignty rights.

Tewa Settlement History

The area of focus in this thesis is the northern end of the Tesuque Basin surrounding the current community of Pojoaque Pueblo. This region has been shown to have had significant population and settlements dating back to the Developmental Period, prior to the proposed influx of 13th century migrants from the Northern San Juan (Schillaci and Lakatos 2016:381). As a result, this area would have been one of the most important areas in the region during the Coalition Period as it was likely a place of coming together of two separate cultures; of identity formation and community integration. Themes of long-distance migration are ubiquitous in Tewa oral history, as they are likely to be for all Pueblo peoples. Archaeology also suggests that community building and growth, and outside group incorporation, must have played an all-consuming role for settlements of the Coalition Period. Among Tewa people, it is a universally-held belief that the Tewa originated in a separate place outside of the current Tewa homelands at the original Sipofene, the emergence place; that all of the major Tewa political institutions were created in this place; and that Tewa people left this place and migrated south
to occupy the homelands where they reside today. The origin place called Sipofene is entirely agreed upon as having been to the distant north, with many claiming a general location somewhere in southern Colorado (Ortiz 1969).

Regardless of where this emergence place was located, Tewa people agree that their ancestors originated from distant locations north and outside of the current Tewa homelands and there seems to be no acknowledgement of the concept that the Tewa emerged in-situ within their current landscape. The Tewa left their origin place and separated into two major migratory groups that reflect the current dual political moiety system generally referred to as Summer People and Winter People. Winter group migrated down the eastern side of the river (usually identified with the Rio Grande) and utilized the eastern mountains while the Summer group migrated down the western side of the river utilizing the western mountains. Once both had arrived in the northern Rio Grande region they reunited at a site or place that became a “mother” village or Owing-P’inge, the first village following the migrations (Ortiz 1969).

Archaeologically this period of migration is generally seen as most likely having taken place during the Late Coalition Period and transitioning into the early Classic Period. This is a time period of large initial population increases throughout the region and the founding of numerous villages south in the Galisteo Basin, north in the Tesuque Basin, and west in the Pajarito Plateau, followed later by a surge in occupation of the Rio Chama Valley. There were already populations living in the Santa Fe area and Espanola valley during the time period that Coalition migrants would have arrived and likely joined existing communities in the area. Other areas such as the Pajarito Plateau and Galisteo Basin seem to have been mostly empty of indigenous populations until settlers pioneered the first settlements in those areas in the Early Coalition Period, around 1150 C.E. and later (Van Zandt 2005; Ortman 2016). It was only late in the Coalition Period that there was any substantial population in the Rio Chama Valley (the earliest tree-ring cutting date from any site in the region is a 1250 C.E. date from Tsama Owing-Keyi
(Duwe 2011:217). These were areas where pioneering migrants settled in areas with sparse prior occupation, whereas in the Pojoaque area there is a record of prior occupation dating back to the Late Developmental Period. Yet here too the size of settlements grew after the start of the Coalition Period. These early Coalition Period settlements confined themselves predominantly to hills tops and canyon lands surrounding the Espanola Valley (Lentz 2005:12) and it wasn’t until the Classic period that they began to move off high spaces and down into valleys and low spaces (Lakatos 2009:11). The middle and late Classic Period was one of great movement within the Tewa traditional homelands resulting in the abandonment of Coalition and early Classic Period settlement locations, and a general shift of settlement patterns from the hills, canyon lands and high places overlooking waterways to down to riparian areas. This shift was characterized by Rio Chama Valley and Pajarito Plateau populations moving down to the Rio Grande while Tesuque Basin populations moved down into riparian areas along tributaries of the Rio Grande. The one exception to this pattern seems to be Pojoaque Pueblo, which continues to this day as a settlement located on the hills above the Rio Pojoaque waterway. This was the situation Onate encountered in 1598 when he recorded a survey of the Tewa Pueblos. This process included the naming of several of the Pueblos by the Spanish, the establishment of churches, and the beginning of administering and colonizing the Pueblos.

It is generally understood that the area around Pojoaque Pueblo itself was settled during the Late Developmental Period (900s C.E.) (Schillaci, et. al. 2017). Evidence for numerous occupations dot the landscape here. If this occupation was predominately Tewa in nature, then we can see a very long Tewa presence in the area and might point to their genesis in the region. Another possibility is that a separate population inhabited the area prior to the arrival of Tewa migrants. Here I must point out the importance of distinguishing the Pojoaque area from Pojoaque Pueblo itself. The issue is that there have been numerous settlements, some large and some small, on the hilltop and in the valley below, of which the current village of Pojoaque Pueblo is just the latest manifestation. For this paper I make the
distinction between the two as there is no way to determine which, if any, Developmental sites were ancestral to the current Pueblo. It is certainly possible that some were, but for the sake of my argument it is necessary to separate the two concepts. If there is a link between the Northern San Juan and the Pojoaque area it would have been during the 13th century migration from that region. Ortman argues that these were Tewa-speaking peoples coming from the Mesa Verde country (2012). If so, the question is how these immigrants relate to the people who had settled the Pojoaque area during the Developmental Period? Was this a case where migrants joined existing groups of locals which together formed what we think of today as Tewa society? Or did these Developmental populations move elsewhere with the arrival of the migrants? Regardless, we can say that Tewa ancestors were certainly in place during the Coalition and Classic Periods and were recorded in place by Onate in 1598.

Language Distributions

Archaeologists falling into the “migration” camp tend to suggest that in-situ growth alone is not likely to account for the spike in occupation of the Northern Rio Grande and that it is reasonable to expect many of the people who left the most populous region of the southwest in the 13th century to have ended up in the region that was growing strongly during that same period (Ortman 2012, 2016). Here it is helpful to look at the distribution of language groups in the Northern Rio Grande (Figure 2). The Northern Rio Grande region can be broadly divided up amongst cultural groups: the Northern Tiwa located in the Taos region, the Southern Tiwa located around the Albuquerque area, and the Tewa located between them. These groups are generally grouped together by language affiliation, although they also maintain cultural similarities. The Tewa language is a separate language from Tiwa, whereas Tiwa has diversified into two significant dialects: northern and southern. Language differences also exist at the individual village level, but generally these groupings are acknowledged by both the tribes concerned and by linguists (Ortman 2012:125-152; Campbell 1997). Tewa and Tiwa are in fact sister
languages. They both descended from a single speech community at some point in the past (Ortman 2012:150-151).

A basic principle of historical linguistics is that new languages can develop from a single mother tongue when two speech communities become isolated. A lack of contact over a long period leads each language to evolve independently into separate dialects, and eventually separate languages (Schreier 2017:355). A degree of isolation is necessary to prohibit merging and homologizing, though Schreier does point out that isolation does not need to be restricted only in a geographical sense, but social isolation can also stimulate such changes (2009). Diversification of the proto-Tanoan language into Tewa and Tiwa branches would appear to suggest that these two sister languages would have developed in isolation from one another. Given the geographic proximities of the Tewa to the Northern Tiwa, and the fact that Tewa territories separate the Northern Tiwa branch from the Southern branch it would seem reasonable to speculate that either one or both linguistic groups were not originally from the Northern Rio Grande. The other possibility is that diversification of the languages did take place in the Northern Rio Grande but given the arrangement of the languages geographically this seems unlikely (Ortman 2010:235-240). Or perhaps the languages did split in the Northern Rio Grande with one remaining in place while the other migrated away but this would imply a later return migration to the Northern Rio Grande which seems far-fetched. Add to this that Towa and Kiowa are also Tanoan languages, and must have originated from additional cleavages in ancestral speech communities, makes this scenario even less likely.
Tewa words have been linked through metaphors embedded in the language to concepts and cultural materials that characterize the Northern San Juan region more so than they do the Northern Rio Grande (Ortman 2012). Tewa oral history as well as some remembered place names also place the Tewa in the Northern San Juan region (Ellis 1974:2 Harrington 1916: 564, 572; Ortman 2012). The geographical placement of Tewa speaking communities in the central Northern Rio Grande, with Tiwa speech communities to the north (around the Taos region) and south (around the Albuquerque region), is at least suggestive that Tewa language speakers were an intrusive group into the Northern Rio Grande (Ortman 2010:236). Further, recent domesticated turkey DNA evidence has shown continuity between Pueblo III Northern San Juan turkey populations and post-1300 Northern Rio Grande turkey populations,
while simultaneously demonstrating a lack of relatedness between migrant turkey populations in the Northern Rio Grande and local wild turkeys of the same region. This suggests that domesticated turkeys moved from the Northern San Juan region into the Northern Rio Grande, and by inference, people did too (Kemp et. al. 2017).

History of Pojoaque Pueblo

There are at least four village sites in the immediate area of Pojoaque Pueblo today. They are: LA 61 (of which there are 2 components); the Winter Village site LA 12271; the Garcia site, and what Ellis refers to in her maps as “East Pojoaque” but is elsewhere referred to as Pojoaquito (LA271) (Ellis 1974:5; Harrington 1916). This last village was the colonial era village of Pojoaque. The Pueblo of Pojoaque was abandoned at least twice in historic times. The first was during the Reconquest of New Mexico by De Vargas following the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. This was a time period of great upheaval when most Tewa settlements were briefly abandoned upon the Spanish return to the region in 1692, but Pojoaque was not reoccupied until 1706 (Lakatos 2009:13). This reoccupation of the area is presumably reflected by the settlement of East Pojoaque/Pojoaquito. Temporary village abandonment was apparently a common Pueblo survival strategy that played out among many other Pueblos during the Reconquest. The second abandonment of Pojoaque (Pojoaquito) occurred near the end of the 19th century, following which the Pueblo was abandoned until Pojoaque descendent families returned in 1934 and the tribe was officially recognized by the federal government in 1936 (Ellis:1974:9).

Pojoaque has been a village little written about or explored by researchers. This is partly due to its discontinuity of occupation from frequent abandonments, and partly due to outsider perspectives that were biased towards the larger Tewa communities in the western side of the Rio Grande Valley. Most often scholars turned toward other Pueblos to understand the Tewa past. The Pueblos most often visited were Ohkay Owingeh, Santa Clara, and San Ildefonso, all located along the Rio Grande in the west.
of the region. There exists a thin but apparent distinction between west (Ohkay Owingeh, Santa Clara, and San Ildefonso) and east (Pojoaque, Nambe, and Tesuque) villages. Ethnographic work of the early 20th century and later scholarship has generally favored investigating the western villages which have a stronger link to the Rio Chama, Pajarito Plateau, and Jemez Mountains at the expense of the eastern villages and their stronger relationship with the Sangre de Cristo Mountains. As such, early ethnographic work on the Tewa has almost always involved investigation of the western Tewa villages with little contribution from the eastern villages. Pojoaque is little mentioned in scholarship, in part because much of this early effort was conducted during a period of Pojoaque’s abandonment. Still, Nambe and Tesuque were both inhabited in the early 20th century era of ethnographic investigation, but don’t have as much scholarship written about them as the western Tewa villages. John P. Harrington and Elsie Clew Parsons were among the few who conducted limited work in this area during the first half of the 20th century.

As this thesis focuses on the history of the Pojoaque area, it is necessary to briefly review the recent history of the Pueblo. John P. Harrington conducted research at the start of the 20th century in the Tewa country, including the areas surrounding Pojoaque. His work included a search for Tewa place-names and traditional knowledge associated with those places. His work entailed locating community members and asking them about their traditional lands; the names of places, landscape features, their linguistic meanings, and what lore might be associated with those places. According to Ellis (1974:8), Harrington was unable to locate anyone from the Pueblo of Pojoaque during his work in 1909. At this time Pojoaque Pueblo had negligible population numbers and many tribal members were dispersed in other Pueblo communities or even farther afield. The last cacique of Pojoaque, Antonio Montoya, died around 1911 and with him passed much of the original ritual knowledge and leadership. Around this time population at the Pueblo had also dropped to a point that it was no longer able to fill any of the needed tribal governing positions with the exception of Governor and sacristan (Ellis 1974:7).
Factionalism, intrusion from outsiders, and transitions to new economies further exacerbated these effects. The last traditional governor whose family was said to be the only remaining Pojoaque family remaining left to find work in Colorado in 1912 and during his absence the village ceased to exist as an entity. Non-Indians by this time occupied the whole of the old village area, although some had done so at the behest of Pojoaque members living away from the village. Many acted as caretakers of fields and orchards (Ellis 1974) that still belonged to Pojoaque tribal members. It is generally presumed that the Pueblo of Pojoaque had ceased to exist during this time. It wasn’t until the Governor’s return in 1931 that he attempted to reconstitute the pueblo, eject many non-Indian peoples, and to receive official tribal recognition from federal and state governments (Ellis 1974:8-9). “Between 1931 and ‘34 the old governor, Antonio Tapia, and about 6 others of Pojoaque birth or parentage returned to claim their land in what had become a Spanish American community” (Ellis 1974:9). Several families returned to the Pueblo during this time, but with little continuity in their traditional leadership positions they chose to create a new system unlike any of their Pueblo neighbors. They chose to elect their officers, who would maintain more secular roles than ritual ones. The governor position was to be delegated to the oldest member of the tribe (Ellis 1974:9). For reasons not known or disclosed, rather than reoccupy the colonial era East Pojoaque/Pojoaquito a new plaza location was chosen just southwest of the original plaza. The entire settlement shifted south and west. “As the group no longer had a cacique, the political offices were planned on an entirely secular basis (Ellis 1974:9).” A system was thus created where all tribal members were considered to be members of the tribal council.

Today the Pueblo of Pojoaque is one of the six Tewa villages with a population approaching 520. The tribe is quickly growing with half the population under the age of 18. The Pueblo is progressive with a tribal governance system that has continued to evolve including having women serve as governors, and a tribal council in which every adult tribal member is considered to be a member of the council. The Pueblo has led the way with creating tribal businesses including the first tribal casino in
the state of New Mexico and a Pueblo indigenous arts and crafts education center called the Poeh Center. There has been a concerted effort by the tribe to revive sacred tribal traditions, rituals, and dances with the help of neighboring Tewa pueblos. Today the tribe is the center of an indigenous regeneration and revitalization effort.

In this chapter I have laid the groundwork for the Pojoaque region. I covered archaeological chronology of the Northern Rio Grande area that pertains to the Pojoaque region. I have discussed basic changes that have occurred in the archaeological record as well as cultural changes correlating them with approximate dates. I have discussed some of the archaeology of the area including early exploration, theoretical perspectives, and confusion over Tewa place names. I have also discussed some of the current history of Pojoaque Pueblo. With this background prepared we can turn to the next chapter to explore processes of memory, power, and the impact of migration.

3 Migration and the Authority of Landscape.

The first spike in population in the Northern Rio Grande occurred around 900 C.E. at the beginning of the Late Developmental Period. Prior to this time use of the area was sporadic and limited, although not absent. Archaic peoples had been utilizing the area for thousands of years beforehand. A second much larger spike in population occurred in the 13th century during the Coalition Period (1280-1400 C.E.). This later spike coincides temporally with the depopulation of the Northern San Juan region (Ortman 2016:22). Many reports by early archaeologists and ethnologists indicate that contemporary Pueblo communities themselves claimed a link to the Northern San Juan (Ellis: 1974:2; Harrington 1916; Ortman 2012; Wendorf 1954:220). As reported in Chapter 2, by the mid-20th century the field of archaeology had transitioned in theoretical perspective that favored closed regional systems and ecological determinism downplaying the role of migration. This shift led archaeologists to dismiss oral histories and the role of migration in Pueblo history. It became the accepted view that there was little to
link the Northern Rio Grande and the Northern San Juan regions culturally. An apparent lack of recognized diagnostic Mesa Verdean traits in the Rio Grande seemed to support this view at the time (Lekson 2012:206). The shift in the 1990s towards post-processualism reopened the door for a reexamination of Southwestern Pueblo migrations and encouraged outreach by the archaeology profession to indigenous communities. Post-processualism opened the door for a more holistic and inclusive view of the past that looked at multiple lines of evidence.

Current arguments over the role of migration in Rio Grande population history derive from two schools of thought. The processually-inspired point of view that considers archaeologically diagnostic Mesa Verdean material culture as more reliable evidence for migration, and generally does not address other lines of evidence (Duwe 2011:238) such as linguistic and oral history (Ortman 2012). A post-processual view, in contrast, looks at multiple lines of evidence in assessing the role of migration in history.

Archaeologists who fall into the “No Migration” camp have tended to cite a lack of continuity in material culture between the Northern San Juan and the Northern Rio Grande and an apparent lack of evidence for material culture intrusion in the Northern Rio Grande. “Mesa Verdean” stylistic traits were highly-developed in late 13th century sites in the Northern San Juan including village arrangement/organization, unit-pueblos components, stylized kiva architecture, masonry towers, ceramic mugs, kiva jars, and Mesa Verde style painted motifs. Places with iconic styles would leading one to think that migrating populations from those places should have reproduced those same traits in any new homeland. Yet, material culture in the Northern Rio Grande generally follows an apparent unbroken line of continuity from the Developmental through the Classic Periods. This fact has led this same group of scholars to proclaim that population models could suggest in-situ growth of the indigenous Northern Rio Grande population and could account for most of the growth seen in the
Northern Rio Grande, with little need for a major immigrant population influx (Lakatos 2007; Schillaci and Lakatos 2016; Boyer et. al. 2010).

