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Abstract
This dissertation presents the results of investigations into the archaeological, textual, and other evidence of the Pueblo Revolt period (A.D. 1680-1696), with a close focus on the events of the Spanish reconquest (1692-1696) at Tunyo, Powhogeh Owingeh (San Ildefonso Pueblo), New Mexico. Guided by the tenets of traditional Pueblo values and Indigenous archaeology, this research examines the character and expressions of the Tewa Pueblos’ assertion of sovereignty in the face of Spanish settler colonial authority. The overarching goal of this research is to present an indigenized history of events that occurred at Tunyo and in the surrounding Tewa landscape during the height of the Spanish reconquest in 1694. Adopting a place-based approach that emphasizes the ontological interdependence of time, space, and history, this research merges Pueblo oral histories, Spanish documentary accounts, ethnohistorical studies, and archaeological data. This research also addresses the false dichotomy between “history” and “prehistory,” resisting the implicit assumption that European records provide the most authoritative sources of information on Indigenous encounters with settler colonialism. The core of this research involves the cartographic mapping and analyses of digital terrain models of Tunyo created by data collected in aerial photography surveys using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), or drones. The evidence indicates that the Tewa people successfully created and defended alternative village sites during Vargas’s siege in 1694. The Tewa adapted to Tunyo’s unique geology by using innovative construction techniques that resulted in distinct village architectural patterns. Oral traditions collected at San Ildefonso and elsewhere reveal that the breadth of the Tewa resistance extended far beyond Tunyo, to places and villages previously occupied by Tewa ancestors. This study concludes that the Tewa strategies of resistance were grounded in spiritual understandings of landscape and contingent on mobility to ancestral places, not only for strategic purposes, but for spiritual reasons. Pueblo survival strategies, and the agency of people and place across time and space, are best understood through holistic analyses that incorporate Pueblo ontologies. Tewa peoples’ engagements with their landscape, and with Tunyo in particular, have long been shaped by reciprocal relationships that embody and transcend the spans of history and time.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Pueblo Revolt of 1680, situated in the North American Southwest, at the northernmost part of the Spanish colonial frontier, is an Indigenous story of freedom and resistance to European settler colonialism.¹ This revolt marks the apex of eighty-two years of Indigenous resistance that culminated in a strategically brilliant uprising by the Pueblo² people against Spanish colonial soldiers. At villages all across the Pueblo World, with the aid of their Athabascan allies, Pueblo Indian people aligned in a coordinated attack to bring their world back into balance by ridding themselves of an oppressive Spanish settler colonial authority.

At the Tiwa Pueblos in the Taos Mountains, the Tewa Pueblos in the Northern Rio Grande region, the Keres Pueblos in the Galisteo Basin and Middle Rio Grande region, the Hopi mesas in Arizona, and everywhere in between, Pueblo warriors destroyed their Franciscan missions and killed their priests. Spanish haciendas surrounding the Pueblos were not spared. The Spanish capital of Santa Fe was besieged by the Tewa for nine days as Governor Antonio de Otermín tried to regain control. Holding the advantageous position, the Pueblos allowed Otermín to retreat from Santa Fe with safe passage to El Paso del Norte (now Ciudad Juárez, Mexico). Spanish documents record that a total of

---

¹ Pueblo Indian scholar Joe Sando (speaking from a Pueblo-centric perspective) characterizes the revolt as the “first American Revolution” (1998:3), but historically, it was not the first “American Revolution” on the continent. The Pueblo Revolt post-dates a far more devastating Native uprising, King Philip’s War of 1675-76, which resulted in the deaths of 30% of the colonial settler population of New England (more than 2,500 people), and approximately 5,000 Native American deaths (Lepore 2009).

² Throughout this dissertation, Indigenous nouns (e.g., Indigenous, Pueblo) will appear with initial capitals, following the styles suggested in Gregory Younging’s Elements of Indigenous Style (Edmonton, B.C.: Brush Education Inc., 2018). Descriptive architectural terms (e.g., pueblo, mission, mesa top) will not be capitalized.
401 settlers and 21 Franciscan priests were killed in the uprising, but the number of Pueblo lives lost was not recorded.

The period of Pueblo independence was challenged almost immediately after the revolt. Otermín in 1681, Petriz de Cruzate in 1688 and Reneros de Posada in 1689, each made unsuccessful attempts to restore Spanish control in the region (Hackett and Shelby 1942). However, it was Don Diego de Vargas who recolonized the Pueblo people and their territory beginning in 1692 (Kessell and Hendricks 1992; Kessell et al. 1995, 1998; Espinosa 1942, 1988). Vargas initially offered absolution to the Pueblos for their sins if they surrendered and became vassals of the Crown. Vargas’s thinly veiled attempts at diplomacy and compassion led to the popular, albeit inaccurate, characterization of his entrada as a “bloodless reconquest,” oblivious to the fact that countless Pueblo lives were lost during military expeditions to recolonize the region. The popular trope of the “peaceful reconquest” has had the unfortunate (perhaps intended) effect of marginalizing and devaluing Pueblo histories and contemporary Pueblo lived experiences.

Several major centers of resistance to Vargas’s reconquista emerged in the years after 1692. One of the most important of these was Tunyo (Figure 1.1) in the Tewa province (Kessell et al. 1998; Hendricks 2002). Vargas led major military campaigns against Tunyo and several other mesa villages in 1694. Tunyo, the ancestral stronghold of San Ildefonso Pueblo, was occupied by refugees from nine Tewa villages. Tunyo was the setting of the last major battle during Vargas’s military campaign and the events that unfolded there in the latter part of the Pueblo Revolt period set the stage for Euro-Pueblo relations for centuries to follow. However, Tewa mobility and the role that Tunyo played
Figure 1.1: Tunyo, San Ildefonso Pueblo, New Mexico. Photo by Joseph Aguilar
during the reconquest remains poorly understood by historians and archaeologists. The Tewa siege at Tunyo offers a unique opportunity to reevaluate traditional narratives of conquest, and colonialism, especially given that it has not been a focus of sustained archaeological or historical research.

Although widely recognized as the most successful Native insurrection along the northern Spanish frontier, the revolt has not achieved a prominent position in contact period scholarship. The placement of this event (or is it a process?) at the margins of scholarship has had the unfortunate effect of devaluing Indigenous histories in contact period scholarship.
This dissertation utilizes a place-based approach to researching the archaeology of Tunyo and emphasizes the ontological interdependence of time, space, and history. My starting point is the idea that places situated within the traditional Indigenous landscape embody history, both physically and spiritually (Aguilar and Preucel 2013:268). This treatment follows the trend in the burgeoning field of Southwest landscape archaeology in engaging with Native American informants and collaborators as “intellectuals, not as data to be studied, but interlocutors with distinct epistemological stances who have their own contributions to make toward the theorization of cultural landscapes” (Fowles 2010:453). An intersecting landscape and place-based perspective furthers the aims of an Indigenous archaeology by rejecting the false dichotomy between history and prehistory, and resisting the implicit assumption that places of “history” are defined solely by entangled European/Indigenous encounters.

Further, this dissertation is an example of community-based research that speaks to tribal interests and needs. My approach, building on the work of Atalay (2012), combines innovative archaeological methodologies with Pueblo Indian knowledge of time, space, and history to aid in our interpretations of the past for the future. The convergence of multiple lines of evidence—including archival, historical, and archaeological data, alongside oral tradition—helps to re-conceptualize Pueblo perceptions of the wartime landscape and the resonance of the Pueblo Revolt. This approach broadens Western archaeological and borderlands histories by unpacking their biases and presenting alternative histories that counter colonial narratives. Equally importantly, I am contributing to my own community’s understanding of our history and heritage by introducing additional ways to learn about our history. The result is a
productive research agenda that is informed by Indigenous perspectives and values, as much as by archaeological interests.

**Research Questions**

The Pueblo Revolt period (1680-1696) is a crucial juncture in the shared experience of all Pueblo people. It is defined by the assertion of sovereignty when common cause brought the Pueblos together in what was likely an unprecedented way. When considering Indigenous histories of resistance to settler colonialism that spread across the Americas, from King Philip’s war in the Northeast (Lepore 2009) to the Caste War of Maya resistance in Mexico (Leventhal et al. 2014; Yaeger et al. 2004), the period of indigenous rebellion between 1680-1696 among the Pueblo Indians stands out as one of the most successful Indigenous rebellions against European colonialism. Viewed in this context, the Pueblo Revolt forces the re-evaluation of Spanish strategies of domination the legacies of which continue to resonate in North American colonial relations today. And yet, the revolt does not hold a prominent position in history of the United States, nor is it a part of the standard curriculum of teaching American history. The reasons for this omission include a regional over-reliance on interpretations of the Spanish documentary record (e.g. Espinosa 1942; Hackett and Shelby 1942), and a lack of archaeological research focused on the Revolt (Roberts 2004).

American history is usually described as beginning with the founding of the English colonies at Plymouth, Massachusetts and Jamestown, Virginia (Lepore 2009). This history generally underplays the European colonization of the west. Although the Pueblo Revolt has been widely recognized as an important juncture in Southwest history (Knaut 1995; Weber 1999), it is geographically, politically and culturally distant from
concerns with Dutch, English and French colonization and Indigenous uprisings in the Northeast and Southeast. This was one of the central critiques of the Borderlands scholars who drew attention to the role of Spain in North America. Only now are Borderlands historians examining Indigenous histories in any detail (e.g. Knaut 1995). This point highlights the notion that all histories are situationally-specific, and that Indigenous strategies of resistance in each instance differ depending the nature of the colonial threat. This context is important when drawing comparisons to other armed Indigenous uprisings across the Americas throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Southwestern archaeology was founded on the study of the Spanish missions and missionized Pueblo villages, especially Pecos Pueblo (Bandelier 1881; Kidder 1916, 1924, 1958), Hawikuh (Hodge 1918, 1937), and Awat’ovi (Montgomery et al. 1949), but this focus was not sustained. The focus quickly shifted to the study of the “prehistoric” past, in particular the archaeology of sites within what is now Bandelier National Monument, Chaco Canyon National Historical Park, and Mesa Verde National Park. The colonial encounter came to mark a convenient break between modern Pueblo life, considered to be the domain of ethnographers, and the deep past, considered to be the domain of archaeologists (Aguilar and Preucel 2013:268). This perceived segmentation of time created an implicit barrier to the practice of holistic research linking Pueblo pasts to the present.

While the focus of recent archaeological investigations has been the mesa top villages (Liebmann 2012; Liebmann et al. 2005; Wilcox 2009; Preucel 2000b; Ferguson 1996), Pueblo people also sought refuge in lesser known locations across the Pueblo landscape, including previously occupied ancestral homes not mentioned in the historical
records. For the Tewa, whose stronghold was at Tunyo, the Pajarito Plateau forming the mesas and canyons below the foothills of the Jemez Mountain Range became an important place at this time. These places lying outside the scope of Vargas’s military campaign have received little attention by archaeologists because of the interest in earlier Classic period occupations. Mobility was a crucial resistance strategy, and the breadth of the ancestral Pueblo landscape provided a means through which Pueblo communities could seek strength and protection. Unfortunately, the Euro-American tendency to focus on the obvious mesa top settlements led many historians to overlook other upland and lowland areas that were key components, in conjunction with the mesa top villages, of the Pueblo resistance strategy.

The Pueblo Revolt and Reconquest period thus offers a unique opportunity to re-evaluate traditional narratives of conquest, and colonialism while simultaneously providing new insights into Pueblo agency and engaging with contemporary Pueblo ways of understanding the past. Through the lens of Indigenous archaeology, this dissertation research examines the character and expression of Pueblo resistance movements. In particular, I seek to examine the following research questions. What are past and enduring meanings of Tunyo to the people of San Ildefonso Pueblo and how does it fit into the practices of Tribal Heritage Management? What archaeological features are associated with the use of Tunyo, especially the mesa village built and occupied during the Revolt period? What were some of the resistance strategies employed by the Tewa from San Ildefonso Pueblo and other villages during the siege at Tunyo? My overarching goal is to contribute to the process of indigenizing the writing of the Pueblo Revolt.

**Methodology**
This work, as an example of an Indigenous researcher working with his own Native community, is intended to provide inspiration to Indigenous students who have an interest in pursuing archaeology. My choice to do archaeology at the post-Revolt mesa village of Tunyo, which was occupied by my own ancestors, provides an opportunity to engage with this community’s history. This also requires me to consider the implications of my research, while reflecting upon my own subjectivities.

Methodologically, I am committed to providing suitable alternative archaeological methods to Indigenous people who may have a vested interest in archaeology but are concerned with the limitations of traditional site-based survey methods and wish to refrain from engaging in invasive archaeological practices. The focal point of my research, the cartographic documentation of the ancestral San Ildefonso site of Tunyo, was carried out using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or drones. Drone technology provides a culturally appropriate alternative to survey excavations for Indigenous site-mapping, since it has virtually no physical impact on heritage resources. It provides a more efficient and precise means of mapping sites and landscapes that should appeal to all archaeologists, regardless of their methodological leanings.

Through the practice of Indigenous archaeology, my dissertation research examines Pueblo resistance movements and the multiple strategies employed by the Tewa from San Ildefonso Pueblo and other villages during the siege at Tunyo. My approach is designed to integrate Pueblo Indian philosophy, Indigenous archaeology, and cultural heritage management principles within the context of an Indigenous history of the Pueblo Revolt period. My research follows the idea of the “collaborative continuum,” whereby collaboration in archaeology transcends mere dialogue with descendant
communities to create new modes of knowledge production by combined efforts (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson, 2008). This research approach provides a platform for Pueblo members to actively participate in the archaeological process and express their values and beliefs, thereby foregrounding perspectives that have been undervalued by archaeologists and historians in the past.

In many ways, as an archaeologist conducting research within my own community, investigating a village occupied by my own ancestors, I am rightfully held to higher standards than those of an outside archaeologist. As an active member of my community and one who holds our traditional values in the highest regard, I have a commitment to conducting research that is in line with the morals and values instilled in me through traditional teachings, while respecting the integrity and ongoing significance of this history to contemporary San Ildefonso people. This relationship dynamic requires me to consult closely with Pueblo elders and administration in all aspects of this research, ensuring that all parties have specified and joint rights and responsibilities. While acknowledging my moral and ethical responsibilities to the community, I also agree to act as a gatekeeper; some of the information shared privately by elders may not be deemed proper to share publicly with the academic community.

Ideally, relationships among archaeologists and Indigenous people should be defined by our capacities as scholars and Indigenous community members to work together to accomplish ends that have some benefit to the communities being studied.3

3 The categories of “scholar” and “community member” and “archaeologist” are not mutually exclusive or always opposing. Many people - myself included - embody aspects of each of these categories. See the many examples in George Nicholas, Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists (2010, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek).
While partnerships between archaeologists and Indigenous people may have diverse meanings, this definition is reflective of a movement within the discipline to practice archaeology in ways that makes archaeology more relevant and beneficial to indigenous communities (Bruchac et al. 2010; Silliman 2008; Atalay 2012; Ferguson Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006).

As the Lakota scholar Vine Deloria Jr. has noted, anthropology as just “compilations of useless knowledge for knowledge’s sake should be utterly rejected by the Indian people. We should not be objects of observation for those who do nothing to help us” (Deloria 1973:136). Deloria was one of the first Indigenous scholars to voice the need for a different type of relationship between anthropologists and indigenous peoples. This was not necessarily a rejection of anthropology by Deloria or by Native Americans as a whole; rather, it was a call for anthropology to better serve Indigenous communities.4

While the relationships among archaeologists and Indigenous peoples have certainly gotten better since the 1970s, there is still much room for improvement. In many ways, Deloria set the standard for anthropologists who wish to work with Indigenous communities, by insisting that self-reflection and introspection are necessary parts of the anthropological process.

**Tribal Heritage Management**

In North America, Indigenous communities often engage with archaeology in two distinct and sometimes intersecting ways: tribal archaeology and collaborative archaeology (Preucel and Cipolla 2010). One way involves working with various...

---

4 See Biolsi and Zimmerman (1997) for an exploration of Deloria’s message on anthropology and the (mis)characterizations of his critiques of the discipline.
governmental agencies in complying with local, state and federal laws meant to protect and preserve cultural heritage. The other is associated with conducting meaningful research on cultural heritage, which often involves collaborating with professional and/or academic archaeologists. More and more, tribal communities are using their engagements with archaeology as an opportunity to address the wants, needs, and goals of their communities, and to exercise tribal sovereignty. This research manifests itself differently across different Indigenous communities.

This research was guided in part by the Pueblo of San Ildefonso’s philosophy on the governance of its people. The preamble to the Governing Document for the Pueblo states that: “Powhoge Owingeh (Pueblo de San Ildefonso) holds the power granted from our Ancestors, the Land, and the People, to govern ourselves as People with our culture.” In accordance with this perspective, the Pueblo de San Ildefonso has established a Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) that is responsible for protecting and preserving the Pueblo’s cultural heritage. The THPO provides the guidance and policy on how the tribal nation will meet its legal obligations to the US government, and its ethical obligations to the pueblo community. In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), a Tribal Historic Preservation Officer is the designated tribal preservation official of a federally recognized Indian Tribe, and the THPO is responsible for interacting with the designated State Historic Preservation

---

5 This statement is integrated to the heritage management philosophies stated in the San Ildefonso Pueblo Tribal Historic Preservation Office’s Heritage Management Plan (2019), the guiding document for the stewardship and management of the Pueblo’s heritage resources.
Officer (SHPO) with respect to tribal land and its heritage resources.  At San Ildefonso, this involves developing a Historic Preservation Program that provides oversight for activities affecting the pueblos’ cultural heritage, which also includes advising and assisting federal, state and local governments in carrying out their historical preservation responsibilities, and reviewing any scholarly research proposals involving the cultural heritage of San Ildefonso.

Prior to the establishment of the THPO at San Ildefonso, there was no mechanism for the Pueblo administration to address the many issues affecting their cultural heritage. As a result, the ancestral landscape of the Pueblo was often adversely affected with little to no recourse for remedy or prevention. The THPO has provided the necessary infrastructure within our tribal government to exert control over our cultural heritage, by assuming the duties that would normally be handled by the state of New Mexico and placing those duties under the purview of the tribe. The pueblo has taken a progressive approach to managing its heritage, whereas prior to the establishment of the THPO, outside entities took advantage of the decentralized structure in the tribal government and often failed to consult with the Pueblo as required by law. This situation is not unique to San Ildefonso and is, in fact, endemic across Indian Country.

---

6 The federal government, through the Department of Interior, National Park Service (NPS), established the framework for these offices which, while not widespread, are becoming more common among all federally recognized tribes. At the time of this writing, there are 185 (out of 573 federally recognized tribes) NPS recognized THPOs. In New Mexico, 15 (out of 23 federally recognized tribes) currently have established THPOs. State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) are individually appointed by each of the fifty states, and they are expected to work cooperatively, if not collaboratively, with THPOs.

THPOs across the country typically believe that their work is an active expression of tribal sovereignty, since they assume historic preservation responsibilities that might otherwise be managed by states for their respective tribal lands. Although a THPO operates within a colonial construct (since THPOs are both a result of the National Historic Preservation Act, and designated only for federally-recognized tribes), these offices are currently the most legally viable and visible way for tribes to assert and exercise tribal sovereignty in regard to land and cultural heritage. A THPO’s duties may include consulting with researchers wishing to study heritage resources, vetting research proposals and gatekeeping research activities, and engaging with museums to return or repatriate cultural objects housed in museum collections (including artifacts and human remains) under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Most THPOs also work directly with local, state, and federal law enforcement to stop illegal activities and prosecute looters of Indian remains and sacred objects.

The tribal historic preservation plan at San Ildefonso emphasizes the importance of oral tradition and includes consultation with tribal elders and spiritual leaders who hold special knowledge of the Pueblo’s traditions. The plan also gives emphasis to the importance of protecting “traditional cultural properties”—places that are eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places because of their association with cultural practices and beliefs that are rooted in the history of the community. The practice of incorporating Pueblo cultural values into the historic preservation program has been consistently cited as a priority for this Pueblo. Thus, this is also a priority for my dissertation research.
THPOs allow Pueblo communities to understand, protect, preserve, and identify heritage properties on their own terms, in ways that are in line with their ethics and values. These offices also enable the tribe to impact federal and state policies by providing the opportunity to become more involved in rule-making processes. Tribal involvement with state and federal agencies can influence changes in policies that are more sensitive to the Pueblo’s methods of understanding, protecting, preserving, and identifying historic properties. While Western philosophies on heritage management and stewardship continue to dominate the field of cultural resource management, when Indigenous peoples become more involved with the rule-making process, archaeology can be more sensitive and responsive to tribal interests. While archaeologists can certainly make beneficial contributions to Indigenous communities, they can only contribute to this cause in partnership with Indigenous communities.

**A Place Based Perspective**

The Pueblo people, broadly defined, are the Indigenous inhabitants of the North American Southwest situated in the present-day states of Arizona and New Mexico. The “Southwest” is not an Indigenous marker of place, but is rather a North American spatial category, characterized as part of the national project of replacing Indigenous societies with settler colonial ones (see, for example, Kiel and Brooks 2017). This categorization, however, is countered throughout this dissertation with Pueblo conceptions of time and place, as well as using Pueblo language, where appropriate.

Pueblo people define themselves as living not in the Southwest of the American world, but at the center of the Pueblo world, where they co-inhabit carefully constructed and spatially ordered “integrated villagescapes” alongside ancestral spirits (Fowles 2017:
The Tewa pueblos conceptualize their villages as being geographically centered; the physical center of each village or *buu pingeh* (middle place) simultaneously serves as the connection to the larger cosmological landscape. Ancestral sites are also conceived in this manner, and although they may appear empty (in that they are not currently occupied by contemporary people), they too have a middle place that interacts with its surrounding landscape. This conception is not a village-centric world view, but is a view that speaks to the interconnectedness of ancestral and contemporary villages to each other and to the surrounding physical and cosmological landscape.

As Alfonso Ortiz (1969) has described, the Tewa world is delimited by a series of nested tetrads. The outermost of these are the sacred mountains. Closer to the villages are the sacred mesas located in each of the cardinal directions which define the sacred local landscape. The names of these mesas, for San Ildefonso Pueblo, are as follows: to the north is *Tunyo Pin*, in clear view of the pueblo; to the west is *Paa Whaa Pin*; to the south is *Shuuma Pin*; and to the east is *Povi Pin* (Figure 1.2). This same tetradic pattern, with locally distinctive mesa referents, is used in each of the different Tewa villages.

At San Ildefonso Pueblo, Tunyo, also called Black Mesa, is the principal mesa of the north. It figures prominently in San Ildefonso oral history (see Chapter 5). In San Ildefonso lore, Tunyo is home to the giant named, *Tsaviyo*, who is known to visit the pueblo, where he threatens to capture misbehaving children and take them back to his cave in the mesa (Harrington 1916:295). The giant was defeated in an epic battle by the

---

8 This knowledge is based on my social and cultural upbringing as a member of San Ildefonso Pueblo, and my ongoing interactions with elders and tradition-keepers.