I take an indigenous Tewa, post-processual, and an archaeological perspective simultaneously. Wearing these “three hats” I suggest a model for the Great Pueblo Migration resulting in the abandonment of the Northern San Juan and movement of some of these people to the Northern Rio Grande. This is only one hypothesized model for migration, one among many that have been postulated over the history of the field of archaeology in the Southwest, but it is one that I believe is useful for researchers to at least contemplate. It is not meant to be a definitive model or final world. Nor does it suggest only Tewa speakers came from the Northern San Juan or that Northern San Juan migrants moved only to the Northern Rio Grande. I suspect and speculate that the ancestral Tewa language was not the only language spoken in the Northern San Juan region. Nevertheless, this model does presume that Tewa migrants arrived in the Northern Rio Grande in very large numbers during the evacuation of the Northern San Juan region.

Landscapes are Imbued with Memory

Landscapes are imbued with memory. By this I mean that cultural histories are entwined with the landscape. Societies that live generation upon generation in the same region map their accumulated knowledge onto that landscape. As a result, a people’s understanding of their own history is understood spatially in landscape rather than temporally as in Western historiography. Western epistemologies are temporally based. They are most often constructed through the use of literature which transcends space. Written laws and documents, written accounts of historical events, science, the Christian bible, and philosophy are recorded in books that can move from one location to another. They allow for the reproduction of the foundations of Western society. The United States for instance was built upon laws, ontologies, and philosophies rooted in Europe. These texts not only transfer knowledge, but also convey
power and authority. Like monks in medieval Europe, power and authority were imbued into the early Church through readers, purveyors, and the curation of sacred knowledge in textual form. This knowledge was not dependent or tied to landscape and as such could be replicated anywhere and in any environment. Further, Kuchler (in Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006:28) describes the difference between an indigenous and Western perspective as “landscapes as memory” as opposed to “landscapes of memory” whereas for “many indigenous cultural landscapes are memory because they constitute the template used to understand and transmit the essential traditional that form recollections.” Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh go further suggesting that land is as important as the human activities that have taken place on these lands. As such the land itself is imbued with memory whereas for Western perspectives it is the activities that once took place there that is marked and remembered (Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006:28-29). “American Indians know landscapes by experiencing them through dynamic stories and place-names (Nabokov 1998-242). This stands in sharp contrast to Euro-American knowledge of landscapes derived from the fixed landmarks inscribed on them (Monmonier 1996 as reported in Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006:29).” Anschuetz describes these differences as “the people adopt a view of history that is not cast exclusively in a past that is never to be repeated (as in a Western perspective). The members of these communities live their history not only to learn from it but also to repeat it, to renew and reassert the veracity of their traditions” (2005:54).

For Pueblo people, culturally important events are remembered in place more so than in time. History is remembered in place and specific places recall specific events and participants. This knowledge and history is shared orally with all those who live in a given location, such that generations are raised in this ontology of the world. It forms the core of their epistemology, of how they understand the world, and it provides an explanation for why things are the way they are. This way of being is entirely dependent on maintaining spatial continuity between ancestors and descendants and retaining
connection to the same landscape. As a result, landscapes come to have agency unto themselves, and act upon succeeding generations of people. Shrines, sacred mountains, hills, canyons, and valleys can act in multiple roles connecting religion, history, ways of doing, lessons, and stories for a people. They have a weight of authority that builds under the blanket of tradition that with each succeeding generation reifies these understandings of the world. This isn’t to say that people are slaves to their environment. Rather, they work in tandem. It is an ontology that one is born into and is raised within and thus is understood as “natural”. It is a natural way of being that would require unnatural forces to alter.

On a day to day basis this system generally operates with little scrutiny with respect to daily activities or larger priorities of simply making a living. A landscape imbued with cultural meaning thus provides a sense of authority that influences people. It becomes a dialectic process of culture and society acting upon landscape and landscape acting on culture and society. Here we must remember that 12th century Tewa ancestors, like their Coalition and Classic Period descendants, likely cycled through a region, and it is these regions where these systems of memory were maintained and reified. Tewa ancestors cycled through the landscape, occupying a new locale then leaving it for another, in cyclical life histories of the region (Anschuetz 2006:67; Lekson 1993: 8; Naranjo 1995:248). This has been referred to as “population circulation” by Schachner (2012:3, 91) who studied a similar phenomenon in the Zuni region. Anschuetz describes this process as “Pueblo traditions characteristically employ the concepts of rest and renewal when referring to population movement, houses, agricultural land, and foraging collecting areas” (2005:59) which also “implies that the people would return in the future” (2005:59). The one constant was the region in which these activities took place. Occupation here should then be understood as applying to a region, not to individual archaeological sites. The villages themselves were temporary with life histories that could be understood with humanistic analogies of birth, life, and death, but the landscape was perpetual. The question then becomes “what happens if a
people who are invested in or reliant upon their regional landscape in this type of ontology remove themselves from that landscape through migration?” What happens when a homeland region is entirely abandoned and replaced by a new one?

When people who have operated within the socio-cultural conventions defined by their homeland migrate, they arrive in a land that is essentially a clean slate; a new landscape that is essentially absent of any mapped histories. Specific landmarks of important cultural memories from the homeland are either lost, become generalized, or are translated onto the new landscape. What is of great importance here is to stress that this is done consciously by the people. They have to decide what to map on to and where. They decide what is worth remembering and what is not. The fact of being in a new landscape brings a spotlight of awareness and self-analysis by the migrants of their own cultural beliefs and practices. In a new landscape they must actively negotiate their culture and the results are mapped onto the new landscape. This presents the opportunity, whether understood as such or not, to make changes, whether drastic or not, to their culture, society, religion, and politics. The Great Migration must then be viewed as a moment of great cultural change rather than as an attempt to reestablish and maintain continuity. Landscape provides the history of a people, but it also provides an understanding of how the world is conceived to work, and it conveys authority.

Pueblo Authority Structures

For societies built upon a culture of landscape, it stands to reason that political legitimacy and authority would reflect this concept. Those who maintain the longest and oldest connections to a land retain a level of authority that newcomers do not have. Authority remains with those who laid claim to that landscape first as well as placing emphasis on the order of arrival of new groups. People who lived in a space for longer would essentially have claim to have a stronger authority over newcomers. This authority can be used to establish a “pecking order” determining access to resources and agricultural
fields. Those with such authority would also have a stronger recognized decision-making authority by community members. Those who founded settlements would have greater authority over those who later joined those settlements. This has played out most notably in the Hopi migrations where authority and seniority lay in the order or sequence that the differing clans arrived (Whiteley 1988:52-53). People who arrived first at a place ranked over those who came later, and this could lead to the formation and rise of elite families and/or groups whose authority and voice had greater weight than that of later arrivals. Ware suggests that this type of authority could have originated with access over farming lands in which families with a longer history in a place had control over the best lands of that place. Late comers would have had to accept what farm lands remained available or unclaimed. This is because, as Snead explains, the scarcity of appropriate lands for agriculture in the Southwest would lead to the claiming of available lands as a significant land tenure process (2008:49). I suggest that early in the history of agricultural practices in the Southwest some of the most vital intra-group relationships were based on land access. This system would likely stretch back at least to the 9th century (Ware 2014: Location 2866). This authority, especially if kin based, would imbue people with authority simply by birthright as dictated by landscape and kin affiliation. Whiteley writes of Hopi “(t)he relationship among households can be hierarchical: each matrilineal clan has a primary household with a “clan-house,” where the clan’s wu’uya (totemic sacra) are kept. The social status of other households in the clan varies in accordance with genealogical proximity to the primary household. The latter forms the “core lineage segment” and possesses prestige deriving from its custody of the “heart of the clan” (the wu’uya) and from the fact that it is usually within this group that clan or ritual roles are inherited. As for the rest, “in a crisis situation, such as drought, crop loss, declining domestic water supply, or overpopulation, the peripheral household groups may be pressed to emigrate” (Connelly 1979:546, as reported in Whiteley 1988: 47-48). This point is echoed by Bernardini’s look at Hopi clan aggregation (Bernardini and Fowles 2010: 258). This is not to suggest that the Tewa and Hopi examples are interchangeable; just that there
is a precedent for hierarchy based on kinship groups, first arrival, or founding families, and that others not associated with these groups could come and go depending on either pull factors from other settlements or push factors from within their settlement. It has been long noted that unit pueblos were the building block of communities in the Northern San Juan, either as individual settlements or as contiguous segments of villages, and these have long been suspected to have been kin-based settlements (Ware 2014: Location 2344-2363). The processes of village formation in the Northern San Juan region during Basketmaker through Pueblo III times might simply have involved the coalescence of kin groups around high-status families (Mills 2004:241) which in turn had already laid claim to the best lands in the locality.

This type of deference to founding families likely existed throughout the occupation of the Northern San Juan. Entire communities could have arisen through these processes with founding families situated in preferred places imbued with both authority and prestige and other people choosing to join or leave such communities. Those with an investment in such authority of landscape maintained their authority by remaining in place. Those new comers would join a community with a willingness to accept an inferior position in the ranking of the community but were likely free to move on as well. Communities were likely a series of repeated negotiations by resident kin groups between those founding families and new comers that likely played out for generations as long as the community site was occupied. This has been noted for the Hopi by Whiteley (1988:47-48) and by Ortman and Varien with regard to the growth of Yellow Jacket Pueblo, one of the largest and longest-lived Northern San Juan communities (2005:146). In much the same way that Swentzell describes the traditional understanding of cycling of occupation on the landscape by Tewa people, families could come and go as they pleased. Identities were not necessarily based on community as we think of them today.

Ware points out that kivas likely started out as kin-based housing (1988: Location 2344) which would then suggest that we should expect to see the large numbers of kivas at later settlements such as
Sand Canyon Pueblo in the Northern San Juan as likely representing kin-based groups. Sand Canyon Pueblo in fact appears to be made up of a large number of Prudden-style architectural units linked together which most archaeologists (Lekson 2004:26; Ortman and Bradley 2002; Varien 1999; Ware 2014: Location 2534) interpret as signifying individual kin groups within the village (Figure 5). The size of settlements compared to the number of kivas in the Northern San Juan region is drastically different from Northern Rio Grande settlements which have far fewer kivas. We can see that Rio Grande kivas are more likely to be moiety and community based (Duwe 2011:290,292). Here I would like to interject that archaeologists have tended to see settlements like Sand Canyon Pueblo as bounded communities when in my view they were probably more like collections of kin groups loosely associated with the community and with a “rotating door” system where people and families joined and left communities. Mark Varien describes this likely process (1999) which he describes as ‘domestic cycling’ in which he discusses the mobility of individuals and kin-based groups such that communities should not be viewed as discrete bounded units. Varien further suggests that residential mobility embedded in social contexts and that social factors thus play a key part in population changes (56). Lower ranking peoples could move in and out of communities whereas the core kin groups consisting of the founding families would likely have not done so since their position of authority and privilege were more closely tied to the settlement itself.

In some ways this would have made communities more resilient by allowing population to wax and wane while the settlement remained intact. The presence of Prudden-style units hypothesized by Ware as representing kin groups (2014) would also suggest that while people at Sand Canyon Pueblo were joining together in some ways similar to a bounded community, the fabric of society was still kin-based and people could essentially “vote with their feet” if necessary. “Because the preponderance of evidence indicates that the pueblo was largely residential, it is probable that much of the village layout and organization was based on kinship ties” (Kuckelman 2007: paragraph 29). “Evidence suggestive of
intercommunity biological relatedness between residents of Sand Canyon Pueblo and residents of Woods Canyon Pueblo (2007: paragraph 29) suggests that units might indeed have been kin-based. If kinship was the basis for society, then it stands to reason that political forces were also kin-based.

Figure 6. Sand Canyon Pueblo

In this framework, the presence of dualistic architecture, long thought by some as an indication or precursor to moieties, might actually represent kin-based moieties in the form of marriageable pools rather than moieties as political organizations, or what Ware (2014) terms dual tribal sodalities, as they are used by the Tewa today. “Moieties are common in aboriginal North America . . . but Eastern Pueblo moieties are an uncommon type. Almost all North American moieties (and most moieties worldwide) form the principal axis of a marriage alliance system” (Ware 2014: Location 1761-1854). It might be that moieties existed at this time, but not in the way they exist in Tewa communities today. Certainly, many Pueblo sites throughout the Mesa Verde world exhibit dualistic architecture. There is evidence for slight
ranking at Sand Canyon Pueblo in the form of two unusually larger D-shaped kivas with associated community granaries or storage rooms. These are kivas (residential/ceremonial rooms) much like the others at the site, but they also contain a greater diversity of artifacts and bird remains associated with ceremonial use, and an unusual number of attached storage rooms (Lipe and Ortman 2000: 111). Varien adds “Although individual structures and residential sites were abandoned frequently, public architecture and the largest residential site clusters maintained their same general locations (2000:59)” referring to Sand Canyon and Goodman Point settlement layouts. I see this description of ‘largest residential site clusters’ within these two mentioned Mesa Verde communities as essentially referencing kin-based groups with the longest histories in the area, likely with the strongest connection to ceremonial structures. I propose that these larger residences were less prone to cycling processes because these were the core families of the community, the founding families, who’s social-political claim of precedence was based on founding the site and longest duration of use of family occupation of that site.

In a world where kin is the fabric of society there may have been related groups to which relatives might have had to surrender some of their harvest. Even if this was seen as benign, perhaps collectively storing grain for protection against future famine for example, it still meant that most families were willingly subjecting themselves to the rule of others. It implies kinship-based hierarchy. Although this does not sound very Puebloan in the way we understand the eastern Pueblos today, it does seem suggestive given some of the cultural discontinuities between the Northern San Juan region during the 13th century and their later Northern Rio Grande descendants. The archaeological record of the Northern San Juan presents a story about societies based primarily on kin groups that transitioned into ever larger and more sophisticated communities, requiring more elaborate community controls to maintain larger settlements.
Another point to address is the apparent lack of archaeological evidence for hierarchy within the Pueblos. It is generally presumed that the Pueblos are egalitarian. Lekson (2012) has argued that Chaco might represent a strong hierarchy, but even he suggests that this authoritarian streak in Chaco was an anomaly. This might be true in part, but it is important to recognize that the traditional Pueblo governing systems of caciques and sodalities are ranked. Sodality members are ranked over non-sodality members. Sodality leaders and the caciques are highly ranked over other community members. The sodalities themselves might be considered to be ranked by order of the creation in oral histories (Ortiz 1969:83). Elders are ranked over the young. The married are ranked over non-married. Local Pueblo residents are ranked over those tribal members who have not resided at the Pueblo. There is a sense of social ranking within Pueblos, but this ranking is dispersed broadly and widely rather than centralized. This might help to explain why we do not see much evidence for elites in the archaeological record. As McGuire and Saitta have suggested, the Pueblos are both egalitarian and stratified (1996:204). We must also keep in mind that it is very possible that the dispersed hierarchy/leadership that we see today stemming from moieties and sodalities might not be accurate analogies for the more centralized kin-based forms of leadership that I am proposing for the 13th century Northern San Juan region. Further, we cannot forget the impact that colonial processes have had on the Pueblos which not only instigated the governor system, but effectively moved the more overt manifestations of moiety hierarchy and power behind closed doors. Nevertheless, the subtle, albeit present, differences in certain, few kin-based kiva/pit structures such as exemplified at Sand Canyon such as size and the presence of slightly more culturally important materials, even if not strikingly distinct, are suggestive of ranking and privilege amongst some families.

I believe that in the Pueblo past a level of social hierarchy divorced from economic hierarchy existed to some extent. The current manifestation of the moiety and sodality leaders are an example. Here moiety and sodality heads hold positions for life, and although they appear to not hold overt levels
of ranking and hierarchy, they actually do. Moiety leaders had the power to punish or banish anyone guilty of social or religious infractions within the Pueblo (Dozier 1966:175). Ortiz reports that in historic times moiety leaders and possibly sodality heads collectively selected those who would fill the position of Pueblo Governor and other public offices (Ortiz 1969:64) which also suggests the ability to exert a level of control over those positions. Ford reports that no harvesting of grain could occur by anyone in the community until a moiety leader gave his blessing (1992:103). I believe that such leaders might have exerted considerable more power in the past. I believe this power extends as far back as moieties do. Such inklings can be found in the construction of duality in architecture within sites which is consistent with the presence of moieties (Coffey 2016:13; Fowles 2005:41; Bernhart and Ortman 2014; Lipe and Ortman 2000).