9 For example, Tunyo is the sacred mesa of the north for San Ildefonso Pueblo and the sacred mesa of the south for Santa Clara Pueblo.
Figure 1.2: San Ildefonso Pueblo local sacred landscape. Sacred mesas are indicated on map.
Twin War Gods, and his remains can still be seen on the mesa today in the form of shrines that are visited by the Tewa.

The mesa is a remnant of a series of volcanic events that occurred over an extended period of geologic time. Traditional stories mention that the mountain once emitted smoke and fire (Harrington 1916:296). The mesa is also the location of one of the most famous of the Tewa Revolt period villages. This village is called *Tunyo Kwayeh Tehwhakeyi* (“Old Houses on Top of Tunyo”) (Harrington 1916:297). The importance of this place is perhaps best indicated by the fact that dances were traditionally performed on top of the mesa, and it continues to be used for ceremonial purposes by the people of San Ildefonso (Harrington 1916:295) as an important part of ongoing traditional ceremonies.

The Tewa and other Pueblo people have inhabited these landscapes from ancestral to modern times. The histories, identities, and sovereignties of each of the twenty-two contemporary Pueblo communities located across New Mexico Arizona, and Texas, while unique, share some commonalities. One of the more pervasive shared experiences is that of having been forced to grapple with settler colonialism. From the onset of the colonial encounter, Pueblo peoples’ experiences with colonial settler peoples and with the colonial project itself have had rippling effects across the Pueblo world (Sando 2005). There is no single or uniform Pueblo Indian account perspective on settler colonialism. Rather, Pueblo peoples’ experiences are the subject of specific local histories particular to individual communities. They are embedded within Pueblo histories, manifesting differently at San Ildefonso, for example, than they have at Acoma.
My research builds on earlier Indigenous interpretations of the revolt and critically examines the process of resistance through a study of archaeology, material culture, ethnohistoric records, and oral histories. I will focus on the events that transpired at Tunyo in 1694 as a consequence of the long-term dynamics of Pueblo-Spanish relations. An essential component of my research involves partnering with the Pueblo of San Ildefonso in formulating research design, data collection, and interpretation of results. I wish to contribute to the study of the Pueblo Revolt period and the broadening of Indigenous archaeology by introducing a place-based approach emphasizing the ontological interdependence of time, space, and history. My starting point is the idea that places embody history, both physically and spiritually, and that historical memories are given life when people re-encounter these places.

My work is also inspired by the collaborative work conducted by Keith Basso (1996) among the Western Apache. He notes that places have a special quality and can actively stimulate acts of self-reflection and memory. As he puts it, places “animate the ideas and feelings of persons who attend to them,” just as “these same ideas and feelings animate the places on which attention has been bestowed” (Basso 1996:107). Elsewhere, I elaborate on this point as follows:

Many Indigenous peoples recognize a set of responsibilities associated with being-in-the-world that requires honoring all living things, from plants and animals to mountains and spirits. This is necessary because things are not always in balance; since there are forces of chaos at work that can make some places dangerous, places require respect and spiritual preparation.

For Pueblo people, places are given meaning through the movements of sentient beings (people, animals, and deities) and their encounters with one another. (Aguilar and Preucel 2013:270)
As Aguilar and Preucel (2013:270-271) explain, “locating past events in absolute time is not a priority with Pueblo people. Rather, what is important is not so much when things occurred, but where they occurred and what they reveal about Pueblo society and cultural values that is useful in the present.”

This approach can contribute to the field of Indigenous archaeology through its emphasis of connecting Indigenous people to not only their pasts, but to places that transcend time. For Pueblo people, there is no clear distinction between place and time. Our world in the present is inextricably linked to the world of our ancestors, and the values of both are imbued in the shared landscape. An emphasis on place, rather than time, maintains that connection. A place-based approach also attempts to deconstruct the artificial barriers of “history” and “prehistory” by rejecting the false assumption that places in “history” are only linked to entangled European/Indigenous encounters, while places of “prehistory” are only linked to a purely Indigenous past (Aguilar and Preucel 2013:269). A place-based approach sees no such barriers and recognizes the longevity of place and history across the spans of time.

During the Pueblo Revolt Period, the Tewa Pueblos deliberately chose to establish their temporary home at Tunyo. Its strategically advantageous position overlooking the Rio Grande was certainly a reason they chose the mesa. However, Tunyo is a powerful place within the sacred Tewa landscape, and has always been a place where ancestors and living people can engage one another. The center place of the village was protected by the craggy cliffs and steep talus slopes and was also protected by the numerous shrines and features inscribed on the Tunyo landscape by the ancestral Tewa. Tunyo thus
embody the values and beliefs of all the people who have inscribed meaning on the mesa and its landscape over time.

**Pueblo Perspectives of the Pueblo Revolt Period**

This dissertation will offer a re-evaluation of some of the popular narratives of conquest and colonialism in the American Southwest; these narratives glorified the actions of conquistadors, while suppressing Indigenous voices. To date, these narratives have been largely dominated by Borderlands historians, New Historians, and Southwestern archaeologists (see examples in Chapter 2). Their research interests have ranged from the expansion of the Spanish empire to considerations of cultural revitalization. A few Indigenous scholars—most notably Edward Dozier (Santa Clara Pueblo), Alfonso Ortiz (*Ohkay Owingeh*), Joe Sando (Jemez Pueblo), and Herman Agoyo (Ohkay Owingeh)—have attempted to broaden out this research to address Pueblo issues and concerns. Their interests, while engaging with history and anthropology, tend to focus on the enduring significance of the revolt to Pueblo people.

Edward P. Dozier has examined the revolt from his perspective as a Santa Clara Pueblo member. For example, in his monograph, he discussed the revolt as a carefully coordinated strategy. He noted that the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was the most successful in a series of Indigenous rebellions throughout the seventeenth century (Dozier 1970). He speculated on the social status of Popay (a well-known leader of the Pueblo Revolt from Ohkay Owingeh (San Juan Pueblo), suggesting that he may have been a kind of religious leader, part of a network of Pueblo leaders who facilitated inter-Pueblo interaction. He characterized these leaders as being at the foundation of the Pueblo Revolt’s success, establishing a supra-village confederation that was crucial for insuring Popay’s success.
Alfonso Ortiz of Ohkay Owingeh is perhaps the most well-known of the Pueblo Indian anthropologists. For Ortiz, the revolt marked an intensive period of “cultural revitalization” associated with massive population movements and dislocations. He wrote, “the Pueblo Indian Revolution of 1680 is to be understood most profoundly as a great act of restoration by the ancestors of today’s Pueblo Indian people. What was restored was a respect for life, peace and freedom by the Pueblo people that was routinely violated by the Spaniards during the seventeenth century…” (Ortiz 2005:2). He further suggested that the Spaniards unwittingly gave the Pueblos a set of political institutions, which they used most effectively to resist both the Spaniards and later colonial powers (Ortiz 1969, 1994). One of those political institutions is the All Pueblo Council of Governors.10

A third Pueblo scholar, who wrote extensively on the Pueblo Revolt was Joe Sando (see Sando 1979; Sando 1992; Sando 2005). His unique writing style incorporated oral traditions and standard histories to create narrated histories of the Revolt. He described Popay, one of the best-known leaders of the revolt, as being able to “unite separate Pueblo nations, with their individual identities and languages, into a unified force powerful enough to alter the history of an entire region” (Sando 2005:xvi). Sando’s most notable contributions of the revolt come in the form of his interpretations of Jemez oral traditions of the battles during Vargas’s reconquest efforts in the Jemez region. For example, he notes:

10 The All Pueblo Council of Governors, is a non-binding governing body comprised of the twenty Pueblo Governors in New Mexico and Texas (Ysleta del Sur) that serves as a collective advocate for Pueblo issues. It is believed that this organization has its origins during the pan-pueblo alliance formation of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. See Jojola (1994) for a more detailed history of this organization.
According to Jemez legend, it was probably during the course of this battle that some people jumped over the cliffs to avoid capture; at that moment a likeness of San Diego appeared on the cliff, and the people who had jumped simply landed on their feet and did not die. (Sando 1992:120)

Sando, along with Herman Agoyo, brought the story and history of Popay and the Pueblo Revolt to the forefront of Pueblo Indian, New Mexican, and United States historical consciousness.

Herman Agoyo from Ohkay Owingeh brought the story of the Pueblo Revolt and Popay to the forefront of Pueblo historical consciousness by first serving (1979 – 1980) as the program director for the All Indian Pueblo Council Tricentennial Commission (Agoyo 1980). He also organized a series of commemorative events including a run from Taos to Hopi, a reenactment of the runs made by Pueblo messengers during the execution of the revolt. He was the director of the Popay Statuary Hall Commission, and was highly influential in achieving the goal of the commission to place a statue of Popay to represent the state of New Mexico in the National Statuary Hall in Washington D.C. The placement of that statue, timed to coincide with the celebration of the tricentennial of the Pueblo Revolt in 1980, helped establish these events to occupy a more visible position in Pueblo historical consciousness.

For Pueblo scholars, the enduring effects of the Pueblo Revolt have been more important than the causes of the Revolt, which have tended to drive the interests of most non-Pueblo scholarship. While this was an important era in Pueblo, New Mexico and United States history, the events and processes of the Revolt have had enduring effects that, for better or worse, are still a part of Pueblo living experiences.

The Intersections of Indigenous and Collaborative Archaeologies
The “decolonizing” mission set forth by Indigenous archaeology (Atalay 2006, 2012; Bruchac et al. 2010; Hart et al. 2016; 2012; Laluk 2014; Nicholas 2006, 2010; Smith and Wobst 2005; see also Tuhiwai-Smith 1999) is a response to the colonial frameworks that continue to deeply influence institutions of knowledge and power. At stake for Indigenous peoples in this endeavor are: the inherent right to control and contribute to the production of knowledge about our cultures and histories; the inherent right to protect, preserve and represent our heritage on our terms; and the inherent right to present our own accounts of our history and past. At the core of this mission is the recognition that, as a Western scientific practice, archaeology does not hold a monopoly on understanding the past, and that archaeologists can benefit from engaging with non-Western (i.e. Indigenous) peoples and perspectives.

A decolonized treatment of Indigenous and collaborative archaeologies is useful for strengthening the voice of Indigenous peoples within the academy and in asserting control over their own histories. Far from merely “adding” Indigenous perspectives, a decolonized approach addresses the marginalization of Native peoples from their own histories and seeks to build an Indigenous archaeology that is “defined by, for and with Indigenous communities to challenge the intellectual breadth and political economy” (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010:228).

The decolonizing agenda might seem to be a monumental challenge. However, the incremental Indigenization of the field through projects like my own dissertation, and others, and the burgeoning number of emerging Indigenous archaeologies, will have a compounding, long-term effect on the field (see Mihesuah 2004). In this sense. I prefer to see archaeology as responding to Indigenous critiques, and this is causing it to be less of
a colonial project, although there is still resistance to the idea of Indigenous science (see McGhee 2008). Any true decolonization effort, whether in archaeological practice, or in Indigenous histories (e.g. the Pueblo Revolt) requires the rejection, accommodation and acceptance of some of the aspects of the colonial enterprise in question.

Indigenous communities have long had a fraught relationship with the field of archaeology. In fact, Indigenous communities have voiced concerns that archaeology contributes to the colonialism inflicted upon their communities, is an inherently destructive practice, and offers very little to Indigenous communities (Deloria Jr. 1969; Watkins 2000). The trailblazers of Indigenous archaeology (e.g., Sonya Atalay, Joe Watkins) recognized this imbalance when it came to working with Indigenous peoples, and have sought for ways to introduce meaningful change within the discipline. In this way, Indigenous archaeology has always strived to prioritize and address the wants, needs and goals of Indigenous peoples by disrupting the status quo in archaeology (Bruchac et al. 2010; Smith and Wobst 2005). Indeed, Indigenous scholars find themselves in the position of being both tribal community members and academic scholars, allowing for unique perspectives, yet they often carry great responsibility of being held accountable on all sides, expected to advance scientific discoveries while also making meaningful contributions to their respective communities (Nicholas 2010).

In recent decades, American archaeology has begun to seriously reflect on the relationships among archaeologists and Indigenous peoples, prompting archaeologists to engage with Native American communities in new ways (Swidler et al. 2008; Dongoske et al. 2000; Silliman 2008). These forms of engagement have come to define the field of collaborative archaeology which has developed on a parallel, and partially overlapping
trajectory with Indigenous archaeology. Collaborative archaeology, as a “range of strategies that seek to link the archaeological enterprise with different publics by working together” (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008:1), presents valuable opportunities for archaeologists to engage with Native American communities and for the two parties to work together to achieve mutual goals.

Indigenous archaeology and collaborative archaeology have many theoretical and methodological intersections, and are sometimes indistinguishable from one another. Some practitioners would suggest that collaborative archaeology is about working with descendant communities on projects of mutual interest and Indigenous archaeology is more attuned to the needs of a specific descendant community, namely Indigenous peoples. Since routine practices of archaeology tend to interact with Indigenous communities in very peculiar (spiritually and physically detached) ways, Indigenous collaborative archaeology is needed to address the specific interests of Native communities that hope to redress the consequences and legacy of colonialism (Cipolla 2013). The plurality of Indigenous and collaborative archaeologies can operate as broad spectrum of approaches—incorporating a diverse range of Indigenous theories, methods, practices, and peoples.

To appreciate the power relations that govern the flow of ideas, to give voice to Native American views of space, time and historicity, and to challenge the dominant narratives of victimization, abandonment and acculturation codified by archaeological narratives and borderlands histories, we must take a holistic approach to understanding the past that involves both scientific practice and engaging with Indigenous perspectives. A history conceived in this way cannot be written solely from within a Western
framework. This does not simply involve “adding in” Indigenous voices but involves acknowledging the right of Indigenous people to tell their own histories. A project so conceived is simultaneously a political undertaking and a form of social identity that can only come from an Indigenous perspective.

Important to this undertaking is the recognition that that not all forms of evidence can be collected or validated by Western standards (nor should they be required to be), and that traditional forms of evidence can often be collected in ways that are in line with Indigenous values. To overcome this challenge, archaeologists must consider different methods and standards of validation for traditional and other varied forms of evidence. While there have been multiple critiques of the related trajectories of archaeology and colonialism (e.g., McNiven and Russell 2005), there is yet to be a significant shift in the methodology employed by the discipline.

In consideration of Indigenous values and ethics, Indigenous archaeologists strive to utilize methods that are in line with the values that guide the management of their heritage (see examples in Nicholas 2010). Although this varies across communities, what is most important is that Indigenous peoples guide the methodologies, whatever form they take (Tuhiwai Smith 1999). Archaeologists who strive to collaborate must adapt and adopt methodologies that meet the needs of the communities with which they work. This may require archaeologists to be more reflexive and give up a certain degree of power while in the field, but what results is a more balanced community engagement and much more robust understanding of the past (Atalay 2012; Rizvi 2008). The use of culturally appropriate methodologies fits within the decolonizing mission of Indigenous archaeology.
Collaborative archaeological practices can ultimately enrich our understandings of past and present Native American cultures. When working closely with Native Americans, archaeologists seek to broaden and enrich the perspectives gained through archaeological research, by incorporating Indigenous voices in research design, methodology, and dissemination of results, and by initiating research projects that are relevant to the concerns of Native American communities today. Indeed, collaborative archaeology has gained a strong footing in the North American Southwest (Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006; Fowles et al. 2017; Montgomery 2015; Ortman 2019), and it is particularly strong in the field of Pueblo Revolt studies (Ferguson 1996; Liebmann 2012; Preucel 1998, 2000b, Wilcox 2009). These examples of collaborative archaeological projects have, in many ways, transcended the realm of collaboration to become “partnerships,” in the sense that archaeologists and the Pueblo communities they work with have cooperatively developed joint rights and responsibilities and shared resources to reach mutual goals.

Indigenous peoples’ histories and lived experiences are only partially manifest in the archaeological and historical records – the purview of academics. The profession’s reliance on incomplete and limited forms of evidence has therefore hindered a holistic understanding of Indigenous histories. To capture and better understand the range of these experiences, archaeologists must engage with contemporary Indigenous peoples, and must consider other forms of evidence and perspectives on the past. Indigenous experiences are not only expressed in individual sites, but on entire landscapes and at sacred places. Knowledges of histories are not just put down in journals and colonial reports, but are also maintained in oral and cultural traditions. These forms of evidence
are perhaps foreign to many archaeologists, but their integration with “standard” forms of evidence is critical for a more complete understanding of the past. We must also look for new ways to collect the forms of evidence that we are familiar with, ways that are congruent with Indigenous values and ethics.

Indigenous Archaeology as an inclusive field is practiced by people from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds. It is practiced by Indigenous people (for example, Atalay 2006, 2012; Bruchac et al. 2010; Martinez 2006; Watkins 2002) and non-Indigenous allies (for example, Nicholas 2006; Preucel and Cipolla 2010; Silliman 2008, Smith and Wobst 2005). The ideas of these scholars are merging to create a diversified field of archaeologists and research questions that reflects the changing social and political nature of the discipline. For Indigenous people, the undertaking typically stems from an inherent desire to contribute to the ethical production of knowledge about our pasts. Each Indigenous person contributing to the field, regardless of the form, does so from a perspective that is informed by their own culturally specific knowledge, ethics, and values. What emerges is not a single Indigenous archaeology, but multiple Indigenous archaeologies (see, for example, individual testimonies in Nicholas 2010). Non-Indigenous allies of Indigenous archaeology often choose to adopt the practice on the grounds that their contributions should not be at the expense of the histories told and written by Indigenous peoples. This approach by non-Indigenous people can be seen through collaborative engagements and partnerships with Indigenous communities (for example, Preucel 1998; Liebmann 2012; Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh; Ortman 2019) that have resulted in meaningful research and, more importantly, meaningful relationships that transcend the traditional scope of archaeology.
The fields of Indigenous and collaborative archaeologies are not overarching one-size-fits-all models, but ethical referents of practice. Effective collaboration with Indigenous communities, in part, means developing alternative recording methods and expanding current theoretical approaches to interpreting the past. Collaboration and Indigenous archaeology are beginning to generate new research paradigms and practices that are gaining favor in the discipline. Ultimately, the Tunyo Research Project offers one example of the positive impact collaboration is having on a new generation of indigenous scholars and scholarship with descendant communities.

Mike Wilcox (2009) offered the first Indigenous archaeology of the Pueblo Revolt, using the event as a case study to provide an explanation for the persistence of contemporary Indian peoples, and as a model for the application of Indigenous archaeology in North America. He sought to dismantle what he calls “terminal narratives”: accounts of Indian histories that emphasize the absence, cultural death, or disappearance of Indigenous peoples (Wilcox 2009:11). For Wilcox, Indigenous archaeology represents a methodological and theoretical commitment to the reintegration of archaeological materials and contemporary Indigenous peoples (Wilcox 2009:11). My dissertation builds on his work, extending to address the concerns of my own village, San Ildefonso Pueblo, where I view Indigenous archaeology as an exercise of tribal sovereignty.

Contributions of this Study

In my dissertation I am introducing some of the practical and sacred dimensions of Tewa mobility during the Pueblo Revolt period; this is accomplished by focusing on the movements of San Ildefonso Pueblo people during the reconquest period and
exploring the reasoning behind them. My approach to understanding Indigenous mobility as strategy of resistance to settler colonialism hopes to expand the breadth of Indigenous archaeology by using spirituality and traditional beliefs to interpret the archaeological record. This approach is inspired in part by Joe Watkins’s (2000) idea of Indigenous archaeology and Greg Cajete’s (2000) holistic approach to Native Science, where different ways of knowing can inform one another to create a more robust whole. I pay particular attention to the movements within their traditional homelands that allowed the Tewa people to withstand the Spanish reconquest, specifically during Vargas’s 1694 military campaigns. I also consider the sacred significance of these locations and Indigenous practices used in paying reverence to ancestors and for gathering strength.

This research builds on the insights of Pueblo Indian scholars and critically examines the process of resistance through a study of archaeology, material culture, ethnohistoric records, and oral histories. I focus on the events that transpired at Tunyo in 1694 as a consequence of the long-term dynamics of Pueblo-Spanish relations. An essential component of my research involves partnering with the Pueblo of San Ildefonso in all stages of the research process, including formulating culturally appropriate research design, data collection, and interpretation of results.

This dissertation illustrates the highly contextual, and culturally specific, nature of Indigenous archaeology as a form of collaborative archaeology. My approach bridges traditional archaeological approaches with specific Tewa perceptions of time, space, and history to create a more robust set of data that can aid in our understanding of a specific period in the Pueblo past, the Pueblo Revolt. I will investigate Indigenous histories of the period while simultaneously broadening Spanish Borderlands histories, presenting them
side-by-side with archaeological data and oral histories. The research will continue after this dissertation, providing an example of a productive collaboration that is informed by Indigenous archaeology.

This study of the Pueblo Revolt period (1680-1696) will contribute to the discipline of archaeology by introducing a place-based approach that emphasizes the ontological interdependence of time, space, and history (Aguilar and Preucel 2013:268). This treatment contributes to the field of Southwest landscape archaeology by providing a case study that engages with an Indigenous community as partners, not as subjects. This approach also furthers the aims of Indigenous archaeology by rejecting the false dichotomies that envision history and prehistory as distinct time periods.

Thus, the Pueblo Revolt, as it played out in my own community of San Ildefonso Pueblo, offers a unique opportunity to engage my community with archaeology and to re-evaluate the traditional narratives of conquest and colonialism that define Pueblo people to the outside world. My research critically examines the events that transpired at Tunyo in 1694, in the larger context of the revolt, as a consequence of the long-term dynamics of Pueblo-Spanish relations. I intend to convey how the revolt is memorialized by, and characterized in the identities of, contemporary Pueblo peoples’ social practices, lived experiences, and historical consciousness. This reevaluation of the Pueblo Revolt adds new and essential dimensions to our understanding of the dynamics of settler colonialism and Indigenous resistance in North America.
CHAPTER 2: NARRATING THE PUEBLO REVOLT

In this chapter, I review how Borderlands historians, New Historians, and collaborative archaeologists have engaged with the Pueblo Revolt. Through this review, I will reveal that there has been a systematic devaluing of Indigenous values and beliefs by Borderlands historians that is now being challenged by archaeologists, as well as by Pueblo scholars and artists. This critique draws attention to how colonial representations and modes of perception are used to maintain the settler colonial power dynamic. I then examine Pueblo oral historical evidence for the Revolt and discuss how it has been used by Pueblo people. Oral histories are a categorically different kind of history. The maintenance of these histories is not so much about documenting past events in absolute time, as it is about maintaining traditional identities while creating contemporary ones. I conclude by reviewing collaborative projects between archaeologists and Pueblo Indian tribes that integrate archaeology, history, and oral history in challenging and productive ways.

The most influential narratives of the Pueblo Revolt period, outside of Pueblo communities, have long been those produced by Borderlands historians (e.g. Bannon 1974; Hackett and Shelby 1942). These scholars were among the first to interpret historical documents produced by the Spaniards that recorded observations of Indigenous peoples during early colonial expeditions into the Southwest. In general, these scholars held the view that the Revolt of 1680 and the Reconquest of 1692 were temporary setbacks in the inevitable push of the Spanish empire into North America. This characterization was later challenged in the 1980s and 1990s by New Historians who
began to consider issues of Indigenous power and agency (e.g. Gutierrez 1991; Knaut 1995; Weber 1999). These re-conceptualizations have recently been expanded by archaeological studies that view the revolt through the lens of revitalization and resistance (e.g., Liebmann 2012; Wilcox 2009). Pueblo people also maintain their own accounts of the revolt period. Some of these have been shared with anthropologists and some have not; some Pueblo accounts have been purposely suppressed in the historical memory of communities, since the events of the Pueblo Revolt Period were too traumatic to maintain. In recent decades, to contemporary Pueblo people, the revolt has taken on new meaning to serve as an expression of Pueblo sovereignty.

The earliest narrations of the Pueblo Revolt were preserved as part of the early chronicles of New Spain. Fray Augustin de Ventancurt (1697), for example, wrote a history of the missionary work carried out by the Franciscan Friars in the New World shortly after the Pueblo Revolt. Carlos Sigüenza y Góngora, a prominent scholar wrote an account of Vargas’s first expedition to New Mexico in 1693 (Leonard 1932). Both men incorporated the Pueblo Revolt into their histories of New Spain. By the end of the nineteenth century, W.W. Davis (1869), Adolf Bandelier (1887-88), Hubert Bancroft (1889), and Ralph Emerson Twitchell (1911) had all incorporated the revolt into their respective histories of the region, albeit only very briefly. The first extensive interpretations of the Pueblo Revolt came in the 1940s, in works by Charles W. Hackett (1942) and J. Manuel Espinosa (1940, 1942).

By the 1970s, Indigenous Pueblo scholars, who were familiar with narratives preserved in their respective communities, began to contribute in writing to Western revolt scholarship. Publications were produced by Pueblo anthropologists Edward Dozier
(1970) and Alfonso Ortiz (1980), and Pueblo historians Joe Sando (1979) and Herman Agoyo (1980). The Pueblo Revolt has also been interpreted in popular books (Silverberg 1970; Folsom 1973; Simmons 1980; Sanchez 1989; Baldwin 1995).

**Borderlands Histories**

The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 and the Spanish Reconquest are key topics in Borderlands history, the field of historical scholarship devoted to Spain’s role in North American history. The founding scholar of Borderlands history is Herbert E. Bolton, who coined the term “Spanish Borderlands.” This term defined a shifting region which included, at different times, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and much of the American West. One of Bolton’s primary concerns was that U.S. history was viewed and written from an Eastern U.S. perspective; thus, he tried to focus attention to the role of Spanish colonization (Bannon 1964:25). In his influential book, *The Spanish Borderlands*, Bolton surveyed the causes of the Pueblo Revolt and wrote,

> For eighty years Spaniards and Indians dwelt at peace with each other. But while the Indians accepted the religion of the friars, they also preserved their own – as they have preserved it to this day – and, under demands that they give it up, coupled with penances and punishments, they became sullen. Then, too, they were driven to labor for their conquerors. The secret bitterness flamed up in the Pueblo Revolt of 1680... (Bolton 1921:178)

This statement mischaracterizes the complex nature of Indian-Spaniard relations and neglects the numerous revolts against Spanish rule that took place during the so-called “eighty years of peace.”

John Francis Bannon, a student of Bolton and a member of the Jesuit Order, wrote a dissertation on this era, published as *The Mission Frontier in Sonora* (Bannon 1955). Like Bolton, Bannon regarded the northern expansion of the Spanish empire as the
advance of civilization into a “wilderness,” a conceptualization that fit comfortably into the romantic tone of the Bolton tradition. In a subsequent book, *The Spanish Borderlands Frontier*, Bannon argued that the Pueblo Revolt was “the end product of culture clash on all levels - material, personal, religious” (Bannon 1974:80). In contrast to Bolton, he observed that revolt had long been coming, due to the demands of the Spaniards, which: “nourished accumulating native discontent and bred strong desires for freedom from the constant exactions, from the too regular summons to forced labor, from the sternly imposed routine of mission life, from the dozens of vexations that had entered their lives since the coming of the white man” (Bannon 1974:80). However, he did not consider the Pueblo people as viable actors in their own right; rather they were merely “irritants” to the expansion of the Spanish empire.

The revolt period was taken up by two more of Bolton’s students, Charles W. Hackett and J. Manuel Espinosa. In his introduction to *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Otermin’s Attempt Reconquest 1680-1682*, Hackett provided a brief discussion of the causes of the revolt (Hackett and Shelby 1942). He wrote that the Indians were driven to revolt not only because of the suppression of their religious beliefs, but also due to the efforts to make them conform to European methods of living (Hackett and Shelby 1942:xxii). He also suggested that Popay held supernatural powers, and that the rewards offered to warriors—when combined with the belief that the Spaniards could be driven out of their territory and the universal desire to return to their ancient customs—made the revolt a success.

J. Manuel Espinosa conducted a historical study of Don Diego de Vargas’s reconquest of New Mexico. He edited *First Expedition of Vargas into New Mexico, 1692*
(1940) and published *Crusaders of the Rio Grande: The Story of Don Diego de Vargas and the Reconquest and Refounding of New Mexico* (1942). Both volumes adopted Bolton’s perspective in that they celebrated the heroism of Vargas and the “crusading spirit (that) governed men’s minds.” In 1988, Espinosa published *The Pueblo Indian Revolt of 1696 and the Franciscan Missions in New Mexico*, which included translations of original ecclesiastical documents as well as historical interpretations. He characterized the 1696 revolt as the “last serious effort” by Pueblo people to drive out the Spaniards and regarded it as the final stage in securing the permanence of Spanish settlements (Espinosa 1988:3).

New Historians

The current generation of Southwestern historians, the New Historians, are committed to understanding the revolt as a consequence of the dynamics of Pueblo and Hispanic agency. Andrew Knaut, for example, seeks to “make the Pueblo experience speak” (Knaut 1995:xvii). To this end, he documents factionalism within the Indian communities and their shifting relationships with the Spaniards. However, Knaut fails to go beyond the limitations of the Spanish sources. Although he stresses the need to discard the monolithic model of “Indians versus Europeans” (Knaut 1995:xv), he ends up discussing events and actions in just these terms.

Perhaps the most provocative of the current scholars is Ramón Gutiérrez. His book *When Jesus Came The Corn Mothers Went Away* (1991) created considerable angst in the field because of its embrace of postmodern concepts of gender and power. His statements imply that he speaks on behalf of Pueblo people and asserts his claim of being an “insider” by virtue of being a New Mexican, not a Pueblo Indian (Jojola 1993:142-
143). Nonetheless, Gutiérrez focuses on the ways that the Spanish church, state, and oligarchy used marriage to enforce Spaniards' sense of social order (Weber 2000). He explains how elite Spanish males maintained their social distance from poorer Hispanics and Indian slaves, even as they exploited their labor and used the women as sexual objects. His characterization of the Spanish elite as prideful, hypocritical, and exploitative is dramatically different from that offered by Bolton. But, he has been sharply critiqued by a cadre of Pueblo Indian scholars for making grossly overgeneralized, inaccurate, and offensive statements on Pueblo history, without any basis or scholarly reference. For example, Ted Jojola of Isleta Pueblo has asserted that “the basic flaw of Gutiérrez is not in the interpretation but in the conviction that his interpretation is representative of the Pueblo worldview” (Jojola 1993:165).

The late David J. Weber edited a volume on the causes of the Pueblo Revolt for the series “Historians at Work” (Weber 1999). Like Bolton, Weber sought to redress the Eastern bias of colonial history and was sympathetic to a more inclusive history that incorporates Indian perspectives. However, his approach was somewhat limited by his lack of engagement with Pueblo worldviews. He wrote: “. . . as with other moments in time, the Pueblo Revolt is gone. It lives on only in oral traditions, in the written words of those who witnessed it, and in the work of scholars who try to reconstruct it” (Weber
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11 These critiques were voiced during the symposium “When Jesus Came” at the 1993 Annual Meeting of the Organization of American Historians. The following notable Pueblo scholars submitted oral and written statements for the symposium: Ted Jojola (Isleta Pueblo), Rina Swentzell (Santa Clara Pueblo), Penny Bird (Santo Domingo Pueblo), Glenabah Martinez (Taos Pueblo), Diana Ortiz (Acoma Pueblo), Jimmy Shendo (Jemez Pueblo), and Evelina Zuni Lucero (San Juan/Isleta Pueblo).
1999:v). This comment, based as it is upon a Western view of time, neglects how the revolt is lived and memorialized by Pueblo people today.

**Collaborative Archaeologies**

It is no exaggeration to say that Southwestern archaeology got its start with the archaeology of mission pueblos such as Pecos (Kidder 1924), Hawikuh (Hodge 1937), and Awat’ovi (Montgomery et al. 1949). This mission focus was part of a research agenda based on the idea of selecting a site with a long occupation and working back in time, from the known to the unknown. During the 1960s amid the rise of processual archaeology, historical texts and research became devalued in favor of analyses of cultural processes, studies of changes in cultural systems over time. When scholars like Stedman Upham (1987) critiqued the use of ethnographic analogy, they inadvertently created a break between the historic and prehistoric periods. Only recently, with the development of collaborative archaeologies conducted with Pueblo tribal nations, has the Pueblo Revolt returned to center stage as an era of study.

The archaeology of the Pueblo Revolt mesa villages provides several cases in which we can identify both sites and regions of refuge that were situated within contexts of active resistance. Refuge archaeology, in the context of archaeologies of the Pueblo Revolt, has been identified as one of several interrelated subfields—Mission archaeology, Pueblito archaeology, Spanish site archaeology—that can be brought together to understand the processes, events, and meanings of the Pueblo Revolt (Preucel 2002). Indeed, mesa top refuge sites have provided some of the most insightful archaeological investigations of the Pueblo Revolt (Ferguson 1996; Liebmann et al. 2005; Preucel 2000; Wilcox 2009) and have led to a renewed interest in understanding the multiple meanings
of the revolt to Pueblo people. These studies have also offered new understanding of the roles of resistance and revitalization in colonial contexts.

Below I will summarize the collaborative projects taking place at Jemez and Cochiti Pueblos that investigate the archaeology of the Pueblo Revolt period. These projects highlight the types of collaborative efforts between archaeologists and Pueblo people that are becoming more and more necessary as Indigenous people explore new ways of understanding their history while challenging outdated narratives of the past. These projects have served as an inspiration to my own efforts, and their influence is reflected in my work.

The overarching objectives of the collaborative projects taking place between archaeologists and Indigenous people at Jemez and Cochiti Pueblos are: to develop an improved understanding of Pueblo Revolt era settlements; to produce data that can be used in long-term management of these sites; and to provide educational opportunities for Pueblo members, especially Pueblo youth. Researchers conducting these projects strive to employ non-invasive methodologies of data collection in which excavations are not a necessary component of the data collection process, so that disturbance to the natural and cultural landscape is minimized. Such methodologies help to ensure the protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Pueblo communities and are in line with Pueblo philosophies that aim to preserve and respect ancestral pueblo sites. These collaborations have not only fostered reciprocal relationships between Pueblo communities and archaeologists but have brought new insights that challenge the generally accepted historical narrative of the Pueblo Revolt period, bringing different versions of history to light.
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In 1995, Robert Preucel established the Kotyiti Research Project, a collaborative research effort between the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology and Cochiti Pueblo. This ongoing research project focuses on the ancestral Cochiti community of Hanat Kotyiti, located North of Cochiti, a mesa top stronghold occupied during the Pueblo Revolt Era (Preucel 1998). While primarily focusing on the archaeology of the village of Hanat Kotyiti, the project also includes an oral history component, and has provided educational opportunities for Pueblo students. The Cochiti Language program organizes a field trip to the mesa during the summer which provides an opportunity for Cochiti youth to experience one of their ancestral homes. In 2011, the Los Conchas wildfire, which burned more than 150,000 acres of forest in the Jemez Mountains, partially scorched Hanat Kotyiti. By drawing upon previous work on the research project, Preucel and his Cochiti collaborators were able to assess the damage to the site caused by the fire, and they are working to mitigate further damage to the site.

The Guadalupe Mesa Archaeological Project, a collaborative archaeological research project established by Matthew Liebmann between the University of Pennsylvania Department of Anthropology and the Pueblo of Jemez, conducted investigations from 2001 to 2005 at Pueblo Revolt era sites in the Jemez region North of Jemez Pueblo (Liebmann 2006). Many of the research objectives of this project revolved around the social practices of revitalization movements during the Pueblo Revolt period and included investigations into the history of occupation at ancestral Jemez sites, cartographic methodologies, damage as a result of past looting and vandalism, and architectural descriptions (Liebmann 2006:15). Liebmann has worked closely with the
Jemez Department of Resource Protection and tribal members in the formulation of research designs, data collection, interpretation, and dissemination of any final products.

These two collaborative projects illustrate the ways in which a collaborative archaeology can be mutually beneficial to both archaeologists and Native communities in the production of knowledge. Collaborative research allows for a broader perspective on the past, merging different forms of knowledge that serve to complement each other and add to greater understanding. Collaboration also provides an opportunity for Pueblo communities to appreciate the usefulness and relevance of archaeology and, just as importantly, allows archaeologists to appreciate the usefulness of Pueblo perspectives of the past. Archaeologists and Pueblo communities and leaders are now interacting in ways seldom before seen in archaeological practice in the Southwest of North America. The sharp boundaries between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples are gradually fading through efforts like these that contribute, in the long term, to an ongoing dialogue about improving archaeological practices and accountability (Atalay 2012; Silliman 2008; Smith and Wobst 2005).

**Pueblo Indian Oral Histories**

Pueblo people, not surprisingly, have interpreted and continue to interpret the Pueblo Revolt on our own terms, in the context of our ongoing cultural, social and educational practices. There is no single or uniform Pueblo Indian account or perspective on the Revolt. Rather, the Revolt and the Revolt period are the subject of specific local histories particular to individual villages. Some understandings are embedded within multilayered oral histories that are expressed in closed, sometimes ceremonial, settings. These kinds of oral histories, only a few of which have been recorded by historians and
anthropologists (e.g. Harrington 1916; Wiget 1996), might be called *internal* or private transcripts, following Scott (1985).

The Pueblo Revolt came to occupy a highly visible public position in Pueblo historical consciousness with the celebrations of the Revolt tricentennial in 1980, and, more recently, the Annual Pueblo Independence Day Celebration at Jemez Historic Site. Pueblo Indian authors, artists, historians and anthropologists have also begun to articulate the multiple meanings of the Pueblo revolt to diverse audiences (Agoyo 1980; Sando and Agoyo 2005). These expressions can be called *external* or public transcripts (Scott 1985). Some of the most widely accessible public transcripts on the revolt have come from Pueblo scholars, most notably Joe Sando (Jemez Pueblo), Herman Agoyo, Alfonso Ortiz, and Edward Dozier (Santa Clara Pueblo) (see chapter one). Other expressions of the Pueblo Revolt have come from Pueblo Indian artists who tell the story of the Pueblo Revolt in their unique ways and see the revolt as an opportunity to express Pueblo sovereignty and persistence through diversified art forms.

**Pueblo Indian Artistic Interpretations**

More recently, notable creative Pueblo artists have been engaging with the multilayered histories and meanings of the revolt. Jason Garcia (Santa Clara Pueblo), Virgil Ortiz (Cochiti Pueblo), Mateo Romero (Cochiti Pueblo) and Aaron Honyumptewa (Hopi) have brought their artistic renditions of the revolt to a wide audience, becoming, arguably, influential voices on the Pueblo Revolt; they have received national and
international acclaim that is a testament to their contributions to our understanding of the revolt.\textsuperscript{12}

Jason Garcia’s artistic compilation \textit{Tewa Tales of Suspense!} includes a suite of hand pulled serigraph prints and painted clay tiles that use comic book idioms to graphically depict Garcia’s renditions of the revolt from a Pueblo perspective. A subset of Garcia’s \textit{Tewa Tales}, a suite of seven serigraphs, was awarded the “Best of Classification Award” for paintings/drawings/graphics/photography at the 2016 Santa Fe Indian Market. In the clay tile “The Siege at Black Mesa [Tunyo]” (Figure 2.1), for example, Garcia depicts three Tewa warriors (two male and one female) standing atop the craggy basalt cliffs of Tunyo in March of 1694, looking down upon three Spanish soldiers clad in military armor and a Franciscan priest flailing in their futile attempts to reach the mesa top. The victorious stance of the Pueblo warriors is set against a backdrop of flames and billowing smoke, which is reminiscent of the violent battles between the Tewa and Vargas during the reconquest. The title of his series is a clever play on words of the synonymous \textit{Tewa Tales} (1926), a Tewa ethnography published by anthropologist Elsie Clews Parsons. Through this series, Garcia simultaneously brings the Pueblo Revolt to life and introduces Pueblo history to a wider audience by using comic forms.

A popular story that has its origins in the Hopi Pueblos of Arizona is that of Yowi or Yowe, more commonly referred to as the “Priest Killer.” Yowi is known as a deity belonging to one of the warrior clans. According to oral traditions, while the events of the

\textsuperscript{12} Works by these Pueblo artists are in the permanent collections of the following museums: the National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, DC; the Haffenreffer Museum of Anthropology of Brown University in Providence, RI; the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in Philadelphia, PA; the British Museum in London, England; and the National Museum of Scotland in Edinburgh, Scotland.
Pueblo Revolt played out, a Hopi named Yowi killed and beheaded a Franciscan priest. The figure has become a popular subject for contemporary Hopi kachina carvers, and many carvings of Yowi can be found in museums and private collections.

Honyumptewa’s graphic portrayal of Yowi (Figure 2.2) wielding an obsidian blade over...
Figure 2.2: Priest Killer. Aaron Honyumptewa (Hopi). 2016. Cottonwood root carving with natural pigments. Photo by Joseph Aguilar.
a Franciscan priest pleading for mercy, while seemingly macabre, must be understood within Hopi cultural and historical context. For contemporary Hopi, *Yowi* serves as means for explaining and understanding the events of the Pueblo Revolt to the Hopi.

In 2016, the revolt was also the subject of an independent, animated short film that aired on PBS. *Frontera! Revolt and Rebellion on the Rio Grande*, produced by John Jota Leaños in collaboration with anthropologist Aimee Villarreal, uses humor, hip hop, and comic book style animation to tell the story of the revolt. Leaños states that “[m]ost people outside of New Mexico do not know about the Pueblo Revolt and its ongoing legacies and meanings for its descendants. I think it’s important for Native, Chicana/o, Asian, Black and other colonized people to see stories of triumph, struggle and resistance in fresh and creative ways.”

**Summary**

The history of the Pueblo Revolt has long been dominated by non-Pueblo historians. Borderland historians have typically sought to place the Revolt within a larger narrative of the inevitable and relentless expansion of the Spanish empire. This triumphalistic story endures to this day in the form of the Española and Santa Fe Fiestas.

Contemporary Southwestern historians have critiqued this narrative and made important contributions by adding in questions of agency and power. Pueblo leaders were not merely passive victims or disempowered actors in the events of the Revolt period; but
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they were savvy strategists who made difficult (sometimes expedient) decisions in order to save their communities. Recently, collaborative archaeologists have drawn insights from this work and focused attention on the Rio Grande mesa villages as refuges and strongholds. However, they have not paid enough attention to the different components of the settlement system and the ideological meanings of these sacred places.

To begin to understand Pueblo Indian perspectives of the Pueblo Revolt, we must first realize that there are multiple, complex, multilayered histories unique to each Pueblo. The Pueblo Revolt period is but one of a multitude of events that helped to shape the Pueblo lived experience over the course of Pueblo history. Extending into the past, and stemming from our emergence into this world, multiple events—our migrations, the coalescing and dispersal of people in villages, and our ongoing encounters with colonialism—have contributed to our existence as Pueblo people. Anthropologists are only beginning to realize that Pueblo lifeways and histories cannot be explored uniformly, and that there is no singular narrative that represents the diversity of Pueblo culture and history. Archaeologists who chose to collaborate with descendant Pueblo communities have come to realize that their work inevitably will characterize, most clearly, the unique perspectives of the communities with whom they work; thus they should be cautious when speaking of other Pueblo’s perspectives and communities. The results of attending to multiple Pueblo perspectives and multiple meanings of the Pueblo Revolt are a recognition of multiple truths that resonate in distinctive ways within each community. Understandings of the revolt among communities and individuals are informed by their unique experiences and histories. Although a shared meaning of the Pueblo Revolt for Pueblo people has emerged amid contemporary interpretations of the
revolt, Pueblo Revolt scholarship must recognize the diversity of experiences and meanings among Pueblo communities.
CHAPTER 3: THE ARCHITECTURE OF RESISTANCE

In this chapter, I discuss the Pueblo villages and settlements established after the 1680 revolt in the northern Rio Grande region. This approach is a shift away from privileging the mission villages (the subject of most Borderland histories) to considering the mesa villages and other occupied areas that served as central places of the pueblo settlement system. These locales facilitated social and political relationships among the mission communities and the more remote habitations located in more secluded upland areas. I describe the mesa villages and a sample of the reoccupied villages in terms of their architectural forms and characteristics for the Pajarito, and Jemez districts.

Resistance, as evidenced in the architecture of the mesa villages and in the actions of certain Pueblo leaders, was not as straightforward as one might imagine. While the relocation to and military defense of the mesa villages appears to be an obvious form of resistance, the material evidence and strategic motivations behind what we see as “resistance” in the ethnohistorical and archaeological record are much more complex than has been heretofore characterized in the Borderlands literature. The scholars who viewed these actions as merely acts of “survival” overlooked Indigenous agency, characterizing Pueblo people as passive responders, rather than as dynamic actors who negotiated and shaped the colonial encounter (Liebmann 2010:200).

Moving to the Mesas

At the onset of Vargas’s reconquest mission, the center of gravity of the Pueblo world shifted from mission villages to mesa villages (Figure 3.1). Because their villages had been contaminated through the bloodshed, Pueblo people vacated most of their
Figure 3.1: Pueblo Revolt period mesa villages. Map based on Preucel and Aguilar (2018: Figure 10.2).
mission homes (Hackett and Shelby 1942). The deliberate movement to mesa villages was the result of many different strategies of resistance, as Pueblo communities anticipated the return of the Spaniards. After all, prior to Vargas, there had been several failed attempts to subdue the Pueblos, by Otermín, Pétriz de Cruzate, and Reneros de Posada. What characterized the reconquest for the Pueblos was not only its violence, but their adamant resistance to it. While the pueblos made some compromises, accommodations, and even made some alliances with Vargas, resistance was overwhelmingly constant throughout Vargas’s reconquest (Kessell et al. 1998).