I would suggest despite the presence of a ranked society, today’s Pueblos do not display any material evidence for the existence of stratification. There appears to be no distinction between the homes of moiety or sodality leaders and the homes of regular community members. Pueblo leadership is characterized as a service done for the good of the community and there is a level of humility associated with the ideals of Pueblo leadership. Yet power and deference does reside with those in leadership roles. I believe that the presence of a ranked social system would be difficult to recognize in the Pueblo past as well, particularly if hierarchy and authority were dispersed as they appear today. Ranked hierarchical positions for the Pueblos don’t translate into apparent material economic distinction. I use this statement merely to point out that a lack of obvious distinction of hierarchy in the Northern Rio Grande archaeological record must be tempered with a realization that it might actually be imperceptible. Again, there appears the suggestion that there was some level of centralized hierarchy at Sand Canyon Pueblo, even if very subdued, whereas today’s Pueblos tend to have a more dispersed hierarchy or ranking.
Some archaeologists, such as Steve Lekson, have struggled to make sense of apparent authoritarian strains in Chacoan society and the lack of such authoritarian tradition in the modern Pueblos (2012). As with Anschuetz (2007:186) description of the Tewa, the San Juan region was likely in some sense a relatively closed region in which families could shuffle between settlements as needed. Families could leave and join new communities at will. Localities with long settlement histories on the landscape and the authority it can spawn along with suggestions of the existence of “elites” in the Chacoan system seem to build upon each other. That is, they seem to be a continuation of the same cultural tenets only modified through time. Other archaeologists (Ortman 2012:282) have suggested that Mesa Verde society of the 13th century was built upon the memory and history of Chacoan society (Bradley 1996:252). This doesn’t mean that they were the same, but that later Mesa Verde society was likely built upon the foundations of the Chacoan system and as such represented a continuation of sorts, even if in modified form of hierarchy and authority. The earliest Northern San Juan settlements might have been built with the idea of first or founding families having authority. When new people arrived, they incorporated themselves into these communities with the permission of the founding families and in so doing accepting a lower place in the community’s social-political ranking. If they later decided to move on and find another community to join these same processes would still be at play, or they could go off and found their own communities in new localities (provided they could find an appropriate place to settle), thus continuing the cycle and tradition of founding families. It might be that Chaco Canyon as an elite center was not an anomaly from the perspective of what had gone before. What may have been anomalous about Chaco was the scale of this type of social-political system, with Chacoan hierarchy being taken to its logical extreme, but with a social-political structure, particularly at Chacoan outliers, that had a long precedent.

The real story might very well be that we have underestimated the revolutionary effects of the late 13th century migrations for Pueblo people. From 575-1280 C.E., the duration of the Pueblo
occupation of the Mesa Verde country (Wilshusen 2006:19-20), this system of authority based on ranked and place-based kin groups might have played out continuously. It is a different way to think about the Pueblos. If one assumes this scenario for the Northern San Juan region, we might then ask, what would happen to such authority structures following major upheaval and inter-regional migration?

Why Some Traits Might Not Transfer

I suggest that when this land-based authority system was challenged by migration processes it led to drastic societal, political and cultural changes. Old conceptualizations of authority grounded in land-based authority groups, which were integral to how that society had functioned in the homeland and which created and maintained that society’s canonical beliefs, would have become open to question, modification, or even rejection following dramatic events such as the migration of an entire society. Newly occupied landscapes provide for opportunities for new authority groups to be installed and old ones deposed or replaced, with old ideas being actively negotiated or rejected depending on their importance to the society. In the case of the Northern San Juan region I believe that its total abandonment would naturally have led to the compete loss of traits which we today consider to be quintessentially “Mesa Verdean” as those who benefited most from the continuance of “Mesa Verde” culture, society, and politics and who maintained its conventions were gone or no longer in power. All we have left are the cultural beliefs, political systems, and societies of the descendants of the migrants who actively constructed, negotiated, and renegotiated their culture in a new homeland following this period of great change, a time in which we could conceive of as involving a relatively quick ‘reshuffling’ of society. The descendants then are not necessarily those that actively promoted or believed in Mesa Verde culture, but rather they would be the ones who ignored it or even rejected it. Those who were most invested in their original homeland and thus be least likely to migrate away would have been the core founding families of the old settlements, particularly as land-based authority was the original
source of their authority and prestige. For them their place in society might have been based entirely on their occupancy of a specific site or place. They would have been the most likely to express the most Mesa Verdean of material culture traits and they would have been the least incentivized to migrate away. They may have even directed, consciously or not, the evolution of what we think of as diagnostic cultural Mesa Verdean traits as such traits would have held the most value for them. Core families, in an effort to combat hemorrhaging communities as people chose to leave, might have been more inclined to express differences between their way (the Mesa Verde way) and that of the Rio Grande and this might have increased the representative level of Mesa Verde traits. Effort to intentionally or implicitly emphasize Mesa Verdean material traits would have been a way to combat disintegrating communities and reinforce the political-social position of founding families. Bradley describes this process as “revitalization” speculating that in the mid-13th century Mesa Verde “doctrine became codified through a series of rituals and the adoption of a formalized symbolism expressed in architecture and specialized ritual artifacts” (1996:252). Those who had the least investment in these political systems and their outward symbols were likely the first to leave and would not have been as likely to maintain the expressions of those political representations and symbols of the founding families in their new homeland. This may be the major reason why some diagnostic “Mesa Verde” material culture traits, even packages of traits, were not continued by their descendants, to the bafflement of generations of archaeologists.

Migration and Land based Authority

This leads to an obvious question: why don’t we see the reconstitution of this landscape-based authority system anew in the Northern Rio Grande region? Wouldn’t the first arrivals have simply established new settlements based on this time-honored system thus creating new founding family settlements with later migrants joining, and thus replicating, the old system? The Great Pueblo
Migration of the 13th century might have led to such a rapid flow of large numbers of migrants into the destination region that it negated any privilege of founding families. If every member of a new community is a recent arrival, then who claims precedence over their fellow members? Ortman has suggested that the Tewa migration into the Northern Rio Grande might have been large in scale, at least towards the end of the 13th century (2012). The arrival of large numbers of people at around the same time would have led to few people ever having the opportunity of establishing an authority of place system to which they might lay claim. Mass migration might have had the effect of dissolving the land-based authority system of founding families, or at least severely muting such authority, as communities were being established as fully immigrant communities that placed migrants on a more equal social, political, and economic footing. Migrants in the case of those coming out of the Northern San Juan at the end of the 13th century, much the same as refugees, might have arrived with a more communal system based simply on convenience, pragmatic concerns, and natural leadership skills of some people that disregarded the imbued landscape authority system from the homeland. If Ortman’s thesis that the Tewa migration was a deliberate rejection of Mesa Verdean culture is to be believed (2012), a migration presented the best time to reconstruct society anew. If one of the primary social concerns in pre-migration Tewa society had been centralization of authority, here was the time to implement a more diversified and distributed form of authority. Also, if Ware’s assertion that authority was based or founded on farming land ownership (2014: Location 2866) is correct, new communities would normally have been created in such a way that some would have precedence over others in laying claim to the best agricultural fields. The creation of new communities formed entirely from coalescing migrant families might have had an equalizing effect.

Of course, as with all things, the situation is not as simple as I have proposed. We must recognize that the Northern Rio Grande wasn’t empty of population before the arrival of the Northern San Juan migrants at the end of the 13th century. There were people already living here prior to the
abandonment of the Mesa Verde country, albeit in smaller population numbers and densities (Ortman 2016). The Northern Rio Grande had already been occupied by people who could trace their histories back to the Late Developmental Period in the 900’s C.E. (Duwe 2011; Schillaci and Lakatos 2016). Large influxes of migrants would have been faced with two questions: join existing communities that had been established by other people or construct their own? If populations of migrants were large this might have necessitated the construction of altogether new settlements. Very large numbers of migrants would have overwhelmed the smaller communities of locals in the Rio Grande. Instead of a few families establishing a settlement and newcomers joining piecemeal at later times, as had been the case in their Northern San Juan homeland, migrants in the Northern Rio Grande might have chosen to establish new communities as a group, and as previously mentioned this would have robbed any one family of individual land-based authority. Groups of people establishing a new village would not have been able to recreate the traditional kin-based and location-based authority structures of the past. When large numbers of equal but disparate people are part of a founding of a new community this process robs any one kin group from claiming that same level of authority as witnessed in the homeland. And additional arrivals would have not been faced with incorporating themselves into such structures. These were all new settlements. Immigrants who had been part of these core founding families in the original homeland would not have had the same privileges in the new homeland. Certainly, migrant peoples likely moved into established local Rio Grande villages if their numbers were small, but as the flow of people leaving the Northern San Juan increased exponentially that option would not have been viable. As a trickle of migrants became a flood, the best option might have been to establish entirely new settlements consisting entirely of immigrants.
Migrants Arrive. Now What?

For initial migrants who opted to join existing Rio Grande communities, this process could have involved small groups of immigrants moving into existing villages, or larger groups constructing entirely new villages alongside existing ones. Tewa migration stories are full of stories of sister communities, which is to say, two villages located a short distance from each other and separated by a river or stream. These two villages are generally seen as part of larger shared community. This appears to have been the case for Ohkay Owingeh and Yungeh Owingeh (Ellis 1987:14-17); a pair of adjacent villages that were occupied into the colonial era and whose relationship was recorded by Spanish colonists. At Ohkay Owingeh there is an established oral narrative of the events of first contact with Europeans in which the Summer village of Yungeh Owingeh was vacated and its people joined the Winter village of Ohkay Owingeh to create space for the Spaniards. Prior to this the two villages where part of a single community split into a paired Summer-Winter relationship. The two villages may have started out independently, but over time the two took on a shared community identity (Ellis 1987:14-17) such that when Yungeh Owingeh was finally abandoned it was only natural for the inhabitants to relocate to Ohkay Owingeh. Another example is Hunpobi and Howiri, a pair of villages in the Ojo Caliente region that Harrington (1916:162) cites as brother and sister villages based on Tewa tradition. Sheer proximity supports this interpretation, as the main plaza of each village is separated by only a few hundred meters (Duwe 2011:293-295).

These examples clearly reflect the Tewa cosmology of organizing things into dual systems. Such systems can include North and East associations belonging to the Winter moiety and South and West to the Summer moiety (Parson 1964:259). This dual division may even be reflected in the settlement pattern for the entire Rio Grande valley, since the oldest settlements are concentrated to the east of the Rio Grande and more recent sites are concentrated to the west, perhaps reflecting regional-scale Winter and Summer people, respectively. There is a dual conceptualization that oftentimes uses streams to
separate the two forms. In such matters it would be entirely within Tewa orthodoxy to build a new community on a west-east or even a north-south alignment next to an existing one. Examples would include Ohkay Owingeh and Yungh Owinge or Huupovi and Huuwidi. One might even consider one moiety as reflecting pre-migration locals and the other representing later arrivals. Severin Fowles (2005:41-43) has argued that the amalgamation of local populations with later migrants was responsible for the creation of what we think of as modern Tiwa for the Taos region. Here the northside or “Winter” moiety claims antecedence over the southside or “Summer” moiety based on their order of arrival in Taos ethnohistory. At Taos Pueblo itself this resulted in a village that was separated into a north and south section with a stream between them. Pot Creek Pueblo, a Coalition Period Tiwa Pueblo, was split in much the same way between north and south (Fowles 2005). Further, there may be precedents for this type of settlement pattern in the Northern San Juan region. Coffey (2016), for example, shows that a constructed road connected Sand Canyon Pueblo and Goodman Point Pueblo as part of a dual village community in the Northern San Juan as far back as 1100 CE. In short, Tewa (and Tiwa) oral history suggests groups of locals and migrants might have drawn upon the logic of mirror-image pairs to establish dualistic settlement patterns. I suggest that these patterns are in some way connected to the moiety system and general Tewa conception of dualism.

Of the new villages that were established, what would they have looked like? In the absence of first/founding families, other leadership forms would have taken precedence in the organization of new communities. Some archaeologists see evidence for the existence of moieties in the Northern San Juan in the form of village layout and architecture (e.g. Lipe and Ortman 2000). It may be that moieties and founding family authority coexisted in the homeland, but following migration the moiety system continued to operate whereas the kin based political system did not. It is also possible that moiety systems would have been seen as more inclusive and would have been more adept at incorporating large disparate groups of migrants. For most people there would have been no opportunity to
reestablish a social-political system based on order of arrival. Migrant families would have coalesced into communities on an equal footing. Most migrants would not have been members of founding families from the original homeland and would have had no interest in reestablishing and reproducing political hierarchical systems that had disenfranchised them in their previous homeland. The most “Mesa Verde” stylized material traits would have been linked to power structures of older social-political systems. In essence these traits were part of a narrative formulated and nurtured by core founding families. The Mesa Verde cultural narrative would have belonged to those most invested in the system, those who most benefitted from it, those with the most authority and privilege: the core kin groups or founding families of settlements. Non-founding family peoples simply operated within this cultural framework. With the abandonment of place and the loss of power and prestige of settlement founding families, the Northern San Juan cultural narrative that we think of as quintessentially Mesa Verdean was no longer emphasized. There simply may not have been any pressure to reproduce Mesa Verdean material styles and cultural traits, or there may have been a backlash against those systems of founding families and those associated Mesa Verdean traits would have been consciously rejected. The later has been suggested by Ortman (2012). An interest in breaking these systems of hierarchy from the old homeland may or may not have been the actual spark for migration, but it surely contributed to the eventual flame resulting in active rejection of previous societal structures.

As Mesa Verdean society broke down near the end of the 13th century, founding families were faced with limited options: migrate and lose all status they had acquired, remain and attempt to survive alone in otherwise empty settlements and landscapes, or fight to counteract the urge of the masses to leave. I would suppose all these scenarios played out as each village reacted to the socio-political climate. To clarify, I do not assert that the breakdown of society in the Mesa Verde region was social or politically based. I see no reason why this system would not have continued unabated long after the turn of the 13th century. Rather, I believe that regardless of the causes of the disruption of society here
the core founding family system was unable to respond or adapt and likely exacerbated the conditions in the region resulting in the migration. Continued attempts to stave off ever increasing social disorder and collapse would have inadvertently reinforced authoritarian tendencies of these leading families creating ever increasingly rigid political structures. It is these pressures I believe drove the migration. Regardless, I believe that once migrants began arriving in their new homeland they were likely faced with the active decision whether or not to replicate the older centralized power structures. A conscious choice not to would mean that we should not expect to find much trace of Mesa Verdean material styles in the new homeland. New communities based on sodalities and non-kin based moieties would have likely further inhibited kin-based hereditary privilege from reestablishing itself. Ware suggests that the two forms can live in concert but are unlikely to be equal. When one is prominently expressed the other is likely muted. (Ware 2014: Location 4667). That is, either a kin-based system or a political-based moiety system would have been dominant, but both could have existed simultaneously within a village. I suggest the move from kin-based moiety to political moiety might have been one consequence of the migrations due to a general de-emphasis on kin groups.

We might also consider that the concept of land-based authority played out in a large-scale way within the Northern Rio Grande between locals and migrants. Local Northern Rio Grande people might have been seen as imbued with land-based authority in such a way that favored their cultural traits over those of the immigrants. Rather than Tewa migrants coming in and bringing Northern San Juan traits with them it might also have been that local Rio Grande peoples would have been seen as those with authority as granted by landscape and order of arrival. Here local material culture traits might have simply been seen as those with the most authority that superseded those of migrant’s homeland traits. To put another way, rather than land-based authority and priority between families or clans within a community, it might have been authority and priority on a grand scale between locals and migrants. It would certainly help that the Tewa were actively rejecting the old hierarchical community systems
based on kinship, were leaving behind many of their associated socio-political traits, and were open to new traits, new ways of being.

**Mapping Memory onto New Landscapes**

So, let us return full circle to the topic of mapping memory onto landscape. In their original homeland Tewa ancestors had memory and authority mapped onto their particular landscape and topography. As discussed previously the case of land-based authority that was imbued in landscape from the original homeland was muted in the new homeland. I suggest that migrants leaving their homeland would have been faced with the decision of either abandoning culturally important memories or reproducing them onto their new landscape. If a society is likely to reproduce its cosmology from their previous homeland onto a new one (as suggested by Bernhart and Ortman 2014), then I would suggest that memory would likely also be reproduced. Stories that take place in a location in the previous homeland might be ascribed as taking place within the new homeland. The story of *P’oseyemu* in the Tewa tradition might be such an example as previously suggested by Ortman (2012:357-361).

The *P’oseyemu* culture hero narrative is one that takes place in a tumultuous Tewa world where previous authority groups are challenged, perhaps even violently. These events are traditionally linked to the Ojo Caliente region near the Rio Grande Valley (Bayliss 1909; Ebright the ojo caliente grant 2014:61-62; Harrington 1916:161,164; Parsons 1994:108-113, Naranjo 2008:259-260; Weigle and White The lore of NM 2003:232-234). Not only are there stories about *P’oseyemu* related to a confrontation between village authorities and the low ranked people, but some non-*P’oseyemu* stories tell of similar events. These events have often been mapped onto Ojo Caliente or the Rio Chama area because *P’oseyemu* has been mapped onto Ojo Caliente. Yet evidence for violence and social upheaval are limited in the Ojo Caliente region. The Ojo Caliente experience might be characterized as reflecting Tewa cultural growth but not necessarily revolution or upheaval. Why is there such turmoil in the
P’oseyemu narratives but little evidence for such turmoil in what has traditionally been proposed as P’oseyemu’s homeland of the Ojo Caliente? I propose that this is a case of memory being remapped onto a new landscape by migrants. What Ortman has indirectly suggested during his analysis of the Tewa origin story was to substitute the P’oseyemu narrative locality of Ojo Caliente region for that of the Northern San Juan region, a place that did experience violence and upheaval (Kuckelman et. al. 2002). Although he doesn’t go into depth about this process, I believe that his assertions are correct.

It might be the Ojo Caliente acted as a stand in for the Northern San Juan homeland. Here too was a formative place for Tewa culture which incidentally lay in the general direction to the northwest, the general direction of the Mesa Verde homeland. Distances to this “stand-in” original homeland are close enough that people could regularly visit and point to the distant past when their people lived here. These are points of similarity and convenience. Ojo Caliente might then act as a stand-in for the Northern San Juan. The narrative, one based on place, is preserved because it has been mapped onto the new landscape. In this way the memory of the original events can be preserved within the traditional system of landscape as memory.

To be clear, landscapes of memory can be broken down into two categories: general culturally important memories and specific memories which reinforced land based-authority systems. Generalized landscape memories can reinforce culturally and widely accepted conceptions of the world that can transcend kin-based political systems such as those that were increasingly expressed in the late 13th century of Northern San Juan region so that they could be expected to be replicated in the new homeland. On the other hand, specific landscape memories that supported and reinforced kin-based hierarchical systems would have been lost, either intentionally or not, as a result of post-migration coalescence processes in the new homeland. The potential that this represents must be emphasized. It may very well be that some Tewa place names and mythological remembered events at places within the current Tewa homeland represent a remapping from the Northern San Juan homeland. Harrington
noted a similar practice with regard to village names: Tewa people often retained a village name when it was abandoned and applied it to a new settlement (1916:95). For example, there have actually been three villages called Ohkay Owingeh, with the name transferring from one village to the next as the previous village was abandoned. Further, Ellis writes “The Tewa on the east side of the Rio Grande referred to their territory as Teguayo, ‘Place of the Tewas,’ even as they also referred to their earlier home in the northwest on the San Juan, apparently either in Mesa Verde or a little farther east in the Upper San Juan around Aztec and the basin of the Navajo Reservoir. As Teguayo was also used to designate a mythical ancestral place of origin, the term puzzled the Spaniards, but causes little difficulty if one realizes that the Pueblos (like ourselves) often duplicated some old names in new areas” (Ellis 1974:2 as reported in Ortman 2012:188). This shows that place-names can travel. In short, oral history of past events such as those involving P’oseyemu might actually reflect a recounting of events that took place in the Northern San Juan.

Conclusions

In this chapter I have laid out a model for migration that accounts for the apparent material culture discontinuities between the Northern San Juan and the Northern Rio Grande as I conceive them. I do not contend that this is THE way the Great Pueblo Migration took place although it certainly is the way I perceive it from my own understanding of both the archaeological evidence and Tewa oral history. It is a synthesis that builds out of two realities: the archaeological reality and the Tewa reality. The Great Pueblo Migration was likely the most pivotal event in Tewa history; one that presented the greatest potential for cultural change that would not occur again until the arrival of the Spanish. I would go so far as to say the abandonment of the San Juan region was the most pivotal and defining moment in Pueblo history overall. I suggest that it is only from a Western ontological perspective of a world where authority and power are tied not to landscape but to laws, rights, and histories recorded in texts that it
becomes natural to imagine migrating groups transporting and reproducing their homeland’s cultural traits as a bounded package in a new place. Instead, from an indigenous landscape as memory and authority perspective such a Western point of view seems unlikely or even unrealistic.

4 Owây waƚhaƚ di: They Were Coming From Far Away.

I want to delve into the origin narrative to examine the Tewa perspective on the migration. Here I will use a compilation of recorded narratives from Alfonso Ortiz, a Tewa anthropologist from Ohkay Owingeh, as well as from a number of ethnographers during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. “The Tewa were living in Sipofene beneath Sandy Place Lake far to the north. The world under the lake was like this one, but it was dark. Supernaturals, men, and animals lived together at this time, and death was unknown. Among the supernaturals were the first mothers of the Tewa, known as “Blue Corn Woman, near to summer,” or the Summer mother, and “White Corn Maiden, near to ice,” the Winter mother” (Ortiz 1969:13). The Tewa mothers sent scouts ahead to discover a way out from the underworld and to prepare the way forward so that their children, the Tewa people, could emerge into this above-world. In so doing they explored the new world, prepared its boundaries, and gained permission to live in this new world from the animals that inhabited them. Then the Tewa mothers chose two men to act in their place in this above-world as they would remain in the under-world; one man was chosen by the Winter mother, and one was chosen by the Summer mother to be their representatives. They were to be the earthly representatives of the corn mothers and to lead and care for their people.

The people emerged from beneath the lake and found the world to be soft and muddy, but through the efforts of their leaders they induced the world to start drying and to harden. After emerging from out of the lake they made several attempts to venture away from there only to have to return each time because they lacked a key component of something that would be necessary for them to live and survive in this new world (Ortiz 1969:13-15; Parsons 1994:9-13). Each time a new sodality or “society”
was created to help the people live in their new home. Thus, each society was a sacrosanct institution with primordial origins in the original lake and each one provided an important element necessary for the successful and functioning whole community.

Once all the societies had been established, the people were now finally ready and prepared to venture away from the lake. They traveled south from Sipofene, eventually reaching a great river (Parson 1994:14). With great difficulty, they crossed the river leaving some of their people behind who had begun to second-guess their travels. Those who continued again split into two groups, each following a different chief. One group followed the Winter chief (earthly representative of the Winter corn mother) traveling southward into lands east of the river (we presume here the Rio Grande valley) where they lived by hunting. The other group following the Summer chief (earthly representative of the Summer corn mother) traveling southward also presumably into the Rio Grande valley west of the river subsisting on plant foods. Eventually the two groups were called together reuniting them. Here they founded the first village called Tekhe Owinge (cottonwood bud village) also called Owing P’ingeh (or middle village). In other narratives this place is called Posi Owinge. This was the first village to be established since leaving the lake where both Summer and Winter people lived (Duwe 2011:99-103; Ortiz 1969, Parsons 1994).

The story of Tewa emergence from Sipofene, the migration south, and occupation of today’s lands vary from village to village, but many of the details are the same. For those Tewa living west of the Rio Grande the first village inhabited at the conclusion of the migrations was called Pose Owinge (located near the town Ojo Caliente) (Ortiz 1969:16) while those east of the Rio Grande laid claimed to Tekhe Owinge (Parsons 1994:15). From a Pojoaque perspective, Tekhe Owinge is the most likely location. The last point does not mean to sow disunity. In numerous stories from the eastern Tewa, Tekhe Owinge is the important first place. The rendition given here is a tiny condensed summary of several recorded stories (Ortiz, Parsons, Harrington). These stories are long and vary in detail but the
main points they all make are the same even though the final destination village varies depending on who is telling the story.

The similarities between the *Ohkay Owingeh* (version reported by Ortiz) and Pojoaque migration stories are really quite striking. Both discuss the movement of the Tewa people from locations far to the north of the Espanola Valley. Both recount the travels of people southward along a river with Winter people moving down the east side and occupying the eastern mountains and Summer people moving down the west side and occupying the western mountains. Both discuss the two sides eventually coming together again in the current Tewa territory. These similarities in the narrative, from independent villages on opposing sides of Tewa territory, suggest the main points have a basis in fact. Both stories would also seem to indicate that the Espanola Valley was not occupied prior to the arrival of the Winter and Summer people. Certainly, no major groups are mentioned as having already been in the Espanola Valley when the Tewa arrived. Another point is that both the Summer and Winter moieties claim their origins were in the north. In fact, Tewa origin stories would suggest that both Summer and Winter leadership positions existed in their original homelands although some might argue that these positions could have been created during the migration. The division of the regular people into Winter and Summer groups didn’t happen, according to the stories, until AFTER the migrations had commenced, with the division being dependent on which leader (Summer or Winter) the regular Tewa person chose to follow. It is also suggestive that both groups left at or close to the same time, although time can be difficult to gauge in these kinds of stories. In one story, the division of Summer and Winter didn’t happen until the people had crossed the river. In another version, Summer chief attempted to leave the lake first but couldn’t because the ground was too soft. As a result, Winter chief had to lead the way out. So, both chiefs had led followers away from their homeland to a great river which they could not cross. Once they were able to cross (through magical means), they found that not everyone wanted to go (Parsons 1994:14; Velarde 1989:10). Those that chose to cross and follow their chiefs continued
southern to become Tewa, whereas those that chose to stay behind remained in their homeland, their fates unknown.

Here it must be recognized that the Tewa were apparently not the only people living in their original homelands, for in the Parsons record “Some were left on one side, some on the other side. They were calling to one another. They threw stones and sticks at one another. Then those who stayed on the other side said, “That is what you need. You are Navajo, Ute, Apache, Kaiowa, Comanche.” So, when they called their names, they said “you belong to them.” They have their own languages. They could not talk to each other (1994:14). Parsons heard two versions of this same story, one from Ohkay Owingeh, the other from Santa Clara (1994:14). I believe the point made in this story is that the lake, the original homeland of the Tewa, was also home to other peoples. Culturally and linguistically they are portrayed or characterized as different. And there is possibly more than one disparate group present there. One can imagine that, in addition to Tewa speakers, the Four Corners was home to Towa and Keresan speakers and perhaps others.

This same version also suggests that this homeland was experiencing violence as the story discusses how the two sides want to fight, but the non-Tewas are eventually told that the Tewa will remain stronger. This reinforces the concept that war and ‘fighting people’ were in the homeland. Parsons reported that this river that had to be crossed ran east-west. This story also suggests that there was disunity at the river among the migrants between those that wanted to continue south following their chiefs while others choosing not to continue (Parsons 1994: 14; Velarde 1989:10). I suspect that this river acted as a social-cultural boundary of sorts marking the extent of the primordial Tewa homeland and their known world; and that beyond (to the south) lay unknown lands, lands that were not Tewa at the time. I believe this river to be the San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico.

Wilshusen and Van Dyke also suggest that the San Juan River very likely served as a cultural boundary (2006:237). This version of the Tewa story also suggests that both Summer and Winter traveled south
together, from the lake to this river boundary, that they worked together to cross the river, and that it was only after crossing that they split into two groups. This story seems to suggest that both the Summer people and the Winter people originated in the same place and time together. In addition, the San Juan River was the only large river besides the Rio Grande that would have presented a significant physical obstacle as it is well known for its unpredictability. We might even suggest that the fact that this river was impassible when Tewa ancestors came upon it may reflect the time of year when the river runs highest, presumably in the Spring. Further, it is suggestive that if the San Juan River acted as a northern boundary, then the lands to the north referenced in the story might indeed correspond to the Mesa Verde region. This interpretation is based entirely on the story of the river as we don’t know how much we can trust in the details, but no other river outside of the Rio Grande would seem to fit the description in the story. Even the Rio Grande seems an unlikely fit.

The Pojoaque area in Tewa Tradition

As mentioned above, several versions of the Tewa migration narrative were recorded by Elsie Clews Parsons in the early 20th century, particularly versions from San Juan Pueblo (today’s Ohkay Owíneh), San Ildefonso Pueblo, and Nambe Pueblo. These narratives discuss the founding of the original village upon which both Winter and Summer moiety peoples came together in the region. In several stories this village is identified as Tekhe Owíneh or ‘Cottonwood Bud village’. This village has been linked to the Pojoaque area. One narrative gathered from Ohkay Owíneh includes a recounting of the establishment of the village of Tekhe Owíneh following the end of the migrations from the north. It was a place where Summer and Winter people first came together after having set off on their respective migrations and represents the arrival of Tewa speaking peoples in their new homeland. Parsons’s informant recounted how after traveling awhile amongst the hills both the Summer and Winter peoples wanted to hold a dance (Parsons 1994:15) and so all the people from both sides of the
Rio Grande gathered together in one place for the first time and established the village called Tekhe Owinge also referred to as “Uwipinge” as recorded by Harrington (1916:336). “Uwipinge” was the spelling used by Harrington and later Parsons who defined it as meaning “the center village” or “middle village”. Today it would be spelled more like Owîñ-P’îngeh

Another explanation from this same person was that after having migrated from the north as separate Summer and Winter people “some on the west side liked the east side and walked over, some on the east side like the west side and walked over. All came down there to Uwipinge” (Parsons 1994:15). Here all the Tewa people lived for a time and it is from here that they dispersed to create all the modern Tewa villages of Ohkay Owingeh, Santa Clara Pueblo, San Ildefonso Pueblo, Nambe Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, and Pojoaque Pueblo (ibid.:16). In this recounting Tekhe Owinge was established as the first place that the Tewa had gathered in the Northern Rio Grande since setting out on their migrations from the far north and from which all other modern Tewa villages derived. It was also explained to Bandelier and later to Harrington by individuals from San Juan Pueblo (Ohkay Owinge), Nambe, and San Ildefonso that Tekhe Owinge was located in a geographically-central location within the Tewa country. All confirmed that Tekhe Owinge had once also been known as Oůwipinge (middle village, center village) because it was the ‘center’ or ‘middle’ village for all of the Tewa. Upon questioning that there were other villages and ruins in the surrounding area just as old that could also be claimed as being geographically centered within Tewa country, informants all conceded the fact but nonetheless maintained that the name Oůwipinge properly only applied to Tekhe Owinge. Bandelier further added “The Tehuas [Tewa] claim that this pueblo marks the center of the range of their people, and that the division into two branches, of which the Tehuas became the northern and the Tanos the southern, took place there in very ancient times. (Harrington 1916:337).” Harrington spent much time trying to record the location from the different informants of Tekhe Owinge concluding that the site was situated at or next to Pojoaque Pueblo above the Pojoaque river.
A different recounting of the migration gathered from two informants, one from Ohkay Owinge and the other from Nambe Pueblo, recalls the establishment of Tekhe Owinge mentioning that after the emergence in the north the Summer and Winter People migrated down along the Rio Grande, with the Summer people traveling down the west side and Winter people traveling down the east side. They traveled until they came to Taos Pueblo where some of their people chose to stay. They traveled further southward and stopped again at Picuris Pueblo, then at Ohkay Owinge, Santa Clara Pueblo, San Ildefonso Pueblo and then Tesuque Pueblo. At each stop they left some people who chose to stay at those places. They also learned from the people living in those places important ritual elements that enhanced their own lives and their abilities for calling the rain and raising crops and essentially making them whole or complete. It was at Tesuque Pueblo that the people decided that two new additional villages should be established so they again divided into two groups. “They stood on a little hill, Tehhe’. “This is going to be te’he’owinge” they said. Half the people lived there and half moved on. At te’he’owinge (pow’aki)” they had all kinds of power, but “this pueblo did not ask for the people to increase. That is why this pueblo came to an end.” The remainder of the people traveled eastward from here and eventually settled at Nambe Pueblo (Parsons 1964:147-150). While this migration story doesn’t recount Tekhe Owinge’s centrality either geographically or chronologically, it does connect Tekhe Owinge directly with Pojoaque. There appears to be an understanding that they are nearly synonymous in place.

The centrality of Tekhe Owinge and its role in Tewa history as provided by Parsons, Harrington, and Bandelier all seem to confirm a belief among many Tewa people that Tekhe Owinge played a pivotal role in Tewa history, whereas one of the migration stories definitely identifies Tekhe Owinge as linked to Pojoaque area. While the second story is somewhat contradictory with regards to the timing of the establishment of Tekhe Owinge, informants from neighboring Tewa villages seem to agree that the first story was more correct as to when the village was established. Rather than choosing one story over
the other, I merely suggest that they both make important contributions and that they might in fact recount separate migration events to the same place.

The location of *Tekhe Owinge* was generally identified by Harrington, who placed it on a map in his *Ethnogeography of the Tewa Indians* (Harrington 1916:337) as being contiguous with the historic village of Pojoaque (Pojoaquito) and in a place identified by Ellis as the “Hillcrest” and by contemporary Pojoaque elders as the “Winter Village”. Although there has been some confusion regarding precisely where *Tekhe Owinge* was located, it has consistently been identified as being very near geographically to Pojoaque Pueblo. Indeed, in the last story it was the hill (presumably Pojoaque hill) which gave the village its name *Tekhe*. It has been common practice for the Tewa to name villages after associated geographical features. Such an example would be *P’o-suwa-geh Owinge* (Pojoaque Pueblo) meaning ‘place to drink water’. The village was once known as a place with springs and was a common watering hole for travelers. Another example would be *K’uu-yemu-geh Owinge* or ‘place where the rocks fall’. The village was named after a land feature where rocks either fell from time to time or was a place of defense where rocks were employed as weaponry against attackers (oral accounting).