Archaeological investigations of the villages discussed in this chapter began in the late nineteenth century, with the work of Bandelier (1892) who conducted extensive surveys of the northern Rio Grande region from 1880-1885 for the Archaeological Institute of America. He translated and reported on the Spanish accounts of the attacks on the mesa villages. He visited Cerro Colorado and mapped Kotyiti and Old San Felipe. From 1896 to 1902, Hewett (1906) began a series of surveys and excavations for the Bureau of American Ethnology. He mapped Astialakwa, Patokwa, Navawi, and Nake’muu. Holmes (1905) mapped Cerro Colorado in 1889. In 1912 Nelson (1914a) excavated at Kotyiti for the American Museum of Natural History. These excavations remain the only excavations undertaken at a mesa top revolt era village to date (Preucel 2002b:13). In 1930, Mera (1940) mapped many of the eastern pueblo mesa top villages as a secondary project to his larger glaze ware ceramics survey. These included Kotyiti, Patokwa, Boletsawka, Canjilon (Old Santa Ana), and Old San Felipe.

Over the last twenty years, there has been focused archaeological research at these mesa villages, largely by archaeologists based at Harvard University and the University
of Pennsylvania. Robert Preucel (2000, 2006; Preucel et al. 2002) and Michael Wilcox (2009) have mapped Kotyiti. Matthew Liebmann (2012; Liebmann and Preucel 2007) has mapped Patokwa, Astialakwa, Boletsakwa, and Cerro Colorado village. In addition, Ferguson and Preucel (2005) and Liebmann et al. (2005) have examined the mesa village phenomenon within a broader Post-Revolt regional study. These studies are valuable in documenting the last major settlement shift that occurred before the reoccupation of the modern villages where the Pueblo people reside today. As valuable as these studies are, they have not fully considered the extent and nature of the Revolt period settlement system.

In the following sections, I discuss Pueblo Revolt period settlement landscape in terms of four kinds of villages (Figure 3.2): new double plaza villages, new multi-roomblock villages, a new Spanish presidio style village, and reoccupied villages (including cavate groups). Several other ancestral Pueblo villages and outposts have not been the subject of extensive archaeological investigations and have only been briefly described by archaeologists; these lesser known villages will be reviewed here as well.

Throughout this dissertation I use the term “village” to denote the places, past and present, where Pueblo people live. My use of the term has its origins in the Tewa conception of the term “owín.” which describes any place that has been consecrated as a place of living. For the Tewa, any place where groups of people have lived can be described as owin. In conversational Tewa, this has come to mean “village” (oral tradition). This could lead to confusion among archaeologists who often search for fixed settled locations that do not always manifest themselves in the same ways as less permanent settlements.
Figure 3.2: Pueblo Revolt period mesa village plans discussed in this chapter. Map based on Liebmann et al. (2005: Figure 5).
Tunyo, for example, was only ever inhabited temporarily in times of conflict. However, the community built on the mesa during the Revolt period constitutes an owín, or a village, since it was consecrated as such. At Tunyo and other places inhabited during the Revolt period, the new villages were inscribed (through shrines, for example) as world centers, making them in a sense, a home away from home. This is most clearly illustrated at Kotyiti (Preucel 2000a, 2000b), where the village architecture is a cosmogram of the Keres world, even though it was only inhabited for a short time. Because not all of the Revolt period settlements discussed in my dissertation fit the expected structure of a “pueblo,” that is to say, some may represent families or sub groups, I am grouping all of these nuanced distinctions into the imperfect term of “village” to describe the various settlements inhabited during the Pueblo Revolt period.

**Double Plaza Villages**

Double plaza villages are well known village architectural forms in the Northern Rio Grande region. They date back to the early twelfth century and were widespread in the Northern Rio Grande during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Fritz 1978; Lowell 1996:77; Fowles 2005). This architectural form, which saw a resurgence during the Pueblo Revolt period, is often associated with the movement of large numbers of people from their mission villages to mesa tops (Liebmann et al. 2005). The dual-plaza plan may be understood as referencing an archetypal Pueblo village, symbolic of the dualism so prevalent in Pueblo society. Preucel has argued that Kotyiti functioned as an ideal village of the Keres worldview (Aguilar and Preucel 2013; Snead and Preucel 1999). Some of the formal, plaza-oriented attributes of the dual-plaza pueblos appear to represent important aspects of the Pueblo universe as recorded ethnographically. For example, the
open gateways at Patokwa, Boletsakwa, and Kotyiti are believed to point to the corners of the world, and the openings may provide a pathway to them. The double-plaza plan of these pueblos attests to the renewed importance of the traditional moiety social organization in establishing the social and political balance desired after the Pueblo Revolt (Preucel 2000b; Liebmann 2012).

Double plaza villages are typically associated with the Keres and Jemez people. They include Patokwa, Kotyiti, Boletsakwa, and Cerro Colorado and may indicate the existence of moieties. With the exception of Cerro Colorado, these villages were constructed early in the Revolt period; this suggests that the people in charge of their construction may have adhered to strict calls to revert to more traditional forms, as exemplified by the dual plaza layout.

**Patomkwa**

Ancestral to Jemez Pueblo, the village of Patokwa was initially mapped by Holmes in 1905 and Mera (no date) and was more recently mapped by Elliott (1992) and Liebmann (2012). The village sits at an elevation of 1774 meters (5820 ft) and is situated on a low mesa above the confluence of the Jemez River and the Rio Guadalupe. Based on ceramics present at the site, an early component of the village, adjacent to the double plaza village was occupied between A.D. 1200-1350 (Liebmann 2006; Elliott 1986), although the documentary evidence shows that it was reoccupied during the Revolt period from A.D. 1681-1696, 1703-1716 (Hackett and Shelby 1942:360; Espinosa 1988:200, 206; Kessell and Hendricks 1992:520-522; Kessell et al. 1995:202, 441-444). The historic period village is comprised of two adjoining plazas with approximately 600 rooms in total, with kivas in each plaza and a mission church in the northwest corner.
When compared to the villages of Boletsakwa and Kotyiti (Liebman et al. 2005), similar architectural plans – dual plazas with a central dividing roomblock – can be seen. This is in stark contrast to villages constructed later in the Revolt period such as Astialakwa (Liebmann 2006:289-94), and Tunyo (see discussion in chapter 6). In 1881, Adolph Bandelier described Patokwa as follows:

[Patokwa] is one that would naturally be selected for residence by primitive peoples, and may well have been a principal pueblo of the valley in pre-Spanish times. One portion of the ruin is a large mound of debris from which the larger stones have been removed. This represents the prehistoric town. The other portion is in a much better state of preservation, and consists of lines of fallen house rows surrounding two great courts. That this structure is of late is clearly indicated, not only by its state of preservation but by the presence at one corner of the ruins of a Catholic Church. (Hewett 1906:46, referencing Bandelier 1881)

Kubler described the church as follows:

Bloom believes that the church ruin located on the low mesa at the confluence of San Diego and Guadalupe canyons, at the site called Patokwa, is to be identified with San Diego de al Monte. The ruins are unquestionably those of a church and Bloom's sources for the identification are compelling. The evidence of the Miera y Pacheco map of 1776 may be added to his argument, where a ruined church is shown occupying a mesa site at the confluence of the canyons. The designation on the map is "San Diego." Friar Francisco de Jesus was assigned to this mission in 1694, with four soldiers, and the church was probably built at that time. Early in June, 1696, Francisco de Jesus was murdered there at the church door. The Indians fled from the mission, and were joined by other Jemez Indians from the area, who were not resettled until after 1703. (Kubler 1940:107)

Liebmann’s most recent mapping of the village (2012), suggests that the spatial organization of Patokwa, with the core-dual-plaza component of the village, was likely constructed by communal labor groups during the migration of its inhabitants in 1681. Most of the rooms within individual roomblocks exhibit ladder-type construction, and several roomblocks were constructed later to accommodate Keres immigrants to the village. A number of outlying roomblocks present at the site may have also
accommodated non-local residents of Patokwa who may have served as reinforcements in the event of conflict with the Spaniards. However, Patokwa was predominantly a Towa speaking community, and any other residents would have been considered outsiders (Liebmann 2006:238-39).

When Vargas visited Patokwa on November 26, 1693, he found that a cross had been set up in its plaza (Kessell et al. 1995:441). Vargas bartered for food and received four half sacks of maize and one of flour in exchange for two cattle. Fray Juan de Alpuente baptized two children who were dying, and Fray Francisco de Jesús baptized one hundred living children. The people of Patokwa then petitioned Vargas to allow them to live on the mesa in their new village since it was close to their fields and there was room to build a church and convento. Vargas conceded to this request. Just as he prepared to depart the village, he met José, the governor of Santo Domingo Pueblo, who swore his obedience and that of his people. Vargas noted that the Santo Domingo people lived on several mesas, sharing them with the Jemez Indians (Kessell et al. 1995:445).

Kotyiti

Hanat Kotyiti (Old Cochiti or Cochiti Above) is an ancestral Cochiti village located approximately five miles northwest of modern Cochiti Pueblo. It sits at an elevation of 1979 m (6493 ft) on Horn Mesa, part of the southernmost edge of the Pajarito Plateau. The community is comprised of two distinct, but interrelated villages – Kotyiti a double plaza pueblo, and an adjacent, dispersed “rancheria” type settlement referred to as Kotyiti East. The rancheria portion of this settlement is not considered to be part of the double plaza settlement pattern.
The village was first mapped by Bandelier (Lange and Riley 1975:151) and was mapped and excavated in 1912 by Nels Nelson of the American Museum of Natural History. Tree ring dates indicate an occupation date as early as 1684 (Preucel, Traxler, and Wilcox 2002). Recent mapping and documentation of the site (Preucel et al. 2002; Wilcox 2009) has illustrated that Kotyiti consists of 137 ground floor rooms, with another 21 possible above ground rooms, distributed among six roomblocks. A central roomblock divides the interior space of the village and creates two plazas, each of which contains a single kiva. The most distinctive feature of the village is its overall symmetry, created by roomblocks with similar, or nearly similar, orientations. Five gateways are present and proved access, to and exits from, the village. The gateways may provide symbolic access to areas adjacent areas in the natural and cosmological landscape.

The accompanying village, Kotyiti East, is located approximately 150 m east of Kotyiti (Wilcox 2009). This settlement is far less formalized and contains approximately 25 non-contiguous structures, ranging in size from one to three rooms each. Most of these rooms are highly eroded and poorly visible on the surface.

Bandelier describes the village and its setting as follows:

"Two classes of ruins occupy the summit, one of which is the comparatively recent pueblo. It is two stories high in some places, very well preserved, and built of fairly regular parallelopipeds of tufa. The woodwork in it was eventually destroyed by fire, and much charred corn is found in the ruins. The average size of 118 rooms on the ground floor, which are all in the pueblo with the exception of about ten, is 5.0 by 2.8 m. (16 feet 5 inches by 9 feed 2 inches). This is a large area in comparison with the size of older ruins. I noticed but one estuña and the pottery bears a recent character." (Bandelier 1892:167)

Bandelier also remarks on the relative visibility of the two classes of ruins,

"There are also traces of older ruins, which mark the existence of small houses. . .The oldest ruins on the mesa, which hardly attract any attention are those of a
prehistoric Queres pueblo; the striking well-preserved ones are those of a village built after the year 1683, and abandoned in April, 1694." (Bandelier 1892:168)

According to Cochiti oral tradition, the village is the sixth of the seven villages founded on the ancestral journey of the Cochiti people from Frijoles Canyon, the location of the village of Tyu’non-yi (Lummis 1897). By the same account, the village was used in times of need, such as threats from Spaniards, nearby pueblos or Navajos. To contemporary Cochiti People, the mesa is regarded as a significant cultural landmark, providing a connection to their ancestors, and is still visited for various reasons to this day (Preucel 2000b).

The village was a major center of resistance during the Revolt period and several Pueblo leaders, including Antonio Malacate, are linked to the site in the ethnohistoric record. He learned that the residents came from the three Keres villages of Cochiti, San Marcos and San Felipe and that the people of San Marcos occupied a roomblock in the “second plaza” of the village (Kessell et al. 1998:200). Vargas identifies El Zepe, as the leader of the Cochiti people and Cristobal, as the leader of the San Marcos contingent.

The mesa top village was also the setting of significant, violent encounters with the Spaniards. The first was with Juan Dominguez de Mendoza in December of 1681, in which the people of Cochiti effectively turned away Otermin’s reconquest effort, which had the much longer-term effect of delaying the reconquest effort for another 12 years (Hackett and Shelby 1942). The second encounter was against Vargas and his allies on April 17, 1694. The village and its occupants were attacked by three separate groups overseen by Vargas, and after a violent battle, the mesa was taken by the Spaniards. A total of 342 noncombatants and 13 Pueblo warriors were captured during battle, the latter
of which were absolved\textsuperscript{15} and “ordered shot without delay” (Kessell et al. 1998:193). Several days later, on April 21\textsuperscript{st}, the Kotyiti survivors, along with their Tewa allies from the north, countered the Spanish offensive by ambushing the Spaniards at the village, where Vargas had set up camp, and releasing some of the imprisoned Pueblo warriors, then escaping into the surrounding mountains. Before completely abandoning his post at Kotyiti, Vargas set fire to the village and its stored corn supplies to prevent any reoccupation.

Recent research at Kotyiti has highlighted the shifting ethnic affiliations in the tumultuous years of the Revolt period and evidence of a pan-Pueblo identity during this period (Wilcox 2009; Preucel et al. 2002). Further, ceramic analyses have investigated the role of Pueblo women in the revolt, presenting a challenge to the popular notion that Keres – Tewa relations were strained to the point of war during the post Revolt interregnum (Capone and Preucel 2002).

Boletsakwa

Boletsakwa, located at an elevation of 2206 meters (7240 feet) on San Juan Mesa in the Santa Fe National Forest, consists of two distinct components. It contains approximately 168 ground floor rooms and was most recently mapped by Liebmann (2006, 2012). There are two kivas located adjacent to the village on the east side. Mera produced maps of the village in the 1920s and 1930s and one of the kivas was excavated by the Girl Scouts Archaeological Unit in the 1960s under the direction of Bertha Dutton.

\textsuperscript{15} Vargas often “absolved” his enemy prisoners of their sins prior to executing them. To Vargas, “saving an enemy’s soul” (in effect, capturing his soul for a Christian God) was more important than saving his life.
The village was later reoccupied from A.D. 1680-1685; these dates are based on dendrochronology (Robinson et al. 1972) and the ethnohistoric record (Kessell et al. 1995:416, 445; Kessell et al. 1998:339-340).

Boletsakwa consists of two distinct components. The earliest component comprises the northern half of the site, and dates to A.D. 1250-1400. There are no visible standing walls in this section of the site, and it seems that much of the construction material used to construct the Revolt year portion of the site was salvaged from the older component. The architecture consists of a U-shaped roomblock with a kiva located in the northern portion of the plaza area (Liebmann 2006:248).

The later occupation is architecturally distinct from the earlier occupation and is located directly adjacent to it. This component consists of two square shaped plazas divided by a central roomblock, with additional roomblocks located on all sides of the plazas. Like Kotyiti, several gateway openings are present in the southern corners of the south plaza, while one exists on the eastern side of the north plaza. A large kiva is present due east of the north plaza, while another kiva is likely present to the east of the south plaza.

Vargas visited Boletsakwa on October 25, 1692 (Kessell and Hendricks 1992:520) and identified it as “the pueblo of the Jemez” while noting that it is located three leagues from the village they abandoned, which has “twelve plazas and a church with a high tower” (Kessell et al. 1995:203). Upon his arrival at the village, he was greeted by more than three hundred Indians who made threatening gestures, such as throwing dirt in his men’s eyes. Vargas describes the village as having “two plazas, one
with an entrance which leads to the other, garrisoned and closed, and each with four cuarteles” (Kessell and Hendricks 1992:521).

Like Patakwa and Kotyiti, Boletsakwa is a double plaza village, with roomblocks defining two large, enclosed plazas. Evidence confirms that many of the rooms at the village were built simultaneously using ladder-type construction throughout (Liebmann 2006:60). Boletsakwa has been referred to as being inhabited by both Jemez and Santo Domingo people in the ethnohistoric record (Kessell et al. 1995:416, 445; Espinosa 1988:129, 149), and based on the architecture, these groups appear to be more integrated than they are at Patakwa and Kotyiti. This is evident in the fact that there are no outlying rooms or roomblocks that would be suggestive of the spatial, and perhaps social, segregation of immigrants joining up with the Jemez people.

Cerro Colorado

Cerro Colorado, ancestral to Zia Pueblo, is a large double plaza village with an L-shaped roomblock located on Cerro Colorado mesa overlooking the Jemez Valley at an elevation of 1878 meters (6160 feet). The site is located on Jemez Pueblo lands, approximately 2.5 miles west of the modern community of Jemez. Based on both ceramic and ethnohistorical evidence, it was occupied from A.D. 1689-1693/4 (Liebmann 2006:354-355; Kessell and Hendricks 1992:26, 518-520; Kessell et al. 1995:113). Until Liebmann recently remapped the site (2006), the only known maps of the site were created by Holmes (1905) nearly a century before.

The village was founded in the latter part of the Pueblo Revolt period, after Zia Pueblo was attacked by a party led by Cruzate in August 1689; 600 inhabitants of the pueblo were killed and 70 taken prisoner (Kessell and Hendricks 1992:25-26). Those
who happened to be away from Zia at the time of the attack were the ones who founded the village. The ethnohistoric evidence suggests that Cerro Colorado was first settled by people from Zia and Santa Ana Pueblos (Kessell and Hendricks 1992:518-520; Kessell et al. 1995:113, 117; Kessell et al. 1998:323-324). Because there are no mentions of Cerro Colorado in the ethnohistoric record after November of 1693, it is likely that Cerro Colorado was only occupied briefly between 1689 and early 1694, when Vargas observed the Pueblo of Zia to be fully occupied (Kessell et al. 1998:323). Liebmann suggests (2006:279) that either individual small groups of immigrants slowly moved into Cerro Colorado over time, or that architecture and spatial organization were utilized to maintain boundaries between social groups, or both.

Holmes described Cerro Colorado as follows:

On a partially isolated bit of mesa about three miles west of Jemez is a considerable ruin, which does not bear evidence, however, of long continued occupancy. The summit of the mesa is without trees and almost without soil, and water must have been obtained from far below. The walls of the ruin are well defined, and stand in places five or six feet in height: but they are formed of rough, loosely laid stones, and are extremely thin and unstable. They could not have been high at any time, as there is a marked absence of debris, and the dearth of pottery and kitchen refuse would seem to stamp the place as a temporary or emergency abode. The site is favorable for defense, and there are traces of defensive walls along the margin of the summit. The buildings are irregular in plan and comprise three groups, the full length of the groups being about 450 feet and the width 350 feet. (Holmes 1905:200-2001)

Holmes was apparently unaware of Vargas’s accounts that indicate that he visited Cerro Colorado in November of 1692 and found that the people who were living there had erected a cross in the plaza and on most of the houses (Kessell at al. 1995:434). Vargas had informed them that the term of the Pueblo leader Cristobal had expired and that he wished for new Pueblo officials to be selected. Once the people of Cerro Colorado
selected their officials, they were given staffs and the official canes of office by Vargas. He then ordered them to come down off the mesa and reoccupy their vacated mission village. Fray Francisco de Jesús baptized twenty-four children born in the last year. The Pueblo people said they would build a church over the one destroyed during the Revolt.

**Dispersed Roomblock Villages**

Some Revolt period villages were constructed relatively quickly and seemingly without formal planning (Liebmann et al. 2005). Their informal distribution may be the result of individual families or groups joining up with a community at different times. More importantly, the evidence of villages exhibiting a dispersed linear roomblock arrangement (less formal) construction during the latter part of the Revolt era may suggest that the revitalization aspects were strongest in the years immediately following the Revolt, and waned as the momentum of the Revolt waned (Liebmann 2005:56).

Another important factor contributing to the dispersed nature of these villages is the multi-ethnic makeup of their inhabitants. At Astialakwa, for example, the dispersed settlement was built there to house large numbers of people from Patokwa as well as from Santo Domingo Pueblo. At this village, several linear roomblocks were laid out in parallel fashion along with numerous isolated rooms that may have housed several extended families. A similar migration pattern is seen in the documentary record at Tunyo where, at one point, people from nine separate Tewa (including southern Tewa) villages occupied the mesa top village. At both Tunyo and Astialakwa, a dispersed settlement made up of distinct architectural units may have helped to facilitate the integration of outside groups into a community, helping to maintain distinct social identities within a single community (Liebmann et al. 2005:57).
Below is a brief description of two dispersed linear roomblock villages occupied during the latter part of the Revolt—Astialakwa and Canjilon Pueblos—that exhibit dispersed, informal architectural patterns. Tunyo, while not technically exhibiting linear roomblock construction, has a similar spatial arrangement, and general comparisons could be made with villages exhibiting these architectural and spatial features.

**Astialakwa**

Astialakwa, ancestral to Jemez Pueblo, is a large village located high on Guadalupe Mesa at an elevation of 2036 meters (6680 feet). It overlooks the village of Patokwa, on a bench below the mesa. Based on ceramic analysis and ethnohistoric records, the village atop the mesa was occupied from 1693-1696 (Liebmann 2012). The village was first mapped by Holmes in 1905 and was described by Hewett (1906). The village was most recently mapped by Dougherty (1980) and remapped by Liebmann (2006, 2012). Holmes provided the following description of the site:

The walls are of unhewn stone, and bear evidence of hurried and apparently incomplete construction, there being a noticeable absence of debris of any kind. Traces of mortar occur in the walls, and a little plaster still remains on the interior surfaces. The walls are in no place more than five or six feet in height. The buildings are in a number of groups ...there are few traces of household refuse on the almost naked rock surface of the site, but remnants of mortars and muliers of the usual type, as well as of pottery of several varieties, were found…There can be little doubt that this village was built at the period of Spanish encroachment by the people of the villages below as a place of refuge and defense, and it was here, according to historical accounts, that they were defeated by the Spaniards and compelled to descend to the lowlands ... It is an interesting fact that along the margins of the precipice are traces of defensive works built of stone. (Holmes 1905:203-205)

The village exhibits both formal and informal architectural elements. The formal elements, restricted to the east side of the mesa, consist of a series of linear roomblocks. The informal elements on the west side consist of isolated rooms. There is no evidence
for kivas. There are fortifications around the edge of the mesa that may have also served as sheep corrals. It was occupied for a brief period from 1693 to 1694.