The informant tells the story of *Tekhe Owinge* but concludes this story discusses why there are no more people at “*Powhaki*”. It should be remembered that at the time this story was recorded, likely in the early 20th century, Pojoaque Pueblo was only sparsely inhabited. It wasn’t until the 1930’s that the Pueblo was reconstituted and gained federal recognition. A variant of this story as told by a Santa Clara Pueblo informant swaps in the name *P’osuwaeger*, the Tewa name for Pojoaque, in place of *Tekhe Owinge* (Parsons 1994:102-106). Again, there seems little doubt from oral stories of a link between *Tekhe Owinge* and Pojoaque hill near the current village. In this last rendition Pojoaque Pueblo and *Tekhe Owinge* are names that seem to swap easily. This doesn’t necessarily mean that they were actually the same village, but rather it might simply be that today’s Pojoaque Pueblo might stand on or next to lands that where once part of *Tekhe Owinge*. It may also be that Pojoaque hill is *Tekhe* hill. Here
I would like to emphasize that Pojoaquito (Old Pojoaque Pueblo), and the Hillcrest site (presumed by me to be Tekhe Owinge) are actual sites that can be more thoroughly investigated and dated. The latter part is important in establishing their antiquity in relation to archaeologically known events of the time and the events ascribed in the migration stories.

Some Contention

I want to acknowledge here that that Tekhe Owinge is not the only settlement that can lay claim to being the “mother village of the Tewa.” P’ose Owinge in the Ojo Caliente area has also been described as such, particularly for Tewa villages on the west side of the Rio Grande. The unusual thing I have noticed is that stories and events ascribed to Tekhe Owinge and P’ose Owinge overlap. In some stories the destination for Tewa people at the completion of their migrations is Tekhe Owinge while differing sets of nearly identical sets of stories state the migrations were completed at P’osi Owinge. One of Parsons informants from Ohkay Owinge describes how a magical boy, the child of the sun, was born at “Tekeowinge”. This recalls similarly structured oral stories revolving around the mythic figure P’oseyemu who is associated with P’osi Owinge. Both locations have been claimed to be the ‘mother village’ of the Tewa, or rather the first locations for establishment for Tewa villages and the coming together of Winter and Summer moieties and both share stories of a mythical child fathered by the sun who becomes a great leader for the Tewa people. However, P’ose Owinge, an archaeologically identified place, is chronologically dated to the Classic Period, later than the Pojoaque settlements and after Tewa style settlements and population migration into the region have already popped up. I believe both sites are likely to have played key roles in the formation of Tewa identity, but they likely mark different events and times chronologically. These two sites are far removed from each other spatially. Tekhe Owinge has always been associated with the Pojoaque area regardless of exact location. The P’ose Owinge site is located in the Ojo Caliente area. These are not simply two different
names for the same site. One hypothesis might be that the Coalition Period Pojoaque region represents
the arrival of Northern San Juan region migrants into the area fostering relationships with local’s and the
Ojo Caliente area might represent a further consolidation or unification under a region wide Tewa
identity. Tewa identity was likely not founded in any one locality or at any one point in time. Rather it
was probably a long process that took centuries and took place in many localities. I thus do not consider
these two locations as necessarily exclusive or absolute on the claim of Tewa origins.

Another point of contention has been the location and identity of Cuyamungue, a site with
ancestral connections for people in Pojoaque and Tesuque Pueblos. The reason why this is important to
resolve is because Schillaci et al. (2017) make an argument that the Developmental Period site called the
“Pojoaque Grant Site” (LA 835), is the village called ‘Cuyamungue’ and was a possible predecessor of a
later village also called Cuyamungue (K’uu Yemu-Geh Owingehe) (LA 38). If true, it would suggest the
Tewa have been in the region far longer than the 13th century Great Pueblo Migration event and that
that Tewa populations have had little contribution from Northern San Juan populations. All of this would
be contrary of Tewa origin narratives and dismissing any real movement from the north (or anywhere
else) as is generally the universally held Tewa belief across villages.

The best way I think to rephrase this argument in a more meaningful way is to question where
the Tewa language was created. Does it have links to the Pueblo 13th century Northern San Juans or to
Late Developmental Northern Rio Grande peoples. The assumption that the language was spoken by a
single biological group, something that Ortman contests is not necessarily a reliable assumption (2012).
Further, it assumes that amalgamation of different peoples is not a likely source for Tewa ancestors. This
argument is based on the concept that the Tewa have had a practice of duplicating village names as
Harrington and Ellis have noted (Ellis 1967:43, 1974:2). I certainly agree that this was a known practice.
The claim by Schillaci et. al. is that LA 835, a Late Developmental site, was the first Cuyamungue and the
name transferred onto LA 38 (a Coalition and Classic site) at a later date. This assertion is based
primarily on an unpublished H. P. Mera map (Sheet Map #779, by H.P. Mera (ca. 1931–1946) from the
Archaeological Records Management Section (ARMS) collection at the Museum of Indian Arts &
Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology) (Schillaci et. al. 2017:147) and on the word of a single informant
from Pojoaque Pueblo (Figure 7). The University of Colorado 2015-17 field schools working at LA 38 have
included collaborative work with Tewa ritual leaders and elders from Pojoaque and other Tewa villages,
and have revealed no such link despite repeated specific questioning on this matter. The general
consensus from tribal elders and leaders is that the name Cuyamungue (K’uu Yemu-Geh or place where
rocks fall) was applicable to the hills near LA 835, which is an important geographical landmark for
Pojoaque Pueblo, but did not necessarily apply to the Developmental village present nearby (LA 835) of
which Tewa elders seemed to have no knowledge of except for a basic awareness that an archaeological
site was indeed present there. After collaborative work it appears only one site seems to have been
referred to as K’uu Yemu-Geh’Owingeh and that site is LA 38. This question was brought up on multiple
occasions with multiple elders from different Pueblos, always with these same results.
Interestingly, it also seemed to not be a big deal that the site of Cuyamungue LA 38 was not located directly at the foot of the Cuyamungue hills as it seemed that this land formation was easily within sight of LA 38 and was close enough for the village to take on that name. Note for example that *P’ose Owinge* is named for the hot springs at Ojo Caliente, but the site thus named for those hot springs is actually located on the hill above and some 1400 feet south of the actual springs. *Tsi-P’In Owinge* is a Tewa village named for Cerro Pedernal, a peak 3.4 miles from the village. *Wiyo Pueblo* (LA 158) is located approximately 12 miles from the “great gap” or saddle land formation between two prominent peaks in the Santa Fe Mountain from which it derives its name. Thus, a site need not necessarily be located directly adjacent to the land feature it is named for. A clear view of that land formation from the site appears to have sufficed for this naming convention. So, LA 38 being named for a geologic formation approximately 1 mile away that is clearly visible from that site seems to follow a typical pattern.
I suspect that what Schillaci et. al. found in Mera’s unpublished map (Schillaci et al. 2017) was the label ‘Cuyamungue’ applied generally to the land formation itself. There are actually three sites on this rock formation according to the map (LA 833, 834, and 835) as well as numerous other sites nearby including LA 38, but none are labeled including LA 38, a known Classic Period village or the Hispanic settlement which is also known as Cuyamungue. The only exception is that the label “Cuyamungue” appears in the area of the rock formation in the midst of LA 833, 834, and 835. Even here the label is uncertain as to which of these three sites this name would be referring to if it was applied to a specific site. I believe that this label “Cuyamungue” is referring to the geologic land formation and not to a specific site. And just as a note, there is no doubt, and no argument from any side, that LA 38 was called Cuyamungue as it was a precontact village that survived into colonial times and was only abandoned following the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 (Ellis 1974:2). There appears to be no specific remembered Tewa name for LA 835.

Which brings us to one last point. The reason I stated earlier that this should be reframed as a question on where the Tewa language was spoken and when rather than where the Tewa people themselves were located. As Ortman has discussed (2012) language, biology, and culture do not necessarily come as a nice bounded package. In this paper I have claimed that Tewa ancestors were a combination of both locals and migrants. Ortman has argued decisively that the Tewa language was spoken in the 13th century Northern San Juan region. It is likely that Tewa ancestors came from both the Northern San Juan and from local Northern Rio Grande populations which in some ways makes this entire argument over LA 835 a moot point. A more interesting question, and one beyond the scope of this paper, is the question of identifying the origins of the local Northern Rio Grande peoples whom I would suggest are themselves migrants sometime during the preceding Developmental Period.

These oral traditions surrounding Tewa history, and the Pojoaque area in particular, as well as a discussion on naming conventions provide the context for the archaeological record of present-day
Pojoaque Pueblo. As discussed earlier in this chapter, I emphasize that one of the important points of the Tekhe Owinge (Hillcrest) site is that it gives us a place to date and test. Here we can see what the maximum date range are for Tekhe Owinge and test to see if they coincide with the movement of people into the region, any reorganization of inhabitation of the area, and with events taking shape in the Northern San Juan region. All of these points may not ‘prove’ anything about the site per se, but collectively they are certainly suggestive of the events remembered by Tewa people.

5 Walking the Grounds

In this chapter I summarize current knowledge of the archaeological record of the Pojoaque Pueblo area, including previous work by Florence Hawley Ellis and more recent survey work by myself and others from the University of Colorado Boulder and the Pueblo of Pojoaque. Although most of this chapter consists of a basic descriptive report of recent work, in the end I will show that this record indicates the Pojoaque area was in fact an early destination for Northern San Juan migrants and played a pivotal role in the creation of Tewa identity.

In 1951 Florence Hawley Ellis conducted surveys and limited excavation work on Pojoaque Pueblo lands as part of a University of New Mexico archaeological field school. During her work she excavated in several areas, conducted surface survey, dated sites via ceramics, and identified sites mentioned by previous researchers. She also wrote a short history of the Pojoaque area from early occupation to recent times (Pojoaque: A Casualty of the Pueblo Revolt), especially chronicling the first half of the 20th century. She did extensive literature research on Spanish explorations, population trends, family genealogies for some of the surviving families, and notes on Pojoaque interaction with neighboring Hispanic residents. She focused on locating LA 61, excavating rooms from the Garcia site, testing a midden area attached to the post-revolt village of Pojoquito, documenting ceramics on several knolls on the crest of Pojoaque hill, and documenting “Hillcrest Pojoaque”, which was referred
to by tribal members as the Winter Village during my work. All these areas are located in and around the current village. She dug a test trench at “The East Dump” which was a midden area next to the colonial era village which she referred to as East Pojoaque but noted that some locals refer to as Pojoaquito to differentiate it from the Spanish settlement of Pojoaque. This area is adjacent to an old apple orchard. Here she noted that ceramic types suggested the midden was used from around 1550 through to the late 19th century and included some examples of majolica sherds. Diagnostic styles included polished red and Black (the bulk of the sample), San Juan red-on-orange, and Tewa polychrome. She also notes that she found a few examples of Santa Fe Black-on-white and Biscuit ware (Ellis 1974:16-18).

Ellis also excavated at the Garcia site located a short distance northwest of the current village and west of the “East Dump.” She excavated 11 rooms and noted from the ceramic types that it was likely occupied from the 14th to the 19th centuries. Since then the site has been mostly demolished, having been bulldozed and turned into agricultural fields. Here there were the same diagnostic ceramic types as found in the East Dump area, but also some Sankawi Black on cream (Ellis 1974:18-19).

Ellis also did survey work attempting to locate LA61 which she referred to as “lower Pojoaque”, said to be a large village located below Pojoaque hill along the Rio Pojoaque (Figure 8). She concluded that the paved road to Nambe Pueblo likely went right through the site and much of it had been turned into agricultural fields and house lots such that no structural remnants remained. She was not able to find any evidence for structures and only a few sherds. She noted that the types were previously recorded by the Laboratory of Anthropology included Kwahe’e Black on white, Santa Fe Black on white, Wiyo Black on white, Biscuit ware, Tewa polychrome, polished red and Black ware and some examples of Tewa Black on red. This suggested a long occupation, dating between 1125 CE and the 19th century. More likely, the Colonial-era ceramics derive from later occupations elsewhere on the hill. She noted that her own survey only located late pottery but she suggests that she may not have been in the exact location of the site (Ellis 1974:23-25).
Ellis also documented three smaller hill tops on Pojoaque hill which she referred to as Knolls 1, 2, and 3 which included a surface survey finding of ‘Chaco II Black on white’ (likely Red Mesa or Kwahe’e Black on white), Mesa Verde Black on white (likely Santa Fe Black-on-white), Wiyo Black-on-white (the bulk of the sample), and Biscuit A. Together, these types suggest a dating between 1000 and 1450. Based on these results, Ellis speculated that there were two different cultural groups that had occupied Pojoaque hill: a Developmental occupation by Keresan speakers who produced Santa Fe Black on white, and later arriving Tewa speakers who produced Wiyo Black-on-white (Ellis 1974:22). While I believe the speculation of Keresan association as the Rio Grande Developmental peoples is unlikely to be true, it is interesting to note that she interprets her data as indicating the presence of two different cultural groups which we might infer here as locals and migrants. Unfortunately, Ellis does not provide the details for her reasoning on this point. Ellis examined the main irrigation ditch (still in use) which runs

Figure 8. Ellis 1951 map of Pojoaque survey area. Note ‘East Pojoaque’ refers to Old Pojoaque/Pojoquito
east-west and is located just north of the current village and which she suspected dated before contact with the Spanish. This much was told to her by her informants (Ellis 1974:25).

Ellis examined two additional sites at a greater distance from Pojoaque Pueblo. One was a place she referred to as Turquoise Pendant Ruin located on Pojoaque hill approximately 1 mile east of the current village. This site included Red Mesa and Kwahe’e Black-on-white, Santa Fe Black-on-white (the bulk of the sample), and Wiyo Black-on-white suggesting dates between 900 and 1300. This might be a site that has been recorded more recently by the University of Colorado Boulder and labeled the Camino Rincon site (see below). The other was the Cano Ditch site, a site between Pojoaque and Nambe Pueblos, but with no strong association with any painted ware.

The final place Ellis investigated, and did some excavation work, was at the Hillcrest site, which as I’ve stated is today referred to by Pojoaque community members as the ‘Winter Village’. Never did I hear anyone utter the term ‘Hillcrest.’ According to Ellis this site has a road that goes through its eastern side separating a mound on that side from a mound, plaza, and kiva on the west side of the road. Here I only examined the village on the west side of the road having not obtained permission to survey the eastern side. This village has a curious geologic feature that has displaced the northern section. According to Ellis there were at least 4 “sinks” that developed parallel to Pojoaque hill in a sequence down towards the Rio Pojoaque to the north. Her informants recounted that the sinks had developed sometime prior to the 1930s and perhaps occurred almost “overnight” (Ellis 1974:19). Upon gaining some geologic advice it appears likely that she viewed the sinks as features that developed because the agricultural terraces nearby were being irrigated from the ditch above. As a result, certain soil components were leached or dissolved in the soil, eventually forcing the land to sink in a series of parallel ripple-like gullies. These sinks likely obliterated some of the old agricultural terraced fields, and the furthest uphill sink appear to have cut through the northern section of the Hillcrest site exposing a large number of sherds, lithic flakes, and some ground stone. It is incredible to imagine the geologic
forces that could produce these actions, yet the damage to the north end of the site suggests either a straight drop of the soil level or a tear in the ground surface followed by movement of that detached northern section, which came to resemble a small knoll. It would be interesting to have a geologist examine the area to get their take on the processes that could have resulted in these processes. Ellis excavated a test pit in the cut side here on the northern section of the village where sherds were plentiful (Ellis 1974:19-19a,26). We know that she conducted this excavation, but what happened to the collection following excavation is currently unknown.

The Winter Village (LA 12271)

In 2017, I conducted a surface survey of the Hillcrest site, and the midden with associated fields likely belonging to East Pojoaque/Pojoquito, the colonial era village (Figure 8, map of the Winter Village area). The Hillcrest site survey was confined to areas west of the road that split the village into two parts. This area likely consists of 2/3 of the site. The area east of the road was not surveyed as permission was not obtained, but Ellis notes that an additional mound was located in that area (Ellis 1974:19). I mapped out the western area of the village and sampled ceramics, lithics, and ground stone. I also recorded features to the south and north which appear to have been agricultural fields but do not appear to have been contemporary with the Winter Village site. Once again, the topography was documented via unmanned aerial vehicle photogrammetry by Archaeogeophysical Associates, Inc.

I surveyed the site and surrounding areas around the site and down towards the Pojoaque River. The survey consisted of architectural sampling to see if I could draw a basic map of the architectural layout of the site. This included house mounds, kiva depressions, and within and outside the site agricultural features. My sampling was focused entirely on surveying ceramics attempting to establish an occupation date range. My sampling collection areas included areas with the largest concentration of sherds and in areas where I had marked as architectural and agricultural features. I placed flag pins on
the ground, recorded their location on a sketched map as well as using Avenza-Maps program with Google Earth to drop a pin in electronic format. I then paced out from the flag approximately 7.5 feet (3 paces) and sampled everything within that distance a circle set around the pin flag. The pacing out distance at 3 feet is what I decided on in order to record a wider variety of sherds and sherd types. The measurements were paced out and this can be criticized but I reasoned that since I was the only person working on the project and if I didn’t change up my natural pace it could be reliable. I recorded both ceramics and lithics, but lithics were far fewer than sherd examples. Overall my purpose was to record the site layout and date it using ceramic seriation. It appears that the Winter Village site consists of at least two and as many as 4 adobe house mounds and possibly 2 kivas (Table 3). Mound 4 appears to have been originally attached to the rest of the settlement site (at least to mound 1 though possibly to 2 and 3 as well) but it has been disconnected in recent times by the aforementioned sinkholes. As stated earlier, a sink had severely impacted the northern section of the village likely taking with it the northern roomblock, Mound 4, and exposing large concentrations of sherds and lithics. Ellis had suggested that the sinks might be related to irrigation from the main ditch stating, “The sinks…are thought to have been old agricultural terraces from under which certain soil components were leached out by years of irrigation, thus causing the surface portion to drop” (1974:26). The result is a structure on top of what is now a knoll that also has a piled stone shrine on top of it.