On November 10, 1693, Vargas learned that the Jemez were moving their provisions from Patokwa up onto Guadalupe Mesa (Kessell et al. 1995:404). The people apparently removed the doors from most of their houses and took their roof beams and metates with them (Kessell et al. 1998:367). Vargas attacked Astialakwa on July 24, 1694, and justified his attack because of “the rebellion and backsliding of the Jemez nation” (Kessell et al. 1998:283). In addition to the 120 presidial soldiers and militiamen, Vargas secured the aid of 100 Zia, Santa Ana, and San Felipe allies to fight against the Jemez. Vargas split his force into two units; the colonial men-at-arms ascended the front of the mesa, while the allied Pueblo troops circled around to the back. The Jemez found themselves with no recourse with this pincer strategy. Following the battle at Astialakwa, the Spaniards reported 84 Jemez casualties, including five who were burned alive in their houses, while 361 Jemez were taken capture.

The village was reoccupied during the “Second Pueblo Revolt” in 1696, but only very briefly (Espinosa 1988:252; Kessell et al. 1998:792-799). Following this brief reoccupation, there is no evidence that the village was ever reinhabited.

**Canjilon Pueblo**

Canjilon is a small L-shaped village ancestral to Tamaya (Santa Ana Pueblo), located on a small mesa overlooking the Rio Grande and Jemez rivers. The village consists of fifteen rooms arranged in two roomblocks oriented at right angles, with a large open area at their intersection, and an isolated kiva south of the roomblocks (Wilcox 2009:204). The walls are 1 to 1.5 meters in height suggesting that the village
was one story high. Canjilon Pueblo is only accessible from the north, and there are stone
fortifications located along the trail leading to the village (Wilcox 2009: 203).

Indications that the village was inhabited during the Revolt period come from
Mera, who stated, “The ruins of this settlement are to be seen on an isolated mesa north
of the Rio Jemez near its junction with the Rio Grande. This site appears to have been
inhabited solely during the production of Groups E and F” (Mera 1940:25). There is,
however, evidence of earlier Development period ceramics, including Kana’a and Lino

**Presidio Village**

In colonial New Mexico, frontier presidios served as military forts designed to
protect the Spaniards against their Indigenous foes. This type of architecture is associated
with formal, fortified walls surrounding an enclosed plaza. Some of the more well-known
presidios of colonial New Mexico include the colonial capital of Santa Fe, the Presidio at
Santa Cruz de la Cañada, and the Presidio of San Elizaro. However, at least one mesa
village occupied during the Revolt era exhibits many elements of presidio style
architecture and thus may be classified as a presidio village.

**Old San Felipe**

The lone example of a presidio style village is Old San Felipe (also called Basalt
Point Pueblo), a unique mesa village ancestral to the people of Katishtya (San Felipe
Pueblo). The village is located on a high basalt mesa overlooking the Rio Grande River
and the modern community of San Felipe Pueblo. It is built with three roomblocks, each
a single room wide, forming an open square whose open end is defined by the mesa edge.
The village contains approximately 65 rooms with a possible kiva located in the
northwest corner of the village that was later converted into a chapel in 1694 (Harrington 1916:498; Liebmann 2012:188).

San Felipe warriors assisted Vargas in his 1694 military campaigns against the mesa villages, serving as auxiliaries in Vargas’s attack on Kotyiti and Tunyo. Some of these auxiliaries may have been the very people who, just a few months earlier, lived on the mesa with the Cochiti people. This alliance, coupled with the presidio style architecture of its revolt era village, may be viewed as a pledge of allegiance to the Spaniards by the San Felipe people.

Bandelier visited Old San Felipe in 1882 and produced a sketch map. He described it as follows:

At the northern extremity of the mesa (San Felipe mesa) stand the ruins of the old church in bold relief, and some heaps which look very much like the remains of the Pueblo of Pecos, and this seem to indicate the ruins of the old pueblo. Its position was an excellent one for observation and defense, as on three sides it is utterly inaccessible. It stands about 300 to 500 feet above the river and the declivity is absolutely vertical for nearly 100 feet. The walls of the church are on the brink of the precipice. (Lange et al. 1975:69)

Mera described it as being located “[on] the mesa top which lies back of and some distance north of the present pueblo of San Felipe there are the remains of a village which is known to have been occupied by the Indians of that pueblo after the Pueblo revolt of 1680. Only Group F material could be found” (Mera 1940:26).

Vargas paid a visit to the village in November of 1693 at the request of the inhabitants of the village, perhaps to deter hostile relations with neighboring Cochiti Pueblo (Kessell et al. 1995:401). He was received by the unarmed people of the village who bore crosses around their necks. In an act similar to that of the people of Cerro Colorado, the inhabitants of Old San Felipe had erected a large cross in the village and
crosses on many of their homes, while pronouncing their allegiance to the Spaniards and asking for protection from their enemies (Kessell et al. 1995:405). Cristóbal, the leader of the San Marcos contingent at Kotyiti, was present and Vargas provided beef and other goods to him in barter (Kessell et al. 1995:409).

**Reoccupied Ancestral Homes**

Numerous previously occupied ancestral villages were reoccupied by Pueblo people following the Revolt, and many of these have yet to be identified by archaeologists. In seeking evidence of these people and their relations, archaeologists need to pay attention to the historic period ceramics present at many Classic period villages on the Pajarito Plateau. The archaeological, documentary and oral evidence all suggest that San Ildefonso and Santa Clara people sought protection at their ancestral villages at Navawi, *Tsankawi, Otowi, Puye* and Frijoles Canyon (including at some of their associated cavate complexes) (Hewett 1906).

In the following section, I review some of these reoccupied ancestral villages located on the Pajarito Plateau that saw reoccupation during the Revolt era. Although well known to descendant Pueblo communities today, these reoccupied ancestral homes are less familiar to archaeologists concerned with the Revolt era, since much of the attention has been focused on the mesa top and mission villages. These ancestral places served an important role in the settlement system during the Revolt era. They were lesser known (if known at all) to Vargas and his allies; thus they were not a target of the 1694-1696 military campaign and provided additional safe havens to supplement the fortified mesa villages. In conjunction with the mesa top village and mission villages, these
reoccupied ancestral villages were important elements of a strategic settlement system that was crucial to survival during the resistance to Vargas’s reconquest.

**M-100 Cavate Complex**

There is evidence of reoccupation at many of the cavate communities in the southern facing cliffs of the Pajarito Plateau. One example is Group M, a cavate group in Frijoles Canyon at Bandelier National Monument (Hendron 1943). The ceramics indicate an occupation during the late Coalition and Classic periods, with the major period reflected by Biscuit B, Glaze D and E during the Middle Classic, and a small reoccupation indicated by Tsankawi, Tewa Polychrome, Kapo Black, and late glazes during the Revolt period.

Pueblo refugees to this cavate complex made incised drawings on the plaster walls of some of the cavates of Group M (Hewett 1938; Toll 1995). Turney (1948:70) has suggested this area may have been reoccupied during or just after the Pueblo Revolt, based on the presence of Kapo black, Tewa Polychrome, and Glaze F sherds. Liebmann (2002) has reexamined the incised drawings of M-100, and notes that the image of a Virgin Mary combining elements of Pueblo and Christian imagery may illustrate the appropriation and manipulation of European symbols to fit into the formation of traditional Pueblo identities during the Revolt period (Liebmann 2002).

The nature and extent of the reoccupation of Frijoles Canyon is inconclusive at present; however, Mera notes that Tyuonyi (the largest village settlement in Frijoles Canyon) may have been reoccupied during the Revolt period. He states: “LA 82 - this number refers to the large circular communal structure (Tuyuoni) in the canon of the Rito de los Frijoles now included in a national monument. All glaze periods from A to F are
represented. The latter possibly represents a small late reoccupation during the Pueblo rebellion” (Mera 1940:24).

Nake’muu

Nake’muu (Figure 3.3) (translated from Tewa as “Village on the Edge”) is a Coalition period single plaza pueblo that was reoccupied during the Revolt period by people from San Ildefonso Pueblo and other Tewa villages. The village is located on the narrow finger of a mesa above the junction of Canyon del Valle and Water Canyon in the Pajarito Plateau and is situated at an elevation of 2200 meters (7220 feet). The site currently sits within the boundaries of the Department of Energy facility, Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), and represents the only ancestral village within the lands administered by LANL that retains its original standing walls.

Hewett, the first archaeologist to document the site, described the village as follows:

Less than a mile west of no. 17 on a high point at the confluence of two very deep gorges is the best-preserved ruin in this region. The walls stand in places eight feet above the debris. Great pine trees are growing within the rooms. There is every evidence that these mesas have been forested since the abandonment of the pueblos. This ruin is almost inaccessible, except from the west. It is not less than 800 feet above the waters of the Rito del Bravo, which it overlooks. The ground plan is very irregular. (Hewett 1906:25)

The village is one of many ancestral homes of the people of San Ildefonso Pueblo that are located on the Pajarito Plateau, the pueblo’s ancestral homeland. Oral histories maintained by the pueblo state that during Vargas’s reconquest, many people journeyed to this village from San Ildefonso, first stopping at Navawi (see below), and then traveling up the canyons to the site of Nake’muu. Some of the oral traditions about Nake’muu’s Revolt era reoccupation were collected by LANL as part of their
Figure 3.3: Nake’muu. The ancestral San Ildefonso village reoccupied by women and children during the Pueblo Revolt period. Map based on Vierra (2003: Figure 5). Photograph by Bradley Vierra.
architectural monitoring program (Vierra 2003). Although annual visits to the site by San Ildefonso were a regular occurrence, its conspicuous location within secure LANL property has unfortunately severely limited Pueblo people’s access to the site.

The village contains at least 55 ground floor rooms distributed in four roomblocks. A close inspection of the wall construction sequence indicates that two separate linear roomblocks were initially built with a series of lateral northern and southern roomblocks was added later, enclosing a central plaza. The outside doorways were subsequently sealed, and the focus of the pueblo became the central plaza area (Vierra 2003:3). The walls are constructed of shaped tuff blocks quarried from the local bedrock and held together by adobe mortar. Steen observed that there was little pottery onsite; the types he identified included Santa Fe Black on white, Wiyo black on white, and Biscuitware (Steen 1977:37).

In their site condition assessment study, Vierra et al. (2003:6) discussed the remarkable state of preservation and attributed it to a combination of four factors: (1) the roofs may have been periodically repaired during site revisits (e.g., during the Pueblo Revolt), thus continuing to protect the walls from the weather; (2) the site's isolated location, which would have lessened the amount of people visiting the site; (3) roofing materials might not have been scavenged until the turn of the century when homesteaders moved into the area; and (4) the site has been located in a controlled access area within LANL, where visitation is limited. One possible explanation for excellent condition of the walls is the possibility that the roofs were repaired during the Revolt period reoccupation. Traditional knowledge about this sacred place has been passed down at San Ildefonso through oral histories and through visits to the village by tribal members.
Navawi

Navawi (Figure 3.4) is a Tewa name, translated to signify the “village at the gap between fields.” This is a large ancestral San Ildefonso village that was occupied between 1325-1600 at time when people began to aggregate into large settlements on the Pajarito Plateau. The gap referenced in the translation is the location of a well-known game trap, from which earlier (albeit inaccurate) translations of the Tewa name were derived (see below). The village is situated on a low rising tuff mesa situated at an elevation of 1978 meters (6490 feet) and is located completely within San Ildefonso Pueblo lands.

Hewett described Navawi as follows:

. . . about two and a half miles southeast of Tsankawi, is situated the ruin of Navawi. It belongs to the same class and epoch as Otowi, Tsankawi, and Tshirege. It consists of two large buildings about 200 years apart, several clan houses on the level mesa near by, and a cliff-village of considerable extent in the face of the low mesa to the south and west. On the narrow neck of the mesa about 300 yards west of the pueblo, at the convergence of four trails is a game-trap (nava) from which the village takes its name. (Hewett 1906:22)

Hewett mistranslates the Tewa name, since Navawi, is “village at the gap between fields.” The word “nava” refers to “field.” There is a well-known game trap in the neck of the mesa.

Oral histories at San Ildefonso recount that Navawi was one of four large villages—along with Tsiregeh, Potsuwi and Tsankawi—previously occupied by their ancestors before the migrations to the Rio Grande valley. At the Rio Grande, a more reliable source of water was available, and they established a new pueblo about a mile west of the present village at Perage (“kangaroo rat place”). As referenced above, Navawi, including its extensive cavate complex, was one of the stops that San Ildefosno people made on their way to reoccupy Nake’muu during the reconquest.
Figure 3.4: Navawi. The ancestral San Ildefonso village was a stop on the journey to Nake’muu during the Pueblo Revolt period. Map by Hewett (1906: Figure 9).

Discussion

My review of Northern Rio Grande Pueblo Revolt period settlements has identified several classes of villages based on their spatial organization, architectural forms, and temporal occupation. These classes are double plaza village, linear roomblock pueblos, a Presido pueblo, and reoccupied ancestral homes. I have attempted to consider the types and locations of all major settlement types occupied by Pueblo people during the post Revolt period. I have proposed one new type of architectural form as being a part of the revolt occupation milieu, the Presidio village. I have paid special attention to the remote villages on the Pajarito Plateau, including Nake’muu and Navawi, that have not been the focus of previous archaeological studies of the Revolt period. The inclusion of these villages provides us with a better understanding of the diversity of villages and
habitation areas occupied during this period, and deeper understanding of the reasoning behind the movements of Pueblo people across their landscape.

My review has also documented temporal variability in settlement and identified specific construction phases. The first construction episodes took place around 1683 and involved the construction of Patokwa, Boletsakwa, and Kotyiti – all of which were constructed at the apex of the revitalization movement (Preucel et al. 2002; Liebmann 2012). The second episode saw construction in 1690, at the heels of Posada’s brutal attack on Santa Ana Pueblo in 1687, and Cruzate’s equally brutal attack of Zia in 1689. This construction took place at Cerro Colorado and Old San Felipe, just prior to Vargas’s return beginning in 1692. The last building episode, in 1693, was defined by less formal architectural attributes and spatial organization, as exhibited at Astialakwa. Of important note is the hurried construction seen in the architecture of Astialakwa, reminiscent of the settlement at Tunyo (see chapter 5). Both villages served to provide immediate protection against Vargas’s military campaign in 1694. Because the movement of people to these mesas was on relatively short notice, and included people from a number of ethnically different pueblos, a pattern of less formal spatial organization emerges at these villages.

The range in variation seen in the layouts of these villages is important. While some villages exhibit formal architectural layouts that create plaza areas (either single, double or multiple), other villages are characterized by less formal, dispersed architecture. The formality of the plaza pueblos may indicate a more integrated community (even if multi-ethnic), while a dispersed village layout may be an indication of a segregated, perhaps haphazardly organized community with less integration. The
latter is certainly evident in the architecture at Astialakwa, and (as we will see in chapter 5) at Tunyo.

The common characteristics of all these villages include their relatively short occupational histories, and the lack of any further long-term occupation following the tumultuous years of the Pueblo Revolt period. These aspects allow archaeologists to investigate the village architecture relatively unobscurred by previous or later occupations. Another, often underemphasized, aspect of all these revolt era settlements is the deliberate choice of Pueblo people to occupy places because of both their spiritual significance as places occupied by their ancestors, and their usefulness as strategic and defensible locations. The choice of San Ildefonso people to move to culturally significant places on the landscape will be discussed at length in chapter 6.

What is particularly fascinating about these villages is their remarkable documentation in the ethnohistoric record, often glimpsed through the actions of Spanish authorities who strove to constrict Pueblo agency and sovereignty. By parsing out the documentary record, we are able to trace the movements of people to and from these villages as a means of understanding mobility strategies, Indigenous diplomacy, and the forging of political alliances. It is especially ironic that the Spanish documents written to further colonial goals actually allow for the indigenization of the past by identifying some of the Pueblo actors and highlighting their agency during this tumultuous time.
CHAPTER 4: TUNYO SETTING AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Occupied for approximately nine months in 1694 during the latter part of the Pueblo Revolt period (1680-1696), Tunyo was a major center of resistance in the Tewa homeland and perhaps the greatest obstacle to Governor Diego de Vargas’s reconquest of New Mexico, which began in 1692. Of all the mesa villages occupied in the northern Rio Grande at this time, it was one of the largest, purportedly “fortified with what seemed like more than one thousand people” (Kessell, et. al. 1998:149). At different times Tunyo served as a safe haven for people from the Tewa villages of: Powhoge (San Ildefonso), Kha’po (Santa Clara), Nanbé (Nambe), Posuwaeg (Pojoaque), Tetsugeh (Tesuge), Kuyuemuughe (Cuyamungue) and Sakona (Jacona), and the southern Tewa villages of San Cristobal and San Lazaro. The events that unfolded at Tunyo during its Revolt period occupation helped to shape the social and political landscape for all Rio Grande Pueblo people and Spaniards in the centuries that followed.

Despite the historical significance of Tunyo, no systematic anthropological work has been conducted, and because of this it remains relatively poorly understood. Because Tunyo is situated completely within the contemporary geopolitical boundaries of San Ildefonso Pueblo’s reservation, and access to the site is carefully controlled by San Ildefonso. Unlike public lands, Pueblo-controlled lands are restricted from public access, which makes archaeological investigations at sites on Pueblo lands a difficult task.

16 This statement must be considered within the context of Vargas’s journals, in which he often overestimated his enemy. The term “one thousand” is a common phrase used by Vargas at the time, simply meant to reference a very large or significant number.
For this reason, no anthropological investigations have taken place at Tunyo since Mera visited the site in 1940. Contributions to this may be the popular belief, among early anthropologists in the region, that archaeology could contribute little to an understanding of the historic period. While several other Revolt Era mesatop villages have been extensively studied (see Liebmann 2012; Preucel 2002; Ferguson 1996), Tunyo remains understudied by anthropologists and historians, leaving its history to speculation.

It is unclear why early archaeologists, like Bandelier, found Tunyo of little interest. Perhaps it is due to the fact that the material record at Tunyo is not particularly eye-catching when compared to other sites in the region like those in neighboring Frijoles Canyon or Puye. As we will see in chapter 5, the architectural remains of the village at Tunyo are difficult to interpret especially when compared to the clearly defined masonry rock walls at other nearby sites. Perhaps because archaeologists like Bandelier did not understand the nuances and complexities of non-masonry architecture, they ignored it. Knowing that the events had transpired in the “historic” period and were well documented, perhaps they also felt that an archaeology of Tunyo had little to offer beyond what has already been narrated in the historical record. Regardless, we have been left with a sparse archaeological understanding to this point.

In this chapter, I provide an overview of the geology and physiography of Tunyo in the context of the greater San Ildefonso ancestral domain; this helps to situate Tunyo within the sacred landscape of San Ildefonso Pueblo. Next, I provide a review of the military encounters at Tunyo in 1694, based on the firsthand accounts of Vargas as
recorded in his *autos*\(^\text{17}\) and journals. These accounts, while inherently biased, offer insights into the military strategies employed by Vargas during his siege of the mesa. When compared against the archaeological record of the mesa and Pueblo perspectives of the material culture and history, a more nuanced perspective of the mesa and its history begins to emerge. Finally, I will provide a review of the previous anthropological research conducted at Tunyo, leading up to this study. But more importantly, it provides the first synthesis of archaeological and historical data as it relates to Tunyo, and the important role it played during the Pueblo Revolt. This synthesis when combined with indigenous perspectives, provides a robust framework from which a more nuanced understanding of the mesa and its cultural significance can begin to emerge.

**The Physical Geography**

Tunyo is a sacred mesa of the San Ildefonso people. It is located within the reservation boundaries of San Ildefonso Pueblo, a federally recognized Native American Tribal Government within the state boundaries of New Mexico. The Pueblo’s 39,449 acres of Tribal Trust Lands (i.e., reservation) are located on the meadows, mesas, and canyon systems situated between the Jemez Mountain Range and the western foothills of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains. It is situated in the Pojoaque Basin, within the Rio Grande subsection of the Basin and Range physiographic province, and it sits between the Arizona/New Mexico Plateau and the Southern Rockies ecoregions. The Arizona/New Mexico Plateau represents a large transitional region among the drier

---

\(^\text{17}\) The autos and journals of Don Diego de Vargas his personal records translated from official and private correspondence between he and the Viceroy of Spain in Mexico. They are a reflection of his experience during his bid to reconquer New Mexico and are official records of his time as Governor of New Mexico. See subsection below titled “The Journals of Don Diego de Vargas” for a brief historiography of these records.
shrublands and wooded higher relief tablelands of the Colorado Plateau to the north, the lower, hotter Mohave Basin and Range to the west, and the forested mountain regions to the northeast and south (Griffith et al. 2006).

Tunyo rises from an elevation of 1689 meters (5540 feet) above mean sea level at its base, to 1853 meters (6080 ft) at its summit. Prominent land forms visible from the summit of the mesa include the entirety of the historical ancestral domain of San Ildefonso (Figure 4.1). This includes the directional cardinal mesas of San Ildefonso: Pa Whaa Pin (Deer Tail Mesa) to the west; Shuuma Pin (unknown etymology) to the south; and Povi Pin (Flower Mesa) to the East. Tunyo (Spotted Mesa) represents the cardinal mesa for the north in San Ildefonso tradition.

The traditional ancestral domain of San Ildefonso Pueblo extends onto lands now occupied and owned by the U.S. Department of Energy’s Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), the National Park Service (Bandelier National Monument), and the Forest Service (Santa Fe National Forest), as well as numerous state, county, and private holdings. The Pueblo also shares a common cultural and jurisdictional boundary with the Pueblo of Santa Clara which lies directly north, abutting Tunyo. The physiographic diversity of San Ildefonso’s historic ancestral domain has had far reaching impacts over time on the settlement patterns of the San Ildefonso people. Throughout history, successive village locations and movements have generally shifted from upland locations on the Pajarito Plateau to the lower floodplain of the Rio Grande valley. During the Pueblo Revolt period, San Ildefonso and many other Pueblo communities returned to those upland areas as their Rio Grande villages became increasingly threatened by Spanish presence in the region. Many of these upland movements included the well-
known mesa villages in addition to several other diverse locations occupied by the ancestors in earlier times. These locations are omnipresent within the ancestral Pueblo landscape and were just as important as the better-known (to archaeologists) mesa-top villages.

In the Tewa language, the name “Tunyo” roughly translates to “spotted” or “has spots.” This etymology derives from a greenish moss that grows sporadically on the basaltic north face of the mesa. John P. Harrington described the mesa as Tunyo Pin (very spotted mountain) and noted that the northern cliffs, especially about the cave, were marked with large greenish spots (1916:293). Tunyo has been referenced by a variety of
other names, the most common of which is “Black Mesa” because it gives a dark appearance even on a sunny day. Other names of note include San Ildefonso Mesa, La Mesa, Mesita, Mesilla, Huérfano (orphan), Sacred Fire Mountain, Orphan Mountain, Beach Mesa, Round Mesa, and Round Mountain (Harrington 1916:293; Galusha and Blick 1971). Galusha and Blick (1971) favor the name “Round Mountain” to differentiate it from the other large “Black Mesa” at the confluence of the Chama and Rio Grande rivers between Embudo and Chamita, New Mexico.

To the people of San Ildefonso, Tunyo is interchangeably referred to as “Tunyo” or simply “Black Mesa.” Local Hispanic communities continue to refer to Tunyo as “Huerfano” mesa, which should not be confused with the Huerfano Mesa in San Juan County, New Mexico, that is sacred to the Navajo people (Jett 2001).

Understanding the Geology of Tunyo

Tunyo is a prominent basaltic, denuded, gravel capped mesa with a composite cinder cone and volcanic neck, with small, localized extrusions of basalt. It rises approximately 500 feet above the Rio Grande riverbed, and is flanked by beds of undisturbed deposits of the Santa Fe Group geologic formation. While no systematic geological survey has been conducted at Tunyo, a number of geological surveys in the vicinity of the mesa, both formal and informal, lend to our understanding of the unique geological history of Tunyo. This brief review of Tunyo’s geologic history will add important context in understanding the material culture that was analyzed during my research.

Hewett’s original description of the geologic history of Tunyo, in relation to the surrounding landscape, is as follows:
. . . basaltic extrusion of recent geologic time. . . which rises boldly from the valley on the eastern bank of the Rio Grande just north of San Ildefonso. . . These black basaltic extrusions bear no geologic relation to the yellow tufa formations that cover the major part of the [Pajarito] plateau. That they are more recent in origin is shown by the fact that the under-side of the tufa cap is thoroughly baked at the point of contact with the basalt, showing that the volcanic tufa was not laid down upon a cold surface, but that, on the contrary, the basalt has been thrust up from below at a time subsequent to the deposit of the tufa, which belongs to a geological period very remote. Geologists hold that the most recent volcanic formations of New Mexico may not exceed from eight thousand to twenty thousand years of age. (Hewett 1909:435-436)

While Hewett is correct in his general assessment that the tuff (“tufa”) formations of the Pajarito Plateau bear no relation to the basalt formations found at Tunyo and in other nearby locales, his interpretations of the relative ages of these formations can be corrected by recent geological surveys (Galusha and Blick 1971. In short, the basalts that occur at Tunyo are much older that the Bandelier tuff of the adjacent Pajarito Plateau.

The basalts of Tunyo consist of a dark grey color that is interpreted to have crystallized in a volcanic neck and associated vents surrounding the mesa (Baldridge et al. 1980; Galusha and Blick 1971). Red cinders, an indication of localized eruptions, and 15 meters of agglomerate occur on the southwest sides of the mesa. A study by Baldridge et al. in 1980 yielded a K-Ar (potassium argon) age of approximately 4.4 Ma for the basalts at Tunyo. However, a more recent dating effort, taken from the basalt landslide blocks on western base of the mesa, has given an 40Ar/39Ar age of 2. 73 ± 0.27 Ma (WoldeGabriel et al. 2001).

The “tufa” that Hewett describes is actually volcanic tuff, named Bandelier tuff by geologists, which was created as a result of pyroclastic flows coming from the Toledo and Valles Caldera eruptions 1.6 Ma and 1.2 Ma, respectively. The Valles Caldera
episode of this geologic event created the Tsiregeh member of the Bandelier tuff (Wolff and Ramos 2013), which over time has eroded, creating the canyons and mesas of the Pajarito Plateau that we know today. A thin ash/tuff bed and localized pumice beds found at the base of the gravel deposit atop Tunyo confirm that the Bandelier tuff deposits of the Pajarito Plateau are relatively younger than the gravel deposits, and by stratigraphic relation, the basalts at Tunyo.

A gravel cap, which has been interpreted to be the remnants of an ancient lake bed that encompassed much of the Espanola and Pojoaque Basins, has been remarkably preserved atop the hard basalt of the mesa. The lake is presumed to have been dammed up at the mouth of what we now know as White Rock Canyon. The dam eventually gave way creating the steep walls of White Rock Canyon as the lake drained, eventually creating the Rio Grande. The sediments and cobbles surrounding Tunyo have since eroded away, only to be preserved atop the mesa. The gravel cap, previously thought to be 10 ft thick, has recently been estimated to be as much as 10 meters thick in some areas (Reneau and Drakos 2017, personal communication). The thickness of the cap varies due to deposition over an irregular paleotopographic surface. The bed, composed of cobble size or smaller river gravels and sediments, is visible on most parts of the summit.

Although the age of the gravels was left uncertain in previous reports, an age of 1.25 Ma, based on the geomorphology, can be given with confidence (Reneau and Drakos 2017, personal communication).

**Vargas’s Military Campaign**

Don Diego de Vargas Zapata y Lujan Ponce de Leon y Contreras, more commonly known as Don Diego de Vargas (or simply Vargas), left Spain for the
Americas in 1672 (Espinosa 1942:29). After serving in various high-profile positions for the Viceroy of New Spain in Mexico City, Vargas assumed the governorship of New Mexico in 1691, eleven years after the Revolt of 1680 (Kessell 1989:49). As a result of the Revolt, the capital of New Mexico was exiled to El Paso del Norte (now modern day Cuidad Juarez), a small settlement comprised of a few Spanish families, a small garrison and Pueblo Indians who had become Christianized. The reconquest of New Mexico was an important endeavor for the Viceroy of Spain in Mexico, as competing interests among other European powers in the Americas began to emerge.

Vargas left a remarkable, nearly complete record of his activities during his tenure as Governor and Captain General of New Mexico between 1692 and 1696. His journals are scattered across state and church archives in Mexico and Spain. Copies of some of these records are preserved in New Mexico in the State Museum, and in the Office of the Surveyor General in Santa Fe (Espinosa 1942). Over six thousand manuscript pages, contained in four *legajos*, have been housed in the Archivo General de Indias for over 200 years. Photocopies of this collection were acquired by the Library of Congress in 1929, while supplemental documents and a significant amount of duplicate material have been archived in repositories in Mexico and Santa Fe (Hill 1942).

In 1980, John Kessell established the Vargas Project at the University of New Mexico with financial support from the National Historical Publication and Records Commission and the Guggenheim Foundation. Between 1980 and 2002, the Project published English translations of the journals of Diego de Vargas, from 1691 to 1704, in a six-volume scholarly set. These volumes are regarded as the definitive translations, superseding earlier translations.
Reporting the Siege at Tunyo

Vargas’s journals and letters are especially valuable for understanding the events that transpired at Tunyo during the post-Revolt period. In recounting these events, I am citing or quoting Vargas as a primary source, as accessed through the 1998 edition of the Vargas journals in translation by Kessell, Hendricks, and Dodge to provide a historical reconstruction of the events that occurred at Tunyo at the height of Vargas’s reconquest efforts.

Shortly after his appointment as governor of New Mexico in 1691, Vargas announced his pledge to reestablish a permanent Spanish colony in the former New Spain territory lost by the Spaniards in 1680. In August of 1692, Vargas’s company—of fifty soldiers, three Franciscan Friars, ten citizens and 100 Pueblo converts—made its way up the Rio Grande. Vargas had received reports that the headquarters of the Pueblo people (or “rebels,” as he knew them) was located at Cochiti Pueblo. Having made his way to the pueblo, he found it vacated, not knowing that the community had reestablished itself on La Cieneguilla de Cochiti, in the rugged canyons north of the pueblo. He then ventured south to Santo Domingo Pueblo and San Felipe, only to find those pueblos vacated as well.

Vargas then turned his attention to the former capital of the colony, Santa Fe. On September 13 of 1693, he reached the town and found it occupied by at least “one thousand” people, who were prepared to defend the city (Kessell and Hendricks 1992:382-400). It was made clear to Vargas that the Pueblo occupants would not easily surrender the city, so he engaged in a series of tense negations. Vargas’s efforts at
diplomacy became all the more critical as his position became more vulnerable, after the arrival of Tewa reinforcements from nearby pueblos (Kessell 1992:389).

Vargas’s military campaign was then redirected to the mesa top villages. Vargas engaged with Tunyo on three separate occasions, but never succeeded in capturing that mesa; the final encounter was not a military defeat, but a negotiated surrender. This campaign, arguably the most violent period during the early colonial period in New Mexico, was characterized by Vargas’s brutal assaults against the mesa-top villages in the rugged upland areas of the northern Rio Grande.

Although only occupied for nine months during 1694, Tunyo was a major center of resistance during the Spanish Reconquest of New Mexico. At the onset of Vargas’s campaign, many of the Pueblo people had already moved to upland areas, while others remained at their mission pueblos along the Rio Grande, Galisteo, and Jemez rivers. The choice to mobilize a community to an upland or mesa-top location was a pressing issue for each pueblo as they sought a strategy to deal with the reconquest in a way that made the most sense to their individual communities.

The siege at Tunyo came on the heels of a battle between the Spaniards and the Tewa occupied capital city of Santa Fe in December of 1693. After the Tewa effort to defend the city failed, Vargas captured and executed seventy Pueblo defenders in the plaza in the center of Santa Fe. The executions did not deter Pueblo resistance but energized it, as many Pueblo people fled to their mesa-top refuges where they could further defy the Spanish. Initially, Vargas made attempts at diplomacy, but the Pueblo leaders did not heed Vargas’s calls to surrender to the Royal Crown. This eventually inspired Vargas to lead military campaigns at the mesa-top settlements of the Keres at
Kotyiti, the Towa and Keres in the Jemez Province, and the Tewa at Tunyo, San Ildefonso.

On January 9th, 1694, Vargas first learned that the Tewa had taken refuge on Tunyo (Kessell et al. 1998:41). His interrogation of two prisoners named Diego and don Diego, from Nambe Pueblo, revealed that people their people—along with those from San Ildefonso, Tesuque, Cuyamungue, Pojoaque, Jacona, and Santa Clara—had taken refuge at Tunyo (Figure 4.2). The move to the top of Tunyo, Vargas learned, was prompted by the devastating battle in Santa Fe just weeks earlier, where the Tewa defenders were executed.

The following excerpt summarizes the nine-month period from December 1693 to September of 1694, when Vargas waged war continuously:

Carried out on 30 December 1693 by order of Governor Vargas, the Summary execution of seventy of the Pueblo Indian defenders of Santa Fe is intended to deter further resistance. It has the opposite effect. Within weeks, Vargas informs the viceroy that New Mexico is a war zone.

Scouting reports and captives reveal that unrepentant Indians from numerous pueblos have taken their belongings to fortified, mesa-top sites. As always, Vargas tries diplomacy: come down, accept pardon, and reoccupy your previous homes as good vassals of your rightful king. Few respond favorably. North, west, and southwest of Santa Fe, they defy the Spaniards, maintaining their defensive communities on the mesas of San Ildefonso, San Diego de los Jemez, and La Cieneguilla de Cochiti. They strike at Spanish herds and at the pueblos of Zia, Santa Ana, and San Felipe, which have allied themselves with the reconquerors.

Under escort, sixty more families of colonists, the Españoles, Mexicanos, reach Santa Fe and have to be fed… (Kessell et al. 1998:27)

On January 10th, Vargas made an expedition to Tunyo and met with Domingo, a war captain from Tetsugeh who, by many accounts, was a leader of the Tewa defenders at Tunyo. Vargas reported that Domingo “spoke, saying that he was not coming down
Figure 4.2: Map of Tewa villages that moved to Tunyo. Map based on Preucel and Aguilar (2018: Figure 10.5).
because he was not well. He and the others repeated that they were not coming down. They were afraid because of what happened to the Tanos (in Santa Fe)” (Kessell et al. 1998:44). The Tewa held the strategically advantageous position and stated that they were prepared to stay on the mesa indefinitely.

Another failed diplomatic attempt saw Vargas attempting to negotiate a surrender through a Spanish speaking Indian named Nicolas on January 30th to January 31st. Furthermore, in an effort to gather intelligence on the Tewa situated on Black Mesa, he interrogated an Apache captive along with two Tewa captives on February 20th, taking their statements before executing them at gunpoint. When Vargas’s diplomatic efforts failed, as they did at the other mesa villages, he decided to attack the mesa with full force. To begin, he led a reconnaissance mission to Tunyo in January of 1694. He wrote:

When the rebel enemies of the Tewa nations and their followers discovered us at the base of the mesa, they gave great war cries, crowding along the top of the mesa, its peñoles, and all around it. They said they were awaiting the Jemez, Keres, Cochiti, Apache, Zuni, Moquino, and many other nations. They spoke shameful words, which led us to fire a few shots at the people, but the heavy snow did not permit bringing the war in the proper manner. We saw that there was a risk of losing the battle completely because of how fortified the enemy was. (Kessell et al. 1998:141)

This would mark the beginning of the siege at Black Mesa, a precursor to the subsequent assaults on other mesa-top villages.

Vargas’s first major military offensive at Tunyo was attempted in February of 1694, but a combination of challenges—too few horses, the relentless Pueblo people’s defense of the mesa, and a heavy snow—prevented Vargas from mounting a proper battle. After setting up camp at San Ildefonso Pueblo, just south of the mesa, Vargas gathered his troops for another assault on Tunyo on March 4. Several skirmishes took
place, and by Vargas’s account, 14 Tewa defenders were killed and 22 Spanish soldiers were wounded. Despite all his efforts, however, Vargas and his allies were unable to take the mesa.

During the siege at Tunyo, Vargas held simultaneous military campaigns at the other mesa top villages of Astialakwa in the Jemez region and Kotyiti just north of Cochiti. At Kotyiti, Vargas and his Pueblo allies overwhelmed the Keres defenders, many of whom broke and ran, escaping as best they could. The allied army captured the plaza and pueblo and seized 342 noncombatants and warriors, the latter of whom were absolved and shot. Eight others died in the battle. The Pueblo allies plundered the pueblo and set it on fire (Hendricks 2002). Soon after in July at Astialakwa, Vargas led a campaign against the Jemez and Tewa people who were living on the mesa. Vargas was able to gain access to the mesa via a back route and was able to take the village. Seventy Pueblo people died in battle, five were burned in their houses, seven leaped off the mesa to their deaths, and two were executed. There were 361 noncombatants of all ages taken prisoner.

After these battles, Vargas returned his attention to Tunyo in another attempt to take the mesa. On March 4th, the first major offensive took place in which Vargas purportedly captured the southern portion of the mesa known as the “Giants Oven” in Tewa oral history; he was not able to take the rest of the mesa, as it was protected by a defensive wall. Hendricks (2002:186) speculated that Vargas was referring to Tewa
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18 Vargas regularly “absolved” his enemy prisoners before executing them. For Vargas, saving his enemies soul (in effect, capturing his soul for a Christian God) was more important than saving their life.
accounts that reported the Tewa on two mesas. This implies that Tunyo was comprised of
two separate mesa top areas - Tunyo village and a separate area known as the Giants
Oven, in Tewa oral history, and that Tunyo village was protected by a defensive wall
sufficiently built to prevent access. Kessell et al. (1998:452, n.81) further speculate that
moieties (the formal division of the Tewa for political and ceremonial purposes) were
being observed in 1694; this implied that Tunyo was occupied by one moiety, and the
distinct “other” mesa was occupied by another.

While the Tewa certainly may have maintained their moietal social structure
while they occupied Tunyo during Vargas’s siege, the archaeological evidence does not
support the suggestion by Hendricks or Kessell et al. The Giants Oven, a basaltic
extrusion, only encompasses a small portion of a detached portion of the mesa proper.
The topography of this detachment does not provide a viable area for a settlement and,
more importantly, there is no archaeological evidence that any settlement was present on
the portion of the mesa in question. Furthermore, if Vargas had indeed made it to this
portion of the mesa, he would have had no trouble accessing the mesa proper, given the
gentle topography. There is no archaeological evidence of a massive wall separating
these portions of the mesa proper. The confusion surrounding Vargas’s assertion that he
summitted the mesa reminds us that, although his accounts are a valuable source of
information, his description of the siege at Tunyo should be carefully examined and
checked against the archaeological evidence.

Between March 7th and 12th, Vargas made yet another attempt to take the mesa.
One of his strategies included using ladders taken from nearby pueblos to scale parts of
the mesa. This proved futile, since the loose basalt rock on the talus slopes could not
support the ladders (Kessell et al. 1998:159-161). At the time, Vargas notes that he had set up camp near the base of the mesa to keep proximity to his enemy, but the locations of this and other camps are unknown. The Tewa defenders recognized the nearness of the enemy and let out shouts, or “war cries,” throughout the nights that Vargas was camped at the base of the mesa. As a form of psychological warfare, this strategy was intended to demoralize the Spanish soldiers. Furthermore, the Tewa’s ability to climb from the mesa in the dark of night to take water from the river, slipping past Spanish guards, must surely have discouraged Vargas and emboldened the Tewa.

On March 9th, Vargas described the Pueblo defenders on the mesa as numbering “one thousand soldiers” (Kessell 1998: 149). Whatever the actual number may have been (see chapter 5 for a discussion on population estimate), it seems that Vargas may have been initially outnumbered, especially after the southern Tewa villages of San Cristobal and San Lazaro joined during this battle. On March 18th, Vargas, low on supplies and morale, recognized that the defense of the mesa by the Tewa was strong enough that he temporarily lifted the siege and retreated back to Santa Fe.

Although Vargas retreated from Tunyo in March of 1694, he did not completely give up his campaign against Black Mesa. The retreat to Santa Fe allowed him to muster up more soldiers, including a significant number of Pueblo allies from Zia, Santa Ana and

---

19 Vargas likely did not literally mean that he estimated one thousand people on the mesa. It’s more likely that he was referring to a large, exaggerated number. In another of his passages quoted above, he states that he was answered with a “million” blasphemies. This usage was quite common among colonial era Spanish speakers (Real Academia Española 1979:2:567). Vargas and his contemporaries in New Mexico frequently over-stated numbers for emotional effect, perhaps to compensate for the fact that they often realized, in the midst of conflict, that they did not enjoy a numerical advantage. Vargas admitted as much almost as soon as he arrived at the mesa. (Hendricks 2002:185)
San Felipe Pueblos (Kessell 1998:378) and additional allies from the Pecos and Jemez Pueblos. He planned to regroup and return in September.

Vargas’s retreat also afforded the Tewa at Tunyo an opportunity to gather themselves and recover from an extensive and brutal battle. During Vargas’s retreat, Tewa gained additional allies from San Lazaro and San Cristobal (Kessell et al. 1998:232). Hendricks speculates that, after these two villages joined up at Tunyo, up to “two thousand” individuals may have been on the mesa, including several hundred warriors (Hendricks 2002:191-193).

On September 4, 1694, Vargas and his allies departed Santa Fe for San Ildefonso and re-engaged the siege. Accompanying him on this military campaign were approximately 150 allies from Santa Ana, San Felipe, Zia, Pecos, and Jemez Pueblos. As with the previous battle, the Tewa held off Vargas and his troops in several skirmishes during which the Tewa shot arrows, threw hooks, and hurled stones and slabs of rock onto the invaders, while fortifying themselves behind stone ramparts. In all, approximately six Tewa defenders and two Spanish soldiers were killed, with many more wounded on each side. On September 8th, Captain Domingo from Tesuque initiated negotiations with Vargas for a cessation of hostilities, on the condition that the Tewa could return to occupy their pueblos below. The Tewa offered gifts of animal hides to Vargas, while he offered the banner of our Lady of Remedies; however, no compromise was reached. On the 9th, Domingo again came down the mesa and vowed to Vargas that they wished to spend the winter on the mesa, but Vargas insisted that he would only lift the siege if the Tewa made a full retreat. It was on this day that the Tewa came down from Tunyo and began to repair their badly damaged pueblos. The siege was then lifted
without incident, and most Tewa moved back to their villages. Some chose to take refuge with relatives in other villages, including villages as far away as Hopi.

Vargas returned to San Ildefonso on October 5 as part of his inspection tour to confirm that the Pueblos were obeying his wishes (Kessell et al 1998:410). He repeated this tour at many of the northern Rio Grande pueblos. Fray Francisco Corvera took ritual possession of the pueblo and secured the agreement of the inhabitants. Vargas then asked the people to select their candidates for governor, lieutenant governor, alcalde, assistant fiscale, and four war captains (Table 4.1). They did so and he gave the new officers canes and staffs. It is interesting that four war captains are mentioned. This account likely refers to two pairs of war captains and assistant war captains and may indicate the existence of two different social units.

Table 4.1. San Ildefonso Pueblo officers observed by Vargas on October 5, 1694 (Kessell et al. 1998:410-411).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Name</th>
<th>Official Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Hino</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Yapa</td>
<td>Lieutenant governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristobal Teca</td>
<td>Alcalde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ani.</td>
<td>Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias Vide</td>
<td>Assistant fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias Yanclegua</td>
<td>War captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Unpeguc</td>
<td>War captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo Eyogue</td>
<td>War captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias Unxe</td>
<td>War captain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early Anthropological Accounts

The first archaeologists to describe the archaeology of Tunyo were some of the most famous Southwestern archaeologists—Adolf Bandelier, Edgar Lee Hewett and H.P. Mera—but their contributions to our understanding of the archaeology of the mesa
were very limited. Considering the remarkable influence that these men had in the field of southwestern archaeology, their limited descriptions of Tunyo characterized the limited understanding of the material culture of the site up to the present time. The best early descriptions of Tunyo were provided by the linguist John P. Harrington (1916) and, prior to this study, constitutes the only substantive anthropological study of Tunyo

The first scholar to describe Tunyo is the famous Southwestern archaeologist and ethnographer, Adolph Bandelier. He was seemingly skeptical of the value of Tunyo to archaeologists when he stated:

The pueblo of San Ildefonso, or Pu-juo-ge, offers nothing of archaeological interest. . . Neither does the black mesa called Tu-yo, two miles from the village, deserve attention except from an historic standpoint. It was on this cliff that the Tehuas held out so long in 1694 against Diego de Vargas. The ruins on its summit are those of the temporary abodes constructed at that time by the Indians. On the steep side of the Tu-yo there is a cave about which some fairy and goblin stories are related, which may yet prove useful for ethnological and historic purposes. (Bandelier 1892:82)

While dismissive of Tunyo, this account is important as the first published mention of the role of Tunyo in the Pueblo resistance against Vargas’s reconquest attempt. It provides important information regarding the kind of settlement on the mesa top, characterizing it as being “temporary abodes,” an indication of Tunyo’s status as a place of refuge. Beyond this description, Bandelier offers no other interpretations and he did not produce any reports or maps.