During a visit to the site, Professor Scott Ortman noted that stratigraphic layers were visible along the south edge of the sink, though this was difficult for me to see. The northern section apparently dropped around 15 to 20 feet below the main site to form a sliver finger-like hill which includes portions of an adobe structure (mound 4). The missing land between these two sections is now about 50 feet wide. It is also possible that Mound 4 was once connected to Mound 3 but the ravine has swung northward and bisected these two sections instead.
Although I have called these mounds “roomblocks” the actual nature of the mounds is unclear. A previous Geophysical survey of the Winter Village area had been conducted as part of a larger tribal initiative to survey Pojoaque landholdings for planning for future development and residential expansion, and water rights negotiations with surrounding non-indigenous landowners and as part of a tribal initiative to expand community archaeological knowledge within Pojoaque Pueblo lands. This survey encountered a confusing distribution of anomalies due to the confusing nature of the geology and at best could be interpreted as something closer to individualized above ground structures. The nature of the geology at the site precluded a clearer assessment using magnetometry. The geophysics survey team concluded that “the general rocky nature of this area’s subsurface..., in addition to the possible collapse of roomblock walls, makes it more difficult to determine the overall patterning of these potential features” (Archaeological Geophysics & Consulting Archaeologists 2011:23). Ground Penetrating Radar had greater success revealing a collection of small individual structures. One observation here is that it was expected that the site would consist of roomblocks. The lack of organized roomblocks and a collection of individualized structures suggest to me a continuation of Developmental Period village construction practices mirroring the Camino Rincon site distribution. There is potential evidence for agricultural stone grids having been placed on top of the site at a later date than its use as a residence that add to the confusion of the site layout from visual observation.
Figure 9. Winter Village survey using ground penetrating radar overlain on photograph of site (Archaeological Geophysics and Consulting Archaeologists). Aerial photo showing interpretive map and overall spatial layout of the site.

Even despite the rocky soil, GPR was able to map a number of potential features, including roomblocks, a possible kiva, and floor surfaces. Magnetometer survey was inconclusive. Note the distribution of structures.
I saw nothing to the south that suggests structures although that area was severely impacted both by continuous upkeep of the irrigation ditch and by the El Calle Joncito (84J) dirt road. The kiva depressions (1 and 2) I identified are both about 7m in diameter. How far the village extended to the east and south could not be determined due to the dirt road and irrigation ditch cutting through the area. The ditch itself appears to bisect the village diagonally just like the road, suggesting that the ditch post-dates the occupation of the Hillcrest site, although Ellis presumes that the ditch has great antiquity (1974:25-26). The village is bounded on the west by a ravine that comes off the irrigation ditch and heads down slope towards the Rio Pojoaque. This ravine may also potentially be a sink, but there are very few cultural materials in the ravine itself. This is interesting in that Mound 1 of the Winter Village butts right up to the edge of the ravine, yet no sherds or lithics were found in the ravine below. I am not sure how to interpret this considering that another ravine to the immediate west that bounds the colonial era pueblo and its midden has abundant cultural materials. Further north of the Hillcrest site the slope increases downwards to the Rio Pojoaque and along this slope there appear agricultural features that can be separated into two areas divided by a northward ravine (separating Mounds 3 and 4) that connects to the Rio Pojoaque and which are also assumed to have been formed by sinks. These agricultural fields are characterized by stone alignments running parallel to the slope but are clearer on field west of the ravine. Again, its assumed that these two fields bisected by the northward ravine were joined at one time.
Figure 11. Pojoaque area. Note the Winter Village in the lower right corner.
Around the Hillcrest village there appear to be faint indications of grid garden-style stone alignments present. These are most evident north of the main area around Mound 3 and much fainter south of the village. There are also possible alignments present in the plaza area of the Hillcrest village and even on top of and around Mounds 1 and 3. There are also several small clusters or piles of stone throughout the Hillcrest site, including in the main plaza area, which may indicate agricultural stone materials or perhaps shrines. The sheer number of these piles argues against at least some of them being shrines. The ceramics of the Hillcrest site were identified and tallied with a few Kwahe’e Black on white sherds present (0.6%), but a preponderance of Santa Fe Black on white (19.8%), some Wiyo Black on white (4.0%), and only a tiny number of Biscuit A ware (2.8%). In addition, there was 19% Mica Smeared Indented Corrugated wares, 13.3% Plain Gray ware, 9.9% Smeared Indented Corrugated ware (without mica), and 6% Indented Corrugated ware. 15.1% was Micaceous plainware. There were 10 (0.8%) examples of coiled clapboard gray from five different locations and 8 (0.6%) examples of Kwahe Black on white from three different locations (Table 4, pottery from the Hillcrest village). As such it would appear that the bulk of the occupation corresponds in time with the production of Santa Fe and Wiyo Black-on-white and Smeared Indented Corrugated, making this predominantly a Late Coalition and Early Classic period site dating from the 13th and 14th centuries, and with a possible small early occupation dating from the 12th century.
Table 1. Feature Descriptions from the Winter Village (Hillcrest) Site (LA12271) corresponding with Figure 11. Note Feature Type refers to mounds suspected to be structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.9m²</td>
<td>A semi circular mound with alignments on surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42m²</td>
<td>A rounded rectangular mound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.8m²</td>
<td>A circular mound with alignments on surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7m²</td>
<td>Detached knoll associated with mound 1 and with shrine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.8m²</td>
<td>Kiva depression associated with mound 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.8m²</td>
<td>Kiva depression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hillcrest site was referred to as the “Winter Village” by all community members including ritual and community leaders who visited the site while I was working there. No other information was mentioned but this may simply reflect the current extent of traditional knowledge regarding the site. It could be that due to Pueblo secrecy no other details were revealed, but I got the feeling that the lack of information was genuine. There was no answer for why the village was referred to as the Winter Village. It is possible that the name implies this site was associated with the Winter moiety. The Tewa have a social-political-ritual system of moieties made up of the Winter and the Summer groups. Could this site have once been occupied by Winter people? Might existence of a “Winter” village at the east end of Pojoaque Hill imply the existence of a “Summer” village somewhere to the west? Although there was genuine interest in the concept that the Hillcrest ‘Winter Village’ might be a paired village with another Summer component, community members were unaware of such a village. It was for this reason that I also conducted a survey across the two ravines towards the colonial village as this would make ideological sense considering that the Winter moiety is traditionally associated by the Tewa with the directions east and north while the summer moiety is associated with the west and south directions (Ortiz 1965:390). It should be noted here that today Pojoaque Pueblo lacks a Summer moiety. Only the Winter moiety survives today at Pojoaque (Bernstein personal communication 11/28/18).
There are numerous settlements west of the Winter Village including LA 61 but many are later or have been severely impacted by continuous and overlapping occupation histories. However, Ellis reports the presence of Kwahe’e Black-on-white, Santa Fe Black-on-white, Wiyo Black-on-white, and Biscuit A and B mixed along with later historic ceramics in LA 61 (1974:24) and Lakatos reports Santa Fe Black-on-white, Wiyo Black-on-white, and Biscuit A in this same vicinity (2009:16). Excavation work by Anschuetz at the base of the west edge of Pojoaque hill found micaceous gray ware, Smeared Indented micaceous ware, and Santa Fe Black-on-white as the dominant types in an apparent cemetery area (1986:31-32). There is ample evidence for Coalition Period occupation of areas immediately west of the Winter Village, where one might expect a corresponding “Summer” village. The overlapping occupations of sites, historical and current occupation of the area, the bulldozing of some portions of the area, and current agricultural fields west of the Winter Village might have obscured a “Summer” village. These conditions obscure Coalition Period occupation here although ceramic assemblages suggest the presence of people here at this time. It might even be that LA 61 began as the Summer Village. At least it is approximately where we would suggest it should be if it were in fact the case. I suggest that the occupation of this site overlaps in time with that of the Winter Village.

It might also be the case that such a pair existed in the Late Coalition Period but during the Classic Period the Winter Village was abandoned as its residents joined the Summer village to the west. This is what happened when the Summer People of Yungeh Owingehe joined the Winter People at Ohkay Owingehe in 1598 (Ellis 1987:16). A similar process has been suggested by Ortman (2016) at Cuyamungue (LA38), where two Late Coalition Period settlements appear to have merged into one during the Classic Period. It may have been a common occurrence for a newer population to settle next to an established site to create a single, paired-village community, with one of the two villages merging with the other at some later date. Currently, more research beyond the scope of thesis would be necessary to explore this hypothesis.
Old Pojoaque Village (LA 271)

The area I focused on for my survey consists of the Hillcrest site (Winter Village) to the east and the northern end of the current Pueblo. To the west, occupied houses sit on top of and adjacent to the colonial era Pojoaquito site, which I have also referred to as ‘Old Pojoaque’. Ellis writes “Dominguez describes the late 18th century pueblo as forming a plaza in front of the church: The sides of the plaza consist of four tenements, which leave a large space in the middle, with three passageways, one near the aforesaid corner of the church, another at the corner below the tenement to the east of the church, and the third on the corner below that tenement that faces north (Adams and Chavez 1956:63.)” (1974:4-5). Ellis refers to this village as “Pojoaquito” throughout her report, but she labels it as “East Pojoaque” on her 1951 map (Figure 8). “This is the site which came to be known as Pojoaquito to distinguish it from the larger Spanish village now known as Pojoaque...It was the last to be abandoned” (Ellis 1974:5). I refer to this site as Old Pojoaque.

Separating this site from the Winter Village two are two parallel ravines. Old Pojoaque can be broken down into five geographical areas which generally conform to current field boundaries (see Figure 8). First, to the south there is an open field currently used as pastureland. Here was located a
number of historic ditches that ran off the main irrigation ditch and which run down slope feeding an abandoned apple orchard. The second area is the old apple orchard, now abandoned, where the largest portion of the village likely sat. A third area is east of the orchard and is dominated by Midden 1 which is being eroded away as materials fall into the arroyo. Area four is a flat field on the northwestern side of the site. Finally, the fifth area is an area of agricultural terraces constructed through cut and fill activities, presumably using horse traction during historic times.

This Pasture area I was told had once been part of the old village although this area was flat and seemed to have no evidence of features except potentially an area in the northwestern corner, and the only real evidence of past occupation was copious amounts of ceramics. Although those I asked did not know if the site had been bulldozed or plowed, the flat Pasture area and Apple Orchard to the north of it likely sat in areas where roomblocks once existed. Some neighboring areas had indeed been bulldozed for agricultural purposes (Ellis 1974:18). Informal shallow irrigation ditches were evident which ran off of the main ditch north through the site and fed the apple orchard. This area consisted predominately of polished Tewa red ware, Black ware (likely Kapo Black), and Tewa polychrome which makes up 35.98% of the ceramic sample (Table 5, pottery from the south Pasture of Old Pojoaque). Also found here were Tewa Black/Kapo Black (19.27%) and Tewa Micaceous plainware (10.36%), which generally had thick walls and an oxidation firing leading to an orange appearance. I found I had difficulty distinguishing the polished Tewa red type from the red slipped base of Tewa polychrome and as such I lumped them together into a single category. Since they roughly coincide temporally, I didn’t see doing this as a problem. This is why I grouped Tewa red, Tewa polychrome, and Tewa red/polychrome together. In any case the date would seem to fall no earlier than the 17th century and might extend though the 19th century due to the documented history of the Pueblo. This area is most likely associated with the colonial era village (Old Pojoaque). The lack of apparent structures and the presence of a widely distributed collection of sherds might suggest that indeed this area had been bulldozed at some point.
The field was completely flat and there were no obvious hill style formations denoting a midden or structure present, although there were plenty of sherds spread throughout the area. This area has been used for pastureland for some time. There was also a clear break between this area and the Hillcrest site of approximately 180 ft from the Pasture area where very little cultural material and virtually no sherds were present. This pastureland blended northward into the abandoned Apple Orchard.

Table 3. Pasture and Old Pojoaque Ceramics Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pot Type</th>
<th>Pojoaque Dump</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kwahe’e Black-on-white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Black-on-white</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiyo Black-on-white</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe/Wiyo Black-on-white</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande White Ware, not Biscuit</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biscuit A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biscuit B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biscuit ware, not further specified</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapo Black</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>23.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewa Red</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>43.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Plain Gray</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cundiyo Micaceous Slipped</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewa Micaceous</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>16.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Apple Orchard is located north of the Pasture and likely composes the bulk of the old village as well as parts of Midden 1. Ellis referred to Midden 1 as ‘The East Dump’. She proposed that the portion of the colonial village had stood close to this area up until 1912 or 1915 or so and the orchard wasn’t in use until around 1934, around the time that the tribe was reconstituted (1974:16). The orchard has long since been abandoned and is today populated with dead apple trees. All are dead standing trees along with encroaching single seed junipers. Again, this area is also flat but the soil throughout is very soft threatening anyone traveling through with their feet sinking into the ground. Due to how flat the area appears and its history as an orchard I suspect that it too was likely bulldozed.
wonder if this has to do with the site below, and since fenced off it is likely the very few people have
walked on this soil in recent decades. Another possibility is that since this orchard was irrigated perhaps
the same erosion conditions that produced the sinks were in progress here? Or perhaps it is due to
rodents. There were many rodent burrows in the orchard. In any case the orchard was flat on the south
side, seemed to have a buried structure on the west side, sloped slightly downwards to the north, and
on the east side is bounded by a ravine and Midden 1. The ravine had impacted the northeast corner
where the large stone retaining wall was in place. This retaining wall did not extend the entire east
boundary leaving the northeast corner was without wall. This wall had apparently been in place when
Ellis came through in 1951 (1974). Those community members whom I questioned about this wall had
no information about it. Above the retaining wall was the midden slope where Ellis conducted a trench
excavation in 1951. According to her tabulations, this excavation work produced mostly polished red,
polished Black, Tewa polychrome and Ogapoge to make up 11.9% of the total sherd count (Ellis
1974:16). She also found 7.4% of types she labeled Polished Tan and San Juan Red-on Orange. The
remainder were mostly utilitarian wares; most commonly the plain ware. She suggests that this area
was most heavily in use in the mid-18th century and it trailed off towards the start of the 20th century. I
conducted a surface survey of the entire apple orchard including the area she excavated and found a
combination of Tewa polished red, polished Black, and Tewa polychrome (73.8% in total) with the
remainder being utilitarian wares (mostly oxidized micaceous jar types).

The Midden Wash area is immediately east of the Apple Orchard and comprises Midden 1. This
area is actually an arroyo where Midden 1 is eroding away with large amounts of ceramics and lithics
ending up in the arroyo. There were also stone erosion control stone alignments present in the arroyo. I
grouped the ceramic survey from midden 1 and the arroyo with the Apple Orchard since they are part of
the same location and the midden from which the materials are eroding from are coming from there.
Besides the large numbers of sherds coming from this location the other notable feature, which this area also shares with the Apple Orchard is the large stone retaining wall.

A section which I label Middle 2 lies immediately north of the Apple Orchard. It is bounded by the Apple Orchard to the south, the ravine to the east, the Flat Field area to the west, and the terraced agricultural slope to the north. This area is probably a continuation of Midden 1 (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. North Midden area Ceramic Survey (Midden #2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PotTyp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe/Wiyo Black-on-white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewa Polychrome/ Tewa Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapo Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indented Corrugated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cundiyo Micaceous Slipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewa Micaceous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this area I found that 56.53% of the ceramics consisted of Tewa polychrome or Tewa red; 12.47% were Tewa Black/Kapo; and 11.74% were historic Tewa micaceous. I believe this is what Ellis referred to as Polished Tan (1974:16) and oxidized micaceous plainware. The sherds in this area appear to be comparable with those from the Apple Orchard.

I sampled a small field northwest of the Apple Orchard which I refer to as Flat Field which is bounded on the west by the paved Old Pueblito Road, to the south by a house mound, the North Midden area to the east, and agricultural terraced fields to the north.
The majority of ware found was a combination of Tewa polychrome and/or Tewa red which made up 52.18% of all sherds found. Next was Tewa Black/Kapo Black at 21%. Very little utilitarian ware was found in comparison.

Finally, I surveyed the terraced agricultural fields north of Old Pojoaque where I found three long parallel rock alignments consisting of single rows of stone spanning the length of the hill, approximately 45.7 meters across. All the alignments seem to be relatively evenly spaced separating terraces. I called the top slope an alignment boundary and counted alignments down slope toward the river in that order (1, 2, and 3). I calculated the areas between the top slope and terrace 1 to be approximately 1352 sq meters, terraces 1 and 2 to be approximately 1197 sq meters and between terrace 2 and 3 to be 1199 sq meters. Below this was a relatively flat area that went out to the cliff edge overlooking the Rio Pojoaque which was approximately 30 meters away. This entire bottom area was likely a usable field although there was no apparent indication of such found. The regularity of the alignments was quite interesting to me as representation for a style of agriculture for the Tewa area.

At the bottom of these terraces out by the cliff edge overlooking the river was a small stretch of land along the edge of the cliff where I found 3 Santa Fe Black on white, 1 grayware with basket impressions, 1 gray indented corrugated, and 1 gray coiled clapboard banded corrugated ware. This little section shows occupation dating approximately 1175 to 1350 CE. I suspect that the Rio Pojoaque has eaten away at the sides of the cliff taking with it a Late Developmental/Early Coalition site, especially

---

### Table 5. Flat Field Ceramic Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PotTyp</th>
<th>Flat Field</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tewa Polychrome/Tewa Red</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>64.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapo Black</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>26.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indented Corrugated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewa Micaceous</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>443</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
since all of these sherds were found within 1-3 meter from the cliff edge. The cliff is sheer here and is quite high overlooking the river, which I estimate to be 20-40m below.

Comparative Analysis

The Camino Rincon Area

During the summer of 2015 a field crew from the University of Colorado Boulder that included me conducted a two-day surface survey of a site called Camino Rincon located approximately between 1 ¼ and 1 ½ miles from Pojoaque Pueblo (Figure 12). This might be the site Ellis referred to as Turquoise Pendant Ruin, which she said was located approximately 1 mile east of the Pueblo (Ellis 1974:22). The Camino Rincon site consists of several small house mounds spread out along two hills each separated from the other by a ravine. Our team sampled 11 features and tabulated 1271 sherds in dog-leash samples spread across these features (Table 6, tabulation of pottery types by feature). The topography of the area was also documented using unmanned aerial vehicle photogrammetry by Mark Willis of Archaeogeophysical Associates, Inc.

Our survey revealed an interesting pattern where the earliest ceramics present were found in the western most hill. This is also the location closest to the one Ellis had referred to as Turquoise Pendant Ruin, where she reported Red Mesa, Kwahe’e, and Santa Fe Black-on-white with this last type being the most prevalent (Ellis 1974:22). I suspect that the two sites are one in the same. On the western hill was found not only the oldest sherd types at Camino Rincon (Lino, Red Mesa, and Kwahe’e Black-on-white) but also Santa Fe Black-on-white and Indented Corrugated ware, with a few examples of Wiyo Black-on-white and smeared indented corrugated suggesting occupation from just prior to the 900s to the late 13th century. In contrast, the eastern hill had lower diversity of ceramics types represented entirely by Santa Fe Black-on-white and Indented Corrugated wares suggesting occupation was of a shorter duration during the 13th century. As a result, it would appear that the western area was
occupied first but that later peoples built east of the initial settlement even as the occupation of the western hill continued.

*Figure 12. Camino Rincon site (no LA number). Site is a collection of mound features (likely residential groups) dispersed throughout the landscape.*

The results of the Camino Rincon survey show that the area was settled gradually, from west to east from the Developmental Period into the Coalition, with the number of inhabited sites growing over time. It is possible that this could be due to Northern San Juan migrants joining locals. The site appears to have been settled first in the west with later occupations consecutively established east of here. This sequence may reflect a first-comer vs. late-comer model, or it may reflect long-term growth of a local population. In either case, the pattern is of an initially small group at the west end of the site gradually
filling the landscape moving upstream and to the east. It should be noted that the settlement was not consecutively occupied in the sense of it being the same group simply moving their home further east over time as the western area (mounds 7 and 10) continued to be inhabited as additional houses were established to the east. In any case, there is a process of growth and aggregation that we are starting to see take place here, even if the individual mounds represent separate kin groups.

Table 6. Pottery assemblages from the Camino Rincon site. F-columns identity feature numbers associated with Figure 12. Totals represent assemblage for the entire site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>F.1</th>
<th>F.2-4</th>
<th>F.5</th>
<th>F.6-8</th>
<th>F.10-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Brown</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lino B/W</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Mesa B/W</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwahee B/W</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpainted white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe BW</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe/Wiyo B/W</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White mountain red ware</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain gray</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.94%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>55.71%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos Incised</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck banded</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indented Corrugated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.94%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smeared indented corrugated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cuyamungue (LA 38)

Cuyamungue Pueblo is located near the residential area also known locally as Cuyamungue and is the site of an ancestral Tewa community inhabited from the 1200s through the Pueblo Revolt, and which has connections to living communities including Pojoaque and Tesuque Pueblos. Recent work by Ortman has led to a reconstruction of the village during the Late Coalition Period, ca. 1300 CE (Figure 14). During this period, the community consisted of two settlements located across from each other on
terraces separated by a drainage. The northern settlement had a formal village layout, with four concise roomblocks formed around a single formal plaza, and one kiva located within the plaza and one outside. The southern settlement was a more extensive village that included an L-shaped roomblock and additional dispersed small roomblocks and kivas. Structures are scattered along the east edge of the terrace closest to the floodplain, with perhaps one informal plaza and perhaps five kivas strung along the site. Further, some of the small mounds are covered by more recent middens, suggesting a long-continued presence of occupational history of the southern settlement. The northern village lacks evidence for such long occupation. It would appear that the two villages are distinct not only in their locations and arrangements, but that this implies the presence of distinct peoples, with the southern village exhibiting much greater continuity with more dispersed style of Developmental Period settlement patterns in the area as exemplified by the Camino Rincon. One might speculate that the southern village was occupied first by local people, and the northern component was built later by a newly-arrived immigrant group.

The arrangement of the southern village at Cuyamungue is also similar to that of the Winter Village at Pojoaque (LA12271). Again, we see a striking village arrangement style composed of small structures loosely organized with no apparent formal plaza or compact formal roomblocks and located on hilltops overlooking waterways or drainages. This style seems to suggest that there was a local, regionally distinctive understanding of how a village should be arranged that stretched from the Developmental Period into the Coalition Period. The identification of LA 12271 as the “Winter” Village is suggestive that the Tewa Winter moiety might have had its origins with local, Developmental Period Northern Rio Grande populations. The arrival of a distinctly different village arrangement, such as that exemplified by the northern village at Cuyamungue, suggests the arrival of a distinct people who attached themselves alongside locally derived communities.
Figure 13. Cuyamungue (LA38) during the Coalition Period. Note the site layout differences between the northern and southern components.
Tsama (LA 908)

Tsama is another ancestral Tewa settlement that was inhabited during the Coalition and Classic Periods in the Chama river valley. It was built upon a hill overlooking the Rio Chama. The site consists of an eastern and western component, both of which are well organized with distinctive well-planned village layouts consisting of roomblocks surrounding plazas (Figure 15). In general, the West Plaza dates to the Coalition Period and the East Plaza the Classic Period (Ortman 2012), but excavations in a portion of the East Plaza in 1970 (“Romero’s rooms”, excavated under direction of Florence Hawley Ellis) excavation of the eastern component revealed the existence of a small Coalition period settlement beneath the Classic Period rooms. The presence of such an earlier site beneath the Classic village suggests there were two contemporaneous villages at this site during the Coalition period that were separated by a just under 400 ft. This may be an additional example of immigrant and local groups living side by side. It might be that “Summer” migrants set up the western village across from a “Winter” village created by locals, with the Summer people eventually joining the Winter people in the East Plaza.
The Winter Village is preserved on the eastern Pojoaque hilltop even though it has been impacted by geologic processes as discussed previously. Additional evidence of long term occupation of the western hilltop is abundant but concealed by historical and current continuous occupation. The existence of a “Winter” Village begs the question of where is the “Summer” Village, if there ever was one? It would logically be located beneath more recent structures to the west, which have obliterated the structural evidence, although a plethora of ceramic evidence for an occupation contemporaneous with the Winter Village remains.

The point here is that in several cases, it appears an organizational layout of villages with roots in the Developmental Period crosses into the Coalition period, where there is an overlap between this style and the sudden appearance of far more formalized village layouts which continue into the Classic Period and are much more closely associated with the Tewa. Such a transition might have been
previously understood as evolutionary process of village construction, or perhaps a re-conceptualization of what a proper village should look like, but it might also reflect the appearance of peoples from outside the Northern Rio Grande who brought with them a vastly different conceptualization of proper village planning. In the case of Cuyamungue (LA38) and perhaps Tsama (LA 908) we might actually be seeing new arrivals setting up a new village next to a village of locals, or even the establishment of a new village attracting a local community to them. Over time such side by side settlements could have merged to form a single community. While it is impossible to say if such processes were also at play at the Winter village, the very fact that this village is associated with Winter, occupies the east end of Pojoaque Hill, and consists of a “Developmental” type of organization, begs the question of whether there was a Summer moiety counterpart village. The presence of contemporaneous ceramics in heavily impacted areas west of the Winter Village suggests a summer village might well have existed in this area.

Summary on the Pojoaque Area

To summarize the work reported here, I first want to emphasize that the Pojoaque area has been occupied continuously since the Developmental Period more than 1000 years ago. The site appears to have been abandoned twice although it was likely never completely abandoned during its entire history. Population estimates produced by Ortman suggest that the Santa Fe area (which includes the Pojoaque area) was first settled around 900 CE and was home to about 2000 people by 1200 CE, followed by a slight decline in population between 1250 and 1280. This was followed by a large population boom leading to around 6300 people in the area by the mid-1300s. Population then gradually declined, eventually stabilizing at around 1300 people around in the mid-1500s. Finally, after a low ebb during the Pueblo Revolt, the population climbed again to around 2500 by the mid-1700s (Ortman 2014:16). An important detail of this history is that the Pojoaque area experienced a drop in
population starting around 1315-1350, reaching a low point around 1515 to 1550 before starting to pick up again. This is nearly a mirror image of what happened in the neighboring Rio Chama region which experienced a dramatic uptick in population around 1350-1400 which peaked around 1400 to 1550, and then followed a precipitous drop off between 1550 and 1600 (Duwe 2011:278, Ortman 2016:16). The take home point is that even though the Pojoaque area always had a smaller population than the Chama, its population trends were the mirror image of those seen in the Rio Chama. These trends suggest that many Pojoaque area people left that area and moved into the Rio Chama to join other Tewa peoples coalescing in that area. These populations then began to return to the Northern Rio Grande Valley after 1500 (Duwe 2011:278,307) coinciding with a return of population numbers to the Pojoaque area although those populations never recovered to what they were before the Rio Chama occupation and were further impacted by the 1680 Pueblo Revolt.

The results from my survey add support to this view. While some Biscuit ware ceramics occur, most of these were Biscuit A, and very few Biscuit B and no Biscuit C sherds were found. Biscuit ware types are relatively infrequent in the Pojoaque area. From my total work, Kwahe’e Black-on-white makes up .17% of the assemblage, Santa Fe Black-on-white 6.45%, Wiyo Black-on-white 1.92%, Biscuit wares (A, B, and C) 1.37%, Tewa Polychrome/Tewa polished red 36.98%, and polished Black 10.54%. According to the percentages of painted ware, there was only limited use of the area during the period of production of Kwahe’e Black-on-white, which coincides with 1000-1200 CE. There was a large uptick in population during the period of Santa Fe Black-on-white, about 1150-1400 CE. Then, there was a drop in population during the period of Wiyo Black-on-white, 1250-1425 CE, and a still larger drop during the Biscuit ware period, 1375-1550 CE. This was followed by a huge jump in the historic period, when Tewa polychrome, polished red, and polished Black were made, around 1600-1900 CE. The relatively low frequencies of Wiyo Black-on-white and Biscuit wares seem to coincide with the suggested population
drop for the Santa Fe area and coincident jump in population in the Rio Chama. It appears then that Pojoaque area populations were subject to broader regional population trends.

The key points I want to raise here are, first, that occupation was fluid, with settlement sizes changing, growing and dropping, and that these trends were part of a larger Northern Rio Grande pattern that tied the Pojoaque area to a larger region. The Pojoaque area was not isolated but an active participant in broader population trends and almost certainly all the social-political-ritual activities that would have been taking place at this time. This was a time of great changes for Tewa peoples with the formation of new identities, new ways of doing and being, active and intentional negotiating what it would mean to be Tewa. This reshuffling of the Tewa world would have started with the Great Pueblo Migration. People of the Pojoaque area were participating in this system of change. The Pojoaque area has been inhabited for over 1000 years, and the western area of the Pojoaque hill around where the current village lays has been densely occupied since the 1200s. Multiple settlements occupied this area, many at the same time and in close proximity. I would suggest that close proximity of many of these settlements crated a need for negotiation between communities, or perhaps even the formation of multiple village communities. The current village of Pojoaque Pueblo is actually just the current manifestation of these processes. That Pojoaque Pueblo has been abandoned in prior times is also just part of this changing process. We shouldn’t view the Pojoaque area, or likely any of the other Pueblo areas as static so much as they are always in the process of “becoming”.

The second point to take away from this investigation is that populations in the Pojoaque area during the Developmental Period, while spread out in places like the Camino Rincon site, the knolls on top of Pojoaque hill, and the location on the cliff edge overlooking the Rio Pojoaque, were all small dispersed sites. This population then grew substantially in the 1200s with larger settlements such as the Winter Village and the expansion of the Camino Rincon community, not to mention an expansion at the western end of the Pojoaque hill (such as LA 61 beyond the area of my survey). It is also important that
the area around Nambe Pueblo, 3 miles east of Pojoaque Pueblo, was also experiencing similar population expansion and settlement change at this time. No fewer than 10 villages associated with Nambe were occupied at various times between the 1200s and today (Ellis 1964). In Ellis’s report on Nambe she shows that while there is a fairly robust presence of Biscuit A in the Nambe sites she sampled, there are hardly any Biscuit B sherds, and things don’t pick up again until the introduction of Tewa polychrome (Ellis 1964:37). This suggests the population trends noted for the Pojoaque area also took place in the Nambe area.

Third and final point is that I found nothing in the way of Mesa Verde ceramic types in the sherds I examined. Ellis does suggest during her survey of the Pojoaque knoll area (1974:20) that she found what she refers to as Chaco II and Mesa Verde Black on white. She also states she found 1 sherd of Mesa Verde Black on white at the Hillcrest site. I did not see any such sherds, although I did not re-sample the Knoll hilltops. According to my migration model hypothesis I would not expect to find intrusion diagnostic cultural materials. Yet population growth during this post migration period would suggest large numbers of people coming in from somewhere.

6 Conclusion: Bringing it all together

In this chapter I summarize and integrate the findings of the various chapters in this thesis in building a model of 13th century social dynamics in the Pojoaque area. In chapter 1 I looked at the historical conception of migration as it has been understood in archaeology and reviewed some of the literature related to that conception. In Chapter 2 I reviewed the archaeological and ethnographic literature concerning the occupation of the Pojoaque Valley and its occupational history from Tekhe Owinge to the current village of Pojoaque Pueblo. Here we examined the events that transpired in a destination region, the negotiations between migrants and indigenous communities, that eventually
produced the Tewa of the eastern Northern Rio Grande Valley. Here we emphasized that although the current location of the mythical village of Tekhe Owinge is not definitely known, it is presumed by oral tradition to have been in the Pojoaque area and it served as a pivotal place in early Tewa post migration histories. We see that this oral history corresponds to archaeological evidence that the Pojoaque area was one of the first regions occupied by Tewa ancestors in the Northern Rio Grande.

In chapter 3 I looked at the meaning of landscape as memory, and landscape as providing authority, to examine how these concepts might have unfolded during the Great Pueblo Migration from the Northern San Juan to the Northern Rio Grande. I attempted to synthesize Indigenous, archaeological, and my own personal perspectives to understand the revolutionary societal and political changes that turned Northern San Juan migrants into Rio Grande Tewa. This led to a new model regarding why there are such strong material culture discontinuities between the source and destination communities resulting from these population movements. In Chapter 4 I examined Tewa place-names of the Pojoaque region and considered how this might inform on the search for Tekhe Owinge, which I later revisit in Chapter 5 in suggesting it corresponds to the site Pojoaque Pueblo elders refer to as the Winter Village. I also examined Tewa naming conventions that correspond to how Tekhe Owinge might have been named and why it might be located where it is presumed to be.