Edgar Lee Hewett elaborated on Bandelier’s comments in a lecture originally given to the Archaeological Institute of America in 1908. He explicitly stated that the temporary abodes were “pit dwellings” and noted that the mesa was in contemporary use by the people of San Ildefonso:
In the cañon opening into the Rio Grande at this point we encounter basaltic extrusions of recent geologic time. An example of this is seen at the mesa, which rises bodily from the valley on the eastern bank of the Rio Grande just north of San Ildefonso. This is the Tuyo [sic] of the Tewa mythology, the Sacred Fire mountain on which the Indians of Pohwoge (as San Ildefonso is called by the natives) [sic] built their pit-dwellings and lived through the historic sieges of the early period of Spanish occupancy, and to which to this day they make pilgrimages and present offerings at their ancient fire shrine. (Hewett 1909:435)

Hewett’s description of the “pit dwellings” atop the mesa provides a valuable clue that this village was constructed in a different manner from that of all other Rio Grande mesa villages. These are typically masonry roomblock architecture (see Liebmann et al. 2005). The proposition of pits as habitation spaces at Tunyo is a significant feature, distinguishing it from all other mesa top villages occupied during the Revolt period.

The most detailed documentation of Tunyo comes from the linguist John Peabody Harrington. He translated the name Tunyjo as “very spotted mountain,” or “very piebald mountain” (Harrington 1916:293). He stated that “The northern cliffs of Black Mesa, especially about the cave, are marked with large greenish spots, and if “Tunjo” really meant originally ‘very spotted’ this feature may have given rise to the name” (Harrington 1916:293). Indeed, the San Ildefonso’s own understanding of the term corresponds closely with the information given by Harrington.

What distinguished Harrington’s work at Tunyo from that of Hewett and Bandelier, aside from being much more extensive, was his gathering of oral histories from his San Ildefonso informants regarding the history and use of the mesa during times of conflict:

The Tewa say that the mesa has been used as a place of refuge and defense in time of war since the earliest period. The cliffs are scalable in four places only. At one of these places are remains of an ancient wall. In historic times the San
Ildefonso Tewa were besieged on the top of this mesa by the Spaniards at the close of the Indian revolt of 1680 [sic]. (Harrington 1916:294)

He further stated that:

The San Ildefonso Indians preserve traditions of this siege. Brave Indians used to descend every night through the gap and get water from the river for the besieged people to drink. The Spaniards were afraid to come near enough to be within range of rocks and arrows. The stone wall and the ruined houses probably date from the siege of Vargas, but still older remains of walls and houses may be discoverable on the mesa. (Harrington 1916:294-5)

Harrington also gathered traditional stories related to the role of Tunyo in Tewa mythology and religion, and observed that Tunyo is said to have been “one of the four places which formerly belched forth fire and smoke. The others were Shumawakip'o, ‘Oguhewe, and Toma, according to San Ildefonso tradition” (Harrington 1916:295). This statement seems to suggest relatively recent volcanic activity, persisting in historical memory. Like Bandelier, Harrington also noted that the mesa was in current use: “The altar on top of the mesa is still perfectly preserved, and remains of offerings are to be found by it, showing that it is still used. It is said that dances were once performed on certain occasions on top of the mesa” (Harrington 1916:295).

H.P. Mera only partially documented Tunyo as part of his larger survey of Northern Rio Grande glazeware ceramics, the results of which were published in 1940. His research at Tunyo was secondary to his main interest, ceramics, and thus no substantial data was produced on the overall archaeology of the mesa. Given the narrow scope of this early research, the archaeology of Tunyo remains severely understudied, with no archaeological investigations conducted since Mera’s time.

Summary
Most of the available documentation of Tunyo is biased toward either Spanish political or American anthropological interests. Not surprisingly, Vargas’s accounts presented his actions in the best possible light. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, American anthropologists were gathering archaeological and ethnographic information for their own professional purposes; these purposes usually did not always align with the memories or concerns of Pueblo people. The main goal of scientific studies was to document the archaeological sites of the region and collect ethnological data that could be placed within an evolutionary framework of cultural progress. There was also a strong tinge of Romanticism underlying this early anthropological work; the use of Pueblo oral history was quite limited and the resultant narratives were one sided, at best. For example, Harrington wrote:

> From the top of Black Mesa one may view the whole Tewa country. It is a strange place, full of historical and mythical interest, and no visitor at San Ildefonso Pueblo should fail to take a trip to the top of the mesa in company with an Indian informant. (Harrington 1916: 295)

Yet, even with these biases and limitations, these accounts provide valuable data that can be incorporated into new understandings of the mesa and its people.

In sum, what occurred at Tunyo during the Pueblo Revolt period may be looked at as a process that manifests though a series of events. On the one hand, the colonization of the Pueblos was made manifest through the military acts of Vargas against the Pueblos. On the other hand, the resistance to Spanish authority by Pueblo people was made manifest through movements to uplands areas such as Tunyo. Through the narrative account of the siege of Tunyo we are able to gain great insights into the some of the pivotal events during the reconquest. Furthermore, we are able to see how Vargas
garnered and organized his troops as well as intelligence on the Pueblos. One of the keys to his strategy was his ability to create alliances with Pueblo allies. These conjoined processes occupy a crucial position in the histories of Pueblo people, New Mexico and the United States, as a liminal moment in colonial history. Therefore, the task of reconceptualizing the reconquest can reveal valuable insights into the social and political contexts that influenced the production of historical knowledge.
CHAPTER 5: THE TUNYO RESEARCH PROJECT

The overall goals of the Tunyo Research project are to identify and understand the social processes and strategies of resistance surrounding the founding and occupation of Tunyo during the Pueblo Revolt period, and to incorporate archaeology into San Ildefonso Pueblo’s own understandings of this sacred place. The research methods involve assessing the archaeological evidence of the Revolt period village on top of the Tunyo mesa, and documentary evaluations of the ethnographic and historical data within the context of revolt settlement patterns. The main component of the archaeological investigation is the cartographic documentation of the mesa village and its associated defensive features.

In this chapter, I offer and compare three forms of historical evidence that provide insights into the actions of Tunyo people during the Pueblo Revolt era. First, I summarize the events of Don Diego de Vargas’s military campaign against the mesa villages in 1694, relying heavily on Vargas’s own accounts. A chronological review of his military engagements at each mesa allows for a greater appreciation of the resistance strategies used by the pueblos as they faced their Spanish enemies. Second, I examine San Ildefonso oral traditions to provide a context for developing Indigenous interpretations. A comprehensive presentation of these oral traditions is not appropriate here, since some of these traditions have not yet entered public knowledge, due to traditional protocols of secrecy among Pueblo knowledge-keepers. Suffice to say that many of these traditions have been maintained since their creation - before, during, and after the Revolt Period - and they represent the voice of the San Ildefonso People, both past and present. Third, I
present the results of my archaeological investigations at Tunyo. The different classes of material culture investigated in this research (defensive features, village architecture, rock art and ceramics) are presented along with the methodologies used to collect and/or analyze them. The chapter concludes with an interpretation of the village based on a synthesis of the diverse types of data to shed light on the social processes and strategies of resistance surrounding the occupation of the mesa village during the reconquest.

**San Ildefonso Oral Historical Accounts**

This research is similar to other recent investigations of Pueblo Revolt period villages in that it integrates oral histories with ethnohistoric documents and archaeological evidence as a means of reconstructing the events that unfolded in the latter part of the period (Ferguson 1996; Preucel 2002b; Liebmann 2012; Wilcox 2009). The integration of oral traditions is, however, a recent practice. Earlier historical and archaeological treatments of the revolt have mostly overlooked or discounted oral traditions or assumed they did not exist (Weber 1999:8-9; Roberts 2004).

Pueblo oral traditions may have been overlooked or outright dismissed because they are not as valued, and not as public, as the Spanish written accounts. These traditions are maintained and disseminated differently in each pueblo and are not freely shared, even within individual communities. The only Pueblo histories that have been integrated into histories of the Pueblo Revolt are those that were shared with early anthropologists working amongst the pueblos (e.g. Harrington 1916). Long-standing oral traditions of this tumultuous period have only recently been collected by anthropologists in other Pueblos (see, for example, Preucel 2007b). These embodied local traditions, rich in situated
knowledges, can enrich our otherwise fragmented understanding of the Pueblo Revolt and Southwest history in general.

Here, I present an overview of some of the documented oral traditions maintained by San Ildefonso regarding the overall cultural significance of Tunyo, particularly as they relate to the defense of the mesa by the Tewa in 1694. Very few of these traditions have been shared outside the pueblo community. It should be noted that San Ildefonso maintains a strong connection to Tunyo that extends far beyond the brief history of their battle with Vargas. Many of the local oral traditions and sacred sites and landmarks associated with Tunyo have, therefore, been omitted from this discussion to respect the privacy of traditional Pueblos protocols. The oral traditions that are respectfully presented in this dissertation — several of which appear in print here for the first time — are those for which I have secured permission from the appropriate elders in the community.

There are, in the present day, designated knowledge-keepers who maintain the memories and oversee practices of seasonal rituals; locations of ancient trails; the ritual language for speaking of and to ancestral spirits; plants that are utilized in feasts and ceremonies. There are long-standing traditional protocols that guide appropriate behaviors when people engage with these things. These knowledges are carefully protected and mediated by Pueblo traditionalists to maintain balance without interference from outsiders and is an assertion of Pueblo sovereignty. Documentary records of such things, produced by non-Native people during the era of salvage anthropology, might
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20 Pueblo people, including San Ildefonso Pueblo, have protocols and exert control over their own Indigenous knowledges, despite the fact that both Spanish colonial-settlers and later outside researchers often refused to recognize those protocols as valid.
seem to be thorough, but they are not as reliable as the practitioners of the living traditions today. My presentation of San Ildefonso oral histories is only a partial vision of what lived Pueblo sovereignty looks like on the ground today.

**Oral Histories of the 1694 Defense of Tunyo**

While many of the events that unfolded during the occupation of Tunyo in 1694 have been well documented in Spanish records, the direct voices of Pueblo people are absent from these narratives. The Pueblo voice only emerges in the documentary record under duress, often in the form of prisoner statements or assertions made during hostile negotiations. Thus, the Pueblo voice has long been filtered through the eyes and minds of those who created the colonial settler records. Pueblo oral traditions are exceptional additions to our historical understandings of the revolt, primarily because they are free from the colonial biases that pervade the Spanish documentary record.

The oral traditions that have been maintained by the people of San Ildefonso Pueblo, including those recorded in the ethnographic and historical records, provide a wealth of valuable information in reconstructing the events of the Pueblo Revolt and the folklore of Tunyo. The mesa itself figures prominently in many San Ildefonso traditional stories. The most well-known story associated with Tunyo is the story of the mythical giant, the Tsaviyo (Figure 5.1). A short version of the story was collected by Harrington (1916:295).

In the spring of 2019, a heretofore unpublished story of the Tsaviyo was shared with me about in the Tewa language by Martin Aguilar, a traditional San Ildefonso elder. I have transcribed a portion of that story into English, as follows:
Figure 5.1: Awa Tsireh (San Ildefonso Pueblo), The Giant of the Black Mesa [Tsaviyo], ca. 1920–1930, watercolor and pencil on paper, Smithsonian American Art Museum, Corbin-Henderson Collection, gift of Alice H. Rossin, 1979.144.6
The mesa contains a cave (volcanic vent) on the north side, facing Santa Clara Pueblo. This cave is said to be the entry to the belly of the mesa where the Tsaviyo is said to live (Figure 5.2). He would often sit atop Tunyo, surveying the surrounding landscape and other Tewa villages. He could see all of San Ildefonso, Santa Clara and as far as Nambe and Tesuque Pueblos. Sitting atop Tunyo, he could hear when children were bad, disobeying or not listening to their parents.

Upon learning of the misbehaved children, he would go to the Pueblo to collect them. He is said to be so large that it takes him only four steps to reach San Ildefonso. Once he retrieves the children, he would place them in his sack, and take them to his home in the mesa. As punishment for their misdeeds, he would eat them, but not before baking them in one of his two ovens (large basaltic extrusions on the mesa).

The Tsaviyo generally terrorized the people of San Ildefonso, filling them with fear that their children are not safe. Until one day they had enough. The leaders of the pueblo called for a meeting and the matter of the Tsaviyo was brought to the War Captain. The War Captain and his staff made a request to the Twin Warriors to handle the giant, as they are the only ones capable of defeating such an imposing enemy. The Twin Warriors accepted the request made to them by the people and prayed for a few days before fighting the giant, asking that they would be successful.

On the last day of their prayers, the Twin Warriors set out to kill the giant, with their bows and arrows. During the epic battle at Tunyo, the Twins were captured by the giant and placed into his ovens. However, they were able to escape and kill the giant. Many parts of his body are now said to be scattered across mesa, including his heart and penis. After the battle, the Tewa people could live without fear of the giant returning to take their children, thanks to the actions of the Twin Warriors. (Martin Aguilar, personal communication, 2019)

While the Tsaviyo no longer terrorizes the Tewa people in the same manner that he did before he was killed by the Twin Warriors, the story still instills fear into the minds of Tewa children, and they are forbidden to go Tunyo for any reason.

In conversations with other traditional people at San Ildefonso, I have learned that the siege at Tunyo is sometimes likened to the epic battle between the Twin Warriors and the Tsaviyo. According to oral tradition, when the Tewa were besieged at Tunyo, they sought the strength and protection of the Twin Warriors in the battle against their own
Figure 5.2: Tsaviyo’s home at Tunyo. Cave entrance (top) to his home, and the inside of his abode with smoking oven (bottom). Drawing by Martin Aguilar.

metaphorical cannibal giant, not Tsaviyo, but Vargas. Just as the Twin Warriors slayed the Tsaviyo, the spirit of the Twins helped the Tewa fight against Vargas. From this perspective, it seems appropriate that rain and snow storms prevented Vargas from scaling the mesa at times, since prayers for the assistance of the Twin Warriors are said to
bring precipitation. Pueblo people saw Vargas as an incarnation of a force that they had faced in the past – in a literal or metaphorical cannibal – and they enlisted other supernatural beings for aid, just as they had done in the past, and in some cases, asked humans – war captains – to embody the traits of those other-than-human beings.

Very few documented oral histories of the siege at Tunyo exist. However, several San Ildefonso accounts about specific episodes of the siege were collected by Harrington as part of his larger ethnographic study of the Tewa (1916:294-298). The oral traditions regarding Tunyo include descriptions of the village atop the mesa:

Somewhat north and east of the center of the surface of the mesa the walls and rooms of former houses or shelters can be traced as low ridges and mounds. The Indians say that the top of Black Mesa was never inhabited except temporarily in times of war. (Harrington 1916:297)

Other San Ildefonso accounts that Harrington collected include references to the defensive features used during the siege at Tunyo in 1694:

The Tewa say that the mesa has been used as a place of refuge and defense in time of war since the earliest period. The cliffs are scalable in four places only… At one of these places are remains of an ancient wall. In historic times the San Ildefonso Tewa were besieged on the top of this mesa by the Spaniards at the close of the Indian revolt of 1680.

The Spaniards were afraid to come near enough to be within range of rocks and arrows. The stone wall and the ruined houses probably date from the siege of Vargas, but still older remains of walls and houses may be discoverable on the mesa.” (Harrington 1916:294-295)

Another memory recounts the bravery of the Tewa warriors who traversed a crevasse in the cliff face to sneak past Vargas’s camp to collect water from the Rio Grande during the siege:

It is said that through this gap a brave young Tewa went down to the river to get water at night when the San Ildefonso people were besieged by Vargas on top of
the mesa in 1694. It is at present difficult to get up or down through this cleft. (Harrington 1916:294)

Further research on oral histories of the siege is needed, however, and could potentially be collected from the modern Tewa Pueblos under the appropriate conditions. For example, a well-documented oral record of the siege at Kotyiti among Cochiti has been preserved (Preucel 2002:7-9); this could serve as a model for collecting oral histories elsewhere. The Pueblo communities that formed alliances with the Spanish are very likely to have maintained oral historical accounts of their experiences as well. Given the number of different Pueblos and the complexities of their individual strategies, future research on documenting these possible oral histories would prove to be a large task.

**Archaeological Survey of Defensive Features**

The first phase of my archaeological research focused on documenting the defensive features located along the perimeter of the mesa that were used as part of a defensive strategy against the Spaniards (Figure 5.3). Archaeological evidence related directly to the siege of Tunyo in 1694 is abundant at the mesa. Defensive fortifications were constructed (presumably in preparation for the 1694 battle) along the southern and eastern extents of the mesa, as well as along its northeast side. These fortifications consist of linear arrangements of unshaped basalt slabs stacked as high as 1.5 m in places. Similar fortifications have been reported at the Revolt period villages of Kotyiti (Preucel 1998), Astialakwa (Liebman 2006, 2012; Wilcox 2009), and Dowa Yalanne (Ferguson 1996).

Furthermore, piles of fist-sized river rolled quartz cobbles were recorded at locales along the most accessible portions of the mesa. This includes the two
most well-known trails leading up to the mesa, as well as at sites directly behind several of the fortifications on the southeastern portion of the mesa. These piles of stones served as stores of ammunition for the slings of Pueblo warriors during their battles with the reconquering forces. While recounting his engagements with the Tewa on Tunyo, Vargas remarked on the effectiveness of this military tactic:

The danger to the men of being killed was great because this place is so impregnable. The mesa was completely rocky and covered with boulders and the enemy so well prepared that they had many rocks from the river to bombard us, hurling them with slings. Most of the people also shot many arrows and some threw hooks at the men. I, the governor and captain general, returned from this my outpost, leaving in it the maestro de campo charged with continuing the bombardment. This was not only because there were so many Indians, but also because some of them were protected by rock ramparts and had the audacity to come down as far as the slope. (Kessell et al. 1998:150)

These piles are the physical remnants of these tactics. Their locations at every site where the mesa is accessible indicates that the inhabitants of the Tunyo anticipated Vargas’s military strategy of ascending the most easily accessible topography of the mesa. It can be inferred that Pueblo people spent considerable effort in collecting and caching these rocks where they would be most needed, and left the unused piles behind when they evacuated the mesa top.

The rock ramparts consist of stacked courses of roughly shaped and unshaped basalt rock (Figure 5.4). These alignments range from one to seven courses high and range from less than 1 meter to no more than 1.5 meter in height. The lengths of these alignments range from less than 1 meter up to 10 meters, although it appears that some segments have eroded away and may have been longer. Furthermore, some alignments may have been connected to others, making some even longer still. The alignments are
straight or curvilinear, while in some instances, alignments are aligned with the topography of the mesa edge.

![Figure 5.3: Defensive fortification blocking access to Tunyo.](Image)

*Photo by Joseph Aguilar*

Most of the rock caches (ammunition stones) consist of piles of river-rolled quartz cobbles (Figure 5.5), but at least two are composed of basalt slabs. All of these caches, like the wall segments, occur along the perimeter of the mesa, and in some instances, they are located directly behind and/or adjacent to the rock alignments, implying they were utilized simultaneously. The number of individual cobbles within each cache varies. Some contain no more than thirty cobbles, while others contain hundreds. Some caches are small dense aggregations of cobbles (less than 1 meter in diameter), and others are distributed over a relatively larger area (up to four meters in diameter). The diameter of
individual cobbles within these caches also varies from approximately 3 cm to 10 cm. Most of these cobbles are roughly fist-sized.

Figure 5.4: Ammunition cache located on the extreme eastern perimeter of Tunyo. Photo by Joseph Aguilar.

Geologists from Los Alamos National Laboratory and Glorieta Geoscience, Inc. have identified a stratigraphic layer of river gravels, approximately 10 meters thick, that caps the mesa (Steve Reneau and Paul Drakos, personal communication, 2017). The gravel cap is the preserved remnants of an ancient riverbed, of which the summit of
Tunyo once served as the bed bottom. This cap has been remarkably preserved atop the hard basalt of Tunyo (see Chapter 4), leaving behind a naturally abundant source of ammunition stones. Because these stones naturally occur on the mesa, the distinction between natural features and cultural features presents a challenge. However, close inspection of the spatial distribution of these features and their physical composition clearly indicates that they are culturally modified natural phenomena, interpreted to be collected and utilized as a defensive mechanism in the defense of Tunyo during the siege of 1694.

Preliminary surveys have identified forty-three rock caches and thirteen stone fortifications on the perimeter of Tunyo (Figure 5.5). The spatial distribution of these features shows that both types — rock caches and rock alignments — occur only on areas of the mesa where the topography allows for access by foot near to known trails. The topography of the mesa may lend some explanation to this irregular distribution along the perimeter. Where the topography of the mesa is at its steepest on the western side of the mesa, and where cliff walls are at least 60 m (~200 ft) high, neither of these feature types is present, since the topography acts as a natural defense. There are instances where rock caches do occur at relatively steep portions of the mesa; however, these are points where lesser known trails traverse the mesa top. Most of these feature types are spatially distributed near or along areas where the topography of the mesa is significantly less steep, relatively accessible, and where known trails traversing the mesa top exist.
Figure 5.5: Map of ammunition caches and fortifications (with trails).

Drone Mapping

In October 2015, I collaborated with Chet Walker and Mark Willis of Archaeo-Geophysical Associates (AGA), LLC, an archaeological consulting firm that specializes in archaeological geophysics, in a mapping project at Tunyo. Formal permission to access the site and operate drones over Pueblo lands was obtained in advance from the Pueblo of San Ildefonso Governor and Tribal Council on October 29, 2014.21 Walker (Principal of AGA) and Willis (AGA Associate) and I conducted an aerial photography survey of the

21 Permission to conduct this research was granted through a formal approval process with the San Ildefonso Tribal Council, and separate permission was granted through the traditional leadership of the Pueblo. This process was undertaken prior to the establishment of the THPO, however, a set of protocols established by the Tribal Council were adhered to. Those protocols (and current ones established by the THPO) distinguishes modern-day archaeological practice on tribal lands from salvage archaeology, when, even if Indigenous protocols existed, they were ignored by non-Native scientists.
mesa and the surrounding landscape using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), more commonly referred to as drones.

AGA focuses on large-scale landscape surveys using survey grade GPS systems and robotic total stations, allowing large areas to be rapidly surveyed at a high degree of precision. A total area of approximately 10 km² was surveyed. The purpose of the work was to collect micro-topographical and three-dimensional data of Tunyo and the surrounding landscape. We produced high-resolution images and digital terrain models (DTMs) of Tunyo based on the aerial surveys. These data aid in our fundamental understanding of the overall settlement layout and architecture on Tunyo (Figure 5.7 and Appendix C).

Equipment and Methodology

AGA used a Skywalker, ready-to-deploy light-weight UAV, weighing 1,300 grams, with a wing span of 180 cm. This unit has an on-board system comprising a Ricoh 16.2-megapixel digital camera, a GPS, and a radio receiver, which is controlled by a ground-based computer (semi-rugged laptop) via a 2.4GHz radio modem for data transfer. In addition to the Skywalker, aerial mapping was augmented with a 3DRobitics X8+ multirotor helicopter. The X8+ is also a safe and lightweight machine that also carries a Ricoh GR camera. The X8+, which is made of carbon fiber and plastic, measures 60cm in diameter and weighs 2,500 grams. The X8+ is best suited for short range, very low altitude missions.