Chapter 5 was an examination of the archaeological record of areas adjacent to the current village of Pojoaque Pueblo. This included the Coalition Period Winter Village, associated gridded agricultural fields, and additional terraced agricultural fields. Occupations were determined through analysis of surface ceramics. I found that the Winter Village was fairly large and that geologic activities likely impacted the village in recent times, such that the size and layout have been obscured. I also pointed out that even if the Winter Village and Tekhe Owinge are not one in the same, the Winter Village gives us a glimpse of an early Tewa village at the cusp of the genesis of Rio Grande Tewa culture, at a place that appears to have been one of the earliest, in not the earliest, areas settled by Tewa.
ancestors in the region. I suggest that the Winter Village by its very name implies the existence of a “Summer Village” and that indeed there were Coalition Period ceramics in areas west of the Winter Village that were likely inhabited at the same time. The amounts reported by Anschuetz, Lakatos, and Ellis suggest that even if the site can’t be seen, there must have been a Coalition presence in this western area. As we have also seen, the western area has been highly impacted by several later, substantial, precontact and post contact Pueblo settlements, as well as Hispanic settlement over much of the area, that have collectively contributed to obscuring these Coalition Period sites. I concluded this chapter by noting that the Pojoaque region was connected to broader events in the Tewa world. For example, I found that as the occupation of the Rio Chama Basin exploded there was a large-scale decrease in the occupation of the Pojoaque area. I also compared the Winter Village with Cuyamungue LA (LA 38), Camino Rincon, and Tsama (LA 908) to suggest that 13th century locals and immigrants constructed settlements in two differing patterns, with clustered small structures likely reflecting the local village style and compact well organized/planned village layouts likely reflecting the migrant style. Another point made was that the Pojoaque region was never completely vacated and that local population fluctuations were tied in with larger regional demographics, particularly with regards to changes taking place in the Rio Chama. From here we see that Pojoaque Pueblo proper underwent a number of cycles of occupation and abandonment concluding with the current village of Pojoaque.

In this final chapter I attempt to bring all of this together in a coherent interpretation. The perspective of this paper is that the history of the Pojoaque area is one of migration, consolidation, culture change, negotiation between migrant and non-migrant, and the creation of new societies and settlements. It is my position that the cultural changes and apparent discontinuities that characterize Mesa Verde vs. ancestral Tewa sites are not quite as mystifying as they are often portrayed. Instead, at the risk of sounding teleological, from a native perspective these were natural and predictable outcomes. I have emphasized an indigenous perspective on Pueblo migration coupled with the
archaeological record and emphasized a practical “on the ground” perspective of what the movement of Pueblo people out of the Four Corners might have looked like. My perspective may not be correct in its entirety, but I hope it will at least spark a different way of looking at migration, one that is inclusive of native ontological perspectives. For instance, there are a number of Tewa migration stories that tell of old or infirm people being left behind in a settlement as the rest of the population moved on. I would contend that this perspective reflects the reality of the process of migration. Not everyone could make the trip, even if they wished to. The process of migrating long distances in societies without pack animals meant people could only bring what they could carry on their backs. What this means from a practical standpoint is that there must have been people who remained in the great Pueblo villages of the Mesa Verde country after the able-bodied members had left. What happened to those people when a few frail members of the community remained (either by choice or not) in otherwise abandoned villages? What was their fate? This is not to say that Pueblo culture was cruel. This would just have been an unfortunate reality of migrating outside their homeland. Does this explain some of the last vestiges of violence that appears to have been visited on some of the last members of some of the great villages in the Northern San Juan (Kuckelman et. al. 2002)? Perhaps marauders upon entering nearly abandoned villages found only the invalid remaining, and they dealt with these last survivors. Or perhaps they died of starvation, unable to fend for themselves or collect food. These are aspects of the Great Pueblo Migration that have generally not been considered by researchers. It is a reality that has been little touched on by archaeologists, yet this reality almost certainly unfolded in the final days of the evacuation from the region. I don’t use terms like ‘evacuation’ and ‘refugee’ lightly. The total abandonment of a region, regardless of the cause, conjures images akin to a refugee scenario more so than the term ‘migration’, which fails to capture the totality and trauma of the abandonment of the homeland. The cause of this abandonment can be debated, but in some ways it is inconsequential to this paper. This thesis is not necessarily about why people left, but rather how those processes of
leaving took place, how people came together in their new homeland, and how the mass of migrants interacted with a smaller population of locals in the destination lands. One possibility is that the new arrivals were subject to hostility from the locals, but the lack of evidence for violence suggests this did not happen. Instead, the process appears to have been one of interaction, and by extension negotiation. This included negotiations for lands, access to resources, and even culture. This last part has been especially perplexing for archaeologists. In this thesis I have suggested that a people already living in the destination area already had claim to levels of authority over that land and its resources by the mere fact that they had settled in the area first. Migrants accustomed to this style of legitimation would have been conscious of this. I have also suggested reasons why those iconic Mesa Verde traits might not transfer over to the Northern Rio Grande region.

I suggest that when the first migrants arrived and negotiated with the locals that there would have been incentive for the small numbers of immigrants to conform to local standards of culture. The large numbers of immigrants who arrived later would have thus been faced with adaptation to a new way of being, one that had both precedence and authority over the region, as well as providing a ready-made culture package with deep roots in the area which immigrants could adopt. This, coupled with the desire to not repeat the social-political systems of their homeland (as suggested by Ortman 2012) and the disruption of their land-based authority systems, would have further removed any expressions of the homeland. In addition, large numbers of disparate migrants arriving during the Coalition Period would have also had an effect in neutralizing any preferences for reestablishing the old land-based authority systems amongst themselves. I believe that this process of negotiation played out in the Pojoaque area.

I have discussed evidence that Late Developmental peoples who lived in small and dispersed settlement interacted with larger populations who created new forms of settlement during the Coalition Period. We see a move towards concentrated occupation of fewer, larger, and more organized pueblo
villages during the same time as the proposed arrival of the immigrants. In some ways this move from many small dispersed settlements to a few large ones might at least suggest negotiations between locals and migrants. Perhaps the settling of low-lying riparian areas might have tied in with the negotiation between these two groups. I might even venture a guess that the impetus for this move during the Coalition Period was a result of negotiation, for as certain as I am of the impact of local ways upon the migrants, we should not presume that all of the exchange was one-sided. Surely there must have been some impact upon the locals and perhaps the move to aggregate in villages was part of that process. If we were to think that the locals spoke a different but related language, or a different dialect of the same language, what we see is that the Tewa language is the only language spoken in this region today. Perhaps this was the price the locals paid, that of adopting the language or dialect of the migrants. Although much of this model remains speculative, it is at least informed speculation, and we must consider the impact of active cultural negotiations that by necessity would have taken place.

So, a lack of incentive to reestablish Northern San Juan societies, a natural deferment to the legitimacy of locals, active cultural negotiation, and the nature of an all-encompassing migration such that amongst the large numbers of migrants none could themselves claim precedence in the new lands, all conspired to eliminate the iconic Mesa Verde material culture. The issue that followed was how to establish new communities entirely from groups of refugees, and how to incorporate a sense of deference and friendly interaction with local communities.

This is where the story of the Pojoaque region takes shape. The Developmental communities with established ties to this region had to contend with large numbers of immigrants. The demographics would suggest that what started as a trickle of new migrants turned into a flood; one that perhaps might have felt threatening to overwhelm the locals. It was in their interest to engage in positive ways with the new arrivals. I suggest that this positive engagement would have been in contrast with the apparent lack of positive engagement between migrants and the Gallina people who lay in the path of many migrants.
Gallina peoples lay directly between the Northern San Juan and the Northern Rio Grande, and they undoubtedly interacted with migrants passing by or through their lands (Borck 2012:62). Obvious hostilities resulting in the relocating of Gallina residents to ever more defensible and inaccessible sites, evidence for extreme violence, and the disappearance of Gallina society (Reed 2015) in their entirety during the period of evacuation of the Northern San Juan all suggest relations gone awry.

Perhaps the Gallina case attests to how hostilities would not have been in the interest of the demographically inferior locals in the destination area. Instead, marrying local ways of doing things to migrants who were willing to adapt could have been the ticket to survival of the locals. It would have been in their interest to act with as much positive agency as possible with the new settlers. And due to their larger population, the migrants would not have felt threatened by the smaller local populations such that I believe they would have been open to adopting or experimenting with new styles. At the same time the new population was not without its own cultural baggage. This baggage was not necessarily the same as that of the founding families for reasons already explained. Rather, it was the baggage of the ordinary Northern San Juan migrant. It was bottom heavy cultural baggage missing the trappings and representations of Mesa Verde elites. It was this baggage, or rather culturally specific landscape as memory, that was reapplied to the new homeland. This process in part legitimized the claim to the land by the new arrivals, but simultaneously preserved pre-migration events and mythologies.

Ortman (2012) has found evidence of early shrine making practices in the late Mesa Verde region that correspond to certain aspects of Coalition and Classic Period Tewa shrine systems. There is suggestive evidence for the existence of moieties in the Mesa Verde region, but my interpretation is that they were in a formative state which was not yet standardized and would have received less emphasis and perhaps even competition from earlier political structures such as the settlement founding first-family system. Oral tradition claims that some Tewa sodality groups (if not all) had their origins in the
premigration homelands. I would suggest that Tewa cosmologies of the post-migration era were often completed, or matured forms of cosmologies conceived of in the old homeland. That is not to say that they existed in the same format or were unchanged. Rather, their pre-established or orthodox origins were molded and experimented with in the old homeland and that what exists today are these seeds having matured and come to full fruition. In essence, to use Tewa vernacular, they were in a process of “becoming.” They were “soft” ideas in the old homeland that have since become “hard” or solidified in the current one.

“Tewa” as a culture was not in its completed form at the conclusion of the migration. This seems an obvious statement, but I feel it needs to be emphasized. It was only after early-Tewa speaking peoples arrived, discarded many of their old homeland’s ways of being, and adopted many of the ways of local Northern Rio Grande peoples, that the Tewa truly came into being in a form that is recognizable today. This is not to say that their connection to their Northern San Juan past was severed entirely by this new way of being. Rather, the Northern San Juan ancestral world merely provides a momentary glimpse of a specific faction of early Tewa society in an early cultural stage that was still in the process of “becoming.” To an extent, these ancestors had yet to become “whole”. I say this because although it might seem an obvious statement, some archaeologists may not readily grasp its importance. They want to find obvious Tewa cultural remains in both the origin and destination lands, or they want to find obvious Mesa Verde/Northern San Juan cultural traits in both the origin and destination lands. This is an absolutism that fails to recognize the power of change that is unleashed by the authority of landscape. This is a failure to understand that Tewa culture was not and is not static or fixed and set. No society is static. Always cultures and their people are in a continuous process of “becoming” and remain so. Cultural intra-regional change is usually *evolutionary* in form, but inter-regional change where complete migration of the entire population takes place should be viewed as *revolutionary* due to the magnitude of changes that can take place in a very short period of time. It was the marriage of Tewa speaking
ancestors from the Northern San Juan with Tewa ancestors from the Northern Rio Grande and their cultural ways of being that produced the culture we know of today as Tewa.

Further, Tewa speakers from the Northern San Juan would have likely had an affinity of sorts with the Rio Grande locals. There was certainly a level of trade between the two regions (Arakawa et al. 2011). It is also likely that they spoke related languages or perhaps dialects. The most closely-related language to Tewa is the Tiwa language, and it appears likely that Tiwa speakers were already in the Southern Sangre de Cristo Mountains and perhaps the Sandia Mountains when Tewa speakers from the Northern San Juan began to arrive. The two languages descended from a single common language meaning that at some point in the past they were part of the same speech community. To restate this point, Tewa and Tiwa at some point in the past were dialects of the same language rather than independent languages. Whether Tiwa speakers were locals in the Northern Rio Grande or if they themselves were migrants from a previous migration from a different time, their geographical distribution today suggests they were present in the Northern Rio Grande prior to the arrival of Tewa speakers (Cooper 2018). Were they Developmental Period locals? Or were the Pojoaque area locals Tewa speakers from previous small scale moves into the region? Or did they perhaps belong to another unnamed group? There is some suggestion that the Northern San Juan was already experiencing small scale out-migration throughout the 13th century, decades before the final abandonment. It seems very likely to me that the earliest Tewa migrants (before the flood of refugees) would have found it easier to migrate to regions that they were already familiar with, perhaps through trade. They would have been likely to travel down previously established trade corridors or trails that connected these two regions, and they would have been likely to try to incorporate themselves into local communities with people they shared traits with: perhaps language being one of them. We know that these are not necessary points considering how linguistically unrelated Pueblo groups have at times joined together in the past.
Examples include Laguna migrants in Isleta Pueblo (Parsons 1928) and Tewa migrants amongst the Hopi (Dozier 1956). But neither are they irrelevant.

Local Pojoaque peoples, whatever their language, would have been faced with the question of ‘how to incorporate ever increasing numbers of people?’ I suggest that they played an active role in the shaping of new epistemologies of the migrants. It would have been in their best interest to do so. And by doing so they themselves were incorporated into the body of the large migrant population. We already have seen that Tewa settlement patterns and cosmologies have at times favored a duality. And we have already seen that some of these conceptions of Tewa duality were to some extent shared with Northern San Juan communities. The flood of migrants into areas with local settlements, settling next to but separate from local communities, would have played to this conceptualization of duality. At a larger scale, locals living in the Pojoaque region on the east side of the Rio Grande and utilizing the east mountains (Sangre de Cristo), and communities of migrants from the Northern San Juan settling west of them and occupying the western mountains (Jemez), would have certainly fit into this conception of a dualistic world. The coming together of two peoples at either scale might be echoed in the conclusion of the Tewa migration story; the rejoining of the Summer and Winter people.

The question of where a rejoining of migrant and local took place is almost certain to include the Pojoaque region as it was one of the most heavily-occupied locations in the Northern Rio Grande prior to 1200 C.E. and it is here that we find the story of Tekhe Owingeh. The story of Tekhe Owingeh is one of migrants arriving into a new land and establishing themselves. This story is explicit in that Tekhe Owingeh was established at the end of a long migration process. These were migrants made up of two different but related groups. We do not know from the story if one group preceded the other into the region. The story does not specify whether any significant temporal distance separated these two groups. As such, we don’t know if one moiety represents earlier arrivals which might be called locals and the later arrivals as migrants or if it represents simultaneous arrivals. The story is silent on whether or
not anyone else was already in the area at the time. All that appears apparent is that Tekhe Owingeħ represents the vanguard of a migration narrative that would result in the creation of Tewa society as we know it. Some might warn against taking oral history too literally. They have a point. Oral history is not recorded on paper. It is passed down from person to person, from generation to generation. All oral history is subject to change, but I believe Pueblo oral histories are slower to change than most given the conservative nature of the tribes and stubborn adherence to conservative traditional Pueblo beliefs in who should curate knowledge and the methods of transferring knowledge from one generation to the next (Silko 1948). These stories present a long temporal memory of the past. We should also recognize that the migration of an entire people from an old homeland into a new alien one would have been a major defining moment for any people. With this we can see why migration stories are so ubiquitous among the Tewa, as well as many if not all the other Pueblo language/cultural groups.

It should be remembered that oral migration stories are told after the fact, interweaving history with culturally dependent interpretations. And there is certainly a teleological aspect to migration stories. Yet, I believe here that we have a general consensus that can be supported by archaeology. Absolutism is the enemy of understanding anything about the human past. People are more complex than this. Oral history is rather a simplified way of understanding past events to levels that can be remembered, understood, and continued. To dismiss it is to dismiss a people’s ability to recall their own past, and their claim upon their own past. This is a colonizer perspective. What we know between the archaeology of the Pojoaque area and Tewa oral history seem to broadly correlate with each other. A place like Tekhe Owingeħ very well could have existed in the Pojoaque area. Whether or not it was the Winter Village of Pojoaque Pueblo isn’t certain, but certainly seems plausible. This point might be irrelevant. This is a story is really about migrants arriving into a new land and building a new life in what was an alien world to them. Here they had to create meaning and by doing so they had to map onto this
landscape concepts of memory. When new arrivals continued to come into their space, they incorporated them. From this developed the Tewa of today.

Much of this paper has looked at a hypothesized way in which migration might have taken place. As such much of it has the potential to be dismissed as mere speculation. To some extent that claim might hold true, but I consider those aspects to be “informed” speculation. By this I mean I am not approaching this out of context. Rather, my own cultural understanding and familiarity with the archaeology of the region, as well as with archaeological methods, allow me to propose these speculations from a perspective that is informed in several important dimensions. The point of this thesis was to suggest a possible model by which one might explain some of the “mysteries” of the Great Pueblo Migration. To further test this model out one would need to look for clearer evidence for the existence of founding families in the Northern San Juan area typified by evidence of social inequalities during the final days of Mesa Verde society. It would be helpful to find an analogous situation from more recent times if one exists as well as worthwhile to continue exploring the Pojoaque area to better define its occupational history. One might also want to explore similarities and differences between more early ‘post-Great Pueblo Migration’ sites in the Pajarito Plateau, Rio Chama, and Galisteo Basins for comparison with early sites in the Pojoaque area. It would also be worthwhile to compare and contrast Tekhe Owinge with that of Posi Owinge to understand why these two sites occupy similar niches in the origin story, even though they are separated by space and time. Further consideration must also be given to the question, “If the Tewa represent 13th century migrants, then who were the Developmental peoples who were there before?” Or, “were those Developmental people Tewa people who had simply arrived at a much earlier date and were rejoined by their later relatives?” Many questions remain, and this project has only begun to formulate, much less answer them.
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