The UAVs, all peripherals, and the ground-based computer can be stored in a single carrying case. Flyovers of Tunyo included multiple, overlapping passes at different elevations not exceeding the altitude ceiling set by the FAA and the Academy of Model
Aeronautics for recreational remote-control aircraft. To create high-resolution maps of Tunyo, the goal was to generate a very dense digital terrain model (DTM) and to provide stereo images for highly detailed architectural mapping and mound volume measurements (if necessary).

The first stage of data acquisition was accomplished through a digital process called photogrammetry. Photogrammetry extracts 3D data from a series of overlapping stereopair images, very much like a pair of human eyes. One image is photographed from a “right-eye” perspective and another from the “left-eye” with approximately 70 percent overlap between the two. Computer software compares the overlapping area from the photographs and then recreates the topography of the region.

Traditional photogrammetry requires fairly rigid control over the way photographs are taken. The spatial relationship between the photographs also must be known. In order to achieve this, the camera mounted UAV is programmed with a flight pattern that uses a fore-and-aft overlap of 70 percent to minimize the influence of wind and to guarantee 100 percent stereo overlap for the area of interest. Spatial controls are established by six control points marked with aerial photo targets placed across Tunyo prior to flight.

After the flyovers were completed, ground control points (GCPs) were recorded using a X90 OPUS static GPS receiver. The GCPs serve to geo-rectify the digital images, establishing the precise location of the imagery to within +/- 10 centimeters under most conditions. The output includes a series of digital photographs that are processed using commercial photo-merging software. The software merges individual photographs by common points relative to the location of the camera.
The software then uses the estimated camera positions with the tiled images to derive a 3D polygonal mesh of the ground surface. It ortho-rectifies the image series to establish a uniform scale, remove any distortion and produce digital orthophotos and DTMs that can be used in any GIS (Global Information System) or 3D mapping software. The most user-friendly interface to view the DTMs and create maps is Google Earth.

The benefits of drone mapping at Tunyo were significant. Under optimal conditions, we were able to collect a large amount of high-resolution data in a fraction of the time it would have typically taken to collect these data using traditional archaeological survey methods. Moreover, drones collected data from above the ground surface, making the impacts on Tunyo virtually nonexistent. This methodology was preferred by the Pueblo as the physical impact to Tunyo and San Ildefonso Pueblo’s heritage resources was minimized, which is in line with the Pueblo’s values and the THPO Heritage Management Plan. Further, the results achieved using drones can aid in the long-term management and potential research of Tunyo, since the drone data provides a baseline assessment of the heritage resources that can be used by the Pueblo in the future.

Drone Mapping Results

The goal of the drone mapping project is to produce high-resolution images and models of Tunyo as a means of aiding in the basic understanding of the archaeology of the mesa, and the settlement on its summit. Data was processed at the AGA GIS Laboratory. Deliverables presented included: georeferenced orthogonal photos, DTMs, and shapefile-based hypsography. A total of 7,552 photos were taken, however, not all were used in the orthophoto or DTM production. All GIS data will be stored on AGA
servers for seven years. Data stored by AGA is secure and propriety to the Pueblo of San Ildefonso.

Preliminary findings of the UAV mapping show that the architecture at Tunyo is distinct from other Revolt period mesa villages. There appear to be few visible formal architectural elements and there is no formal dual-plaza structure, as seen at the other mesa-top villages such as Kotyiti, Patokwa, and Boletsakwa, which have been interpreted as evidence of a moiety social organization (Liebmnn 2012; Preucel et al. 2002; Wilcox 2009). Instead, the analysis of three-dimensional models of the architecture reveals clusters of shallow pits and mounds scattered across the mesa (Figure 5.6). This informal construction may be consistent with the fact that the move to Tunyo happened quickly, and involved multiple social groups from different pueblos in response to Vargas’s military campaign against the Pueblos. The total distribution of the pits and mounds covers an area of about 4.01 acres (16,250 square meters) or 174,913.54 square feet. In terms of the total area of distribution of architectural elements, Tunyo is relatively large when compared to the other Revolt period villages (Table 5.1).

Tunyo’s geological history provides an important context for understanding the nature of the settlement. The mesa is capped with the remnants of an ancient riverbed, consisting of loose quartzite cobbles, river gravels and silts. The soil composition is not particularly suitable for the construction of mud mortar and masonry wall construction. It is better suited for the excavation of shallow pits that, when topped with a temporary superstructure could provide the temporary habitation space needed during the winter of 1694. This expedient architecture is in line with San Ildefonso oral traditions that assert that Tunyo was only temporarily occupied in times of war.
Figure 5.6: Digital Terrain Model (DTM) illustrating extent of Tunyo village.

Table 5.1: Total area (in square meters) of Pueblo Revolt period mesa villages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mesa Village</th>
<th>Tunyo</th>
<th>Kotyiti</th>
<th>Patakwa</th>
<th>Boletsakwa</th>
<th>Cerro Colorado</th>
<th>Astialakwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Area in Sq. Meters</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>9,047</td>
<td>9,047</td>
<td>6,891</td>
<td>12,682</td>
<td>42,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no historical descriptions of this village in print, because Vargas never summited the mesa during his siege in 1694. The fact that it was built to house people from multiple Tewa villages suggests that it would have involved planning and coordination by several Pueblo leaders, to accommodate people from multiple villages. Vargas mentions that he observed 1,000 people defending the mesa, although, as Hendricks (2002:185) has noted, there is some debate about this. It seems likely that the
topography of the mesa and the defensive features helped to secure this defensive position rather than the form of the village itself. A similar conclusion has been drawn at the refugee community of Dowa Yalanne near Zuni, where it has been shown that the mesa itself, and not the architecture of the village, provided defensibility (Ferguson 1996a:119).

A total of one hundred and fourteen “pit rooms” are identifiable in the village (Figure 5.7). These pits are the result of manually excavated soils to create living spaces. The excavated soils were deliberately piled into mounds to create berms that surrounded and supported a shallow pit formation used as habitation spaces. The pits and resulting mounds are now so highly eroded that the loosely packed river gravels are prone to slumping if not maintained.

Figure 5.7: Tunyo Village layout with identifiable pit architecture.
Because Tunyo was only ever occupied temporarily in times of war, these living spaces have not been maintained by the descendants of those who lived in them. The pits likely saw their last use during the 1694 siege and have long since eroded into their present state. The mounds themselves do not constitute living spaces, but the space created by digging them, and the spaces, or pits, between mounds, likely served as habitation spaces at the village.

![Figure 5.8: Closeup of mound and pit architecture.](image)

The ambiguity of the mounds and pits that comprise the village presents an interesting challenge in identifying either individual “pit rooms” or aggregate living spaces (Figure 5.8). This makes it difficult to estimate population size because traditional models cannot be applied to the village architecture of Tunyo. There appears to be no

---

22 Maximum population estimates for other Revolt Period Villages have been calculated by dividing total room number by 0.6 people per room (Liebmann 2012, 93).
clear indication that “roomblocks” or, in this case, “pit blocks” exist at the village. Tunyo is the only non-masonry mesa village occupied during the Pueblo Revolt Period. The mounds and pits seem to comprise what can best be described as informal, semi-subterranean pit structures that likely had an improvised superstructure to protect from the elements.

**Rock Art Survey**

I also conducted a pilot rock art survey on and around the mesa with Richard Ford and Robert Preucel, to determine how Pueblo people interacted with this sacred place. The purpose of the survey was to identify the nature and viability of rock art at Tunyo which, until this study, had never been documented. While a rigorous research and survey design was not utilized for this phase of the project, we hope that the data gathered will be helpful in forming the basis for future rock art surveys at Tunyo.

The survey procedure involved examining areas of high rock art potential, particularly the mesa top, the talus slopes, and the main trail. A total of 23 individual rock art panels were recorded. A majority of the rock art we observed closely conforms to the "Rio Grande style" rock art as defined by Schaafsma (1992). The panels observed also appear to date to different time periods spanning the Archaic, Coalition, Classic, and the Historic periods of archaeological timeframes.

The oldest rock art appears to be a panel incised on an upright rock outcrop adjacent to the feature known as Giant's Oven. The images on the panel consist of amorphous like images – geometric and wavy lined designs. This panel is heavily eroded and may date to Archaic period (5500BC - AD 600).
I also identified a group of tipis and arrows located on the outward face of the Giant’s Oven. These were incised into the rock face, probably with a metal tool such as a knife, and are difficult to access. Somewhat similar tipi shapes have been reported by Fowles et al. (2017) at the Vista Verde site in the Taos area, and are interpreted as Comanche rock art. These clearly date to a more recent period and potentially the time of the Pueblo Revolt. If the latter, they may indicate a previously undocumented association between the Tewa and the Comanche. Following the narrative interpretations of Comanche rock art (Fowles et al. 2017), this panel suggests arrows were being shot down at enemies below the mesa.

I identified three abstract faces pecked into the rocks at the western base of the mesa. For example, one panel (Figure 5.9) located on the main trail of Tunyo consists of a face with three triangle tipped eagle feathers. This image is clearly similar to the famous Classic period (AD 1325 – 1600) “capitan” figure (Kidder and Shepard 1936), but the form of the eagle feathers likely dates it to the a more recent period. Other panels include “star faced” beings that are similar to depictions have been described as associated with warfare (Schaaafsma 2000). Another panel is a simple rendering of a face which just an outline plus eyes and a mouth. It is very similar to faces carved into the cliffs above the talus villages in Frijoles Canyon at Bandelier National Monument (Rohn 1989).

I emphasize the fact that this pilot rock art survey was only preliminary; an additional, comprehensive survey would undoubtedly produce a much more robust understanding of rock art at Tunyo, and of the temporal span of occupation before, during and after the Pueblo Revolt era. At the request of the THPO office, photos of the
individual rock art panels are not presented in this dissertation, but are archived with the pueblo. The rock art identified and recorded in this study can provide a baseline from which San Ildefonso can plan future rock art assessments. This study clearly demonstrates the range and diversity of rock art that exists at Tunyo, representing the cultural diversity of Indigenous people who, over an expansive period of time, inscribed meaning onto the Tunyo landscape.

Figure 5.9: Panel – 3 “capitan” style rock art panel.
Ceramic Analysis

The dominant Tewa ceramic types dating to the Revolt period have been documented by numerous archaeologists. Wilson (2007) has provided a useful review that serves as the basis for the following descriptions.

_Tewa Red (also called Posuge Red) (AD 1625-1920):_ Vessels have a highly polished red slip. This is the same as Kapo Black, except the iron rich slip is fired in an oxidizing atmosphere to produce a red vessel. No decorative designs. Mera (1939) and Harlow (1973) describe this type.

_Tewa Polychrome (AD 1650-1750):_ Large areas of these vessels’ surfaces are red slipped. Bowls are painted on the red slipped or unslipped interiors. On decorated exterior surfaces, white slip is applied over red slip. Designs resemble Sankawi, except for the presence of single, instead of Sankawi’s double, framing lines. Rim lips often have dots or slashes. Bowls have sharp inflection points; jars have a protruding “spare tire” around their midsections. Jars are the more common form. Jars have a red slipped neck and are decorated on the “spare tire” and occasionally, just below the rim. Mera (1932), Mera (1939), Harlow (1973) and Frank and Harlow (1974) describe this type.

_Kapo Gray (AD 1650-1920):_ This type can be distinguished from Plain Black by its highly polished surfaces, tuff temper, finer and more homogenous paste and harder, thinner walls. It is the same as Tewa Red (Posuge Red) except it has been fired in a reducing atmosphere. This classification should be assigned when high polish and tuff temper are present. The type was abundant from 1650 to 1760 (McKenna and Miles1996).

_Pojoaque Polychrome (AD 1720-1760):_ This is a transitional type distinguished from Tewa Polychrome by the narrow band of red slip below the white band at the bulge. This band does not extend to the base. Jar forms are wider and rounder than Tewa Polychrome jars. Mera (1939), Harlow (1973), Frank & Harlow (1974) and Dittert & Plog (1980) describe this type.

H. P. Mera visited Tunyo as part of his regional survey of the glaze paint sites in the northern Rio Grande district, and made a surface collection. His objectives were to determine the relationships between the “prehistoric” and “historic” pueblos, and to examine changes in the distribution of Pueblo populations over time. The “Mera card” at
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the New Mexico Museum of Indian Arts and Culture, Laboratory of Anthropology provides more specific information on the ceramic assemblage at Tunyo (Table 5.2).

Table 5.2: Tunyo pottery counts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type</th>
<th>Mera Survey</th>
<th>2009 Survey</th>
<th>2012 Survey</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Painted Wares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Mesa black on white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe B/W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewa Polychrome</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque Polychrome</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewa Red</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewa White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polished Tan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polished Brown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red (painted)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapo Grey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotyiti Polychrome</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified green glaze</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Wares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smearred corrugated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washboard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micaceous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micaceous washboard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish Wares</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majolica (Blue and white)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mera recorded the following types of painted ceramic types at Tunyo: Red Mesa Black-on-white, Santa Fe Black-on-white, Tewa Polychrome, Pojoaque Polychrome, Tewa Red, Tewa White, Polished Tan, Polished Brown, Red (painted), Kapo Grey, Kotyiti Polychrome (Glaze F), Orange, and unidentified green and white wares. The utility wares he records are: smeared corrugated, washboard corrugated, micaceous, micaceous washboard, and unidentified plainware.
This assemblage clearly indicates multiple periods of use at Tunyo from the 1100s to the Pueblo Revolt Period. The Red Mesa Black on White is evidence for a Late Developmental/Early Coalition use of the mesa, as speculated by Bandelier (1982) and Harrington (1916). The Tewa Polychrome, Polished Red, and micaceous pottery are strong indicators of the Revolt Period occupation.

I also conducted pilot ceramic surveys on the mesa in 2009 and 2012 on the mesa summit in the immediate vicinity of the village. The purpose of the survey was to identify observable ceramics at Tunyo which have only been briefly documented by Mera (see above). While a rigorous research and survey design was not utilized for this phase of the project, we hope that the data gathered will be helpful in forming the basis for ceramic and artifact surveys at Tunyo. The survey procedure involved examining areas of high ceramic potential, particularly the vicinity of the village. A total of 25 individual ceramic sherds were recorded. The dominant ceramic type consisted of Tewa Red and Pojoaque Polychrome. Also present was Kotyiti Glaze Polychrome, a tradeware manufactured in the Keres district and possibly indicating ties to Cochiti. One piece of Spanish majolica was recorded. This indicates that Spanish material culture continued to be used after the revolt. This observable material record noted during this pilot study is consistent with Mera's findings and provides the primary temporal evidence for the Pueblo Revolt occupation of Tunyo.

The Tunyo ceramic assemblage is extremely low density. This may be because the mesa was a popular spot for Santa Fe tourists to picnic, and they likely collected any artifacts that they saw (Harrington 1916:295). The low density of ceramics may also be attributed to the fact that Tunyo was occupied in haste, and that the occupation was
defined by intense conflict, leaving little time to relocate. The sparse material record may reflect the possibility that few ceramics or other belongings were brought up to the village. However, the ceramics identified and recorded in-field provide a baseline from which future studies can begin. There is clearly evidence of a Pueblo Revolt period occupation, based on the dominant Tewa ceramic types.

**The Ancestral Villages of Navawi and Nake’muu**

In all of Vargas’ extensive accounts of the whereabouts of the Pueblo people during his campaign against the mesa villages in 1694, he seemed to be unaware that some Tewa took refuge on the Pajarito Plateau at their ancestral village of Nake’muu. Oral tradition records the journey of women and children from Powhoge to Navawi and then up the canyons to Nake’muu (Vierra 2003:12). These villages were important locations during the reconquest period that provided safe locations for the most vulnerable of the Tewa population, away from the violence of the mesa villages (Figure 5.10). They remain important places for the people of San Ildefonso today and are visited regularly by tribal members. However, these villages remain poorly understood in the context of their Revolt period occupation because they have been overlooked by archaeologists who’s focus has been the mesa villages.

Navawi is remembered by San Ildefonso people as a stopping place where people would temporarily stay in the cavates located on the cliff face below the mesa on their journey to Nake’muu. There is no indication from oral histories that the village proper was ever reconstructed or reoccupied and an inspection of the physical condition of the village confirms this, as no standing walls or ceramics dating the Revolt period have been
observed at the village. Navawi remains an important place on for the Pueblo of San Ildefonso today and is regularly visited by tribal members throughout the year.

Figure 5.10: Locations of Navawi and Nake’muu. Map based on Aguilar and Preucel (2019: Figure 6.1)
Nake’muu is a small plaza pueblo originally occupied between 1275–1325 A.D., containing at least fifty-five ground-floor rooms distributed in four room blocks (Figure 5.3). A close inspection of the wall construction sequence indicates that two separate linear room blocks were initially built. Sometime later, a series of lateral northern and southern room blocks were added, enclosing a central plaza. The outside doorways were subsequently sealed, and the focus of the pueblo became the central plaza area (Vierra 2003:3). The walls are constructed of shaped tuff blocks quarried from the local bedrock and held together by adobe mortar. One possible explanation for excellent condition of the walls is that the roofs may have been repaired during the Pueblo Revolt Period occupation.

This explanation for the preservation of the walls at Nake’muu corresponds with oral traditions that the most vulnerable of the Tewa population – elderly, women and children – sought refuge at Navawi and at Nake’muu. These ancestral villages were far away from the violence seen at Tunyo during the siege. Vargas unwittingly received intelligence about these types of places away from Tunyo, but he did not follow up on this information. For example, Vargas recorded a statement taken from an unnamed Cienega prisoner:

He said he was from Cienega, lived in Tesuque Pueblo, and was a Tewa. He said he had come to this pueblo for maize, because he was on the little mesa opposite San Ildefonso Pueblo, since his brothers were there. Half the people from Santa Clara, San Ildefonso, Jacona, Cuyamungue, and Pojoaque are on it. The other half of the people from these pueblos are on another mesa opposite San Ildefonso. On the west bank of the river there is a little spring. The soil is white and there are some caves. (Kessell et al. 1998:134)

While we cannot be certain that the other mesa opposite San Ildefonso where half of the people are located describes Nake’muu, what is certain is that a proportionately large
number of people (half, according to the prisoner statement) are on another mesa that is not Tunyo. The Cienega prisoner mentions that the place he speaks of has “white soil and some caves. This description fits the highly eroded Bandelier Tuff that comprises the white soils at Navawi. Further, a series of cavates are present on the low-lying cliffs of the mesa on which the village is located.

Traditional knowledge about these sacred places has been passed down at San Ildefonso Pueblo through oral traditions and visits to these villages by tribal members. The Tewa are intimately familiar with their traditional landscape, and that is evident in the fact their landscape is an inextricable part of many of their oral histories. These oral traditions stand as strong testimony to the links between the recent and deeper pasts and their role in shaping notions of the sacred.

**Interpretation**

Results of the UAV mapping have shown that the architecture at Tunyo is distinct from that of the other Revolt period mesa villages. There is no formal dual plaza structure, as seen at the other mesatop villages such as Hanat Kotyiti, Patokwa, and Boletsakwa, which has been interpreted as evidence of a moiety social organization (Liebmann et al. 2005). Instead, the analysis of 3D models of the architecture reveals clusters of shallow pits with stone footings, some in linear alignments, scattered across the mesa. This informal construction may be consistent with the fact that the mobilization to Tunyo happened quickly, involving multiple social groups from different pueblos, in response to Vargas’s military campaign against the pueblos.

Interestingly, it has been suggested in other areas in the Tewa region that similar pits acted as habitation spaces. John Beal (1987) has suggested that pits in the Chama
region of Northern New Mexico possibly were pithouse remnants. An alternate suggestion is that the pits identified at the village of Tunyo are actually “barrow pits,” or manually excavated pits used to harvest precipitation. An alternate suggestion is that the pits are actually “barrow pits,” or manually excavated pits used to harvest precipitation. These pits have been described by Ansheutz (1998, 2007) and lends to an interpretation that the Tunyo pits were agricultural in nature. It may be significant that the Tewa people used similar pit excavations or “dugouts” in the construction of their gravel mulch fields (Bandelier 1892:46).

The suggestion that similar pits have been identified as being part of an agricultural system lends to an interpretation that the pits on the summit of Tunyo may have been used in multiple ways. The expediency of their construction and their informal architectural characteristics suggest that the Tewa living on Tunyo may have adapted a familiar agricultural technology, such as barrow pits, to function as living spaces. The Tewa were intimately familiar with this type of structure. In fact, several of these agricultural, or barrow pits, are located northeast of Tunyo on the terraces below the mesa and they appear to be unique to the San Ildefonso area (Camilli et al. 2012:31).

Ethnographic evidence documents the Hopi departure of Oraibi in the early years of the twentieth century to found Bacavi, where they built shallow pit rooms for temporary habitation (Whitely 1988). Other examples from Hopi include hogan-like brush structures that the Hopis constructed as temporary shelters in 1906, following the Oraybi split, in the camp that would develop into the village of Hotvela (Dockstader 1979:531). These include one type of structure the Hopis refer to as *homoki*, defined as “a large circular structure with a pointed center (Hopi Dictionary Project 1998:92). The
etymology of the word homoki refers to a “mound house,” which accurately describes the shape of the wooden superstructure. It is reasonable to surmise that the ancestors of the Hopis also used homoki or other wooden structures and ramadas in earlier centuries, when they first migrated to the Hopi Mesas and needed temporary shelter while they awaited acceptance into a village (Ferguson, personal communication).

Perhaps the use of pit structures by Pueblo people in the later period much more common than we might think. The use of pits for temporary housing and as agricultural features resonates thoroughly with the results of this research, and in fact resonates with oral traditions at San Ildefonso Pueblo that describe people living in “little holes” on the top of Tunyo during their defense of the mesa in 1694.

Pueblo metaphors often draw analogies between houses, people and plants and perhaps what we are seeing on top of Tunyo are traces of all of these things. It is possible that some depressions were temporarily used as homes, and then plants over time.

Perhaps the process of creating pits atop Tunyo through excavation of the soils was even more important than the depressions created. Given the relationship between homes and agriculture, and planting and emergence of people and pants from the ground, such as Scott Ortman (2012) has discussed, the pit features likely embed multiple layers of reference--and reverence--that are all part of a Tewa material and spiritual resistance to Spanish authority.

We should view Pueblo places, and placemaking, as a kind of ceremonial practice, leaving the material record that this research is documenting as much more than the sums of their physical patterns. A liturgical order patterns human action, aspects of which archaeologists can begin to observe in the material record (Rappaport 1999).
Following this view, archaeologists cannot observe the specific meanings and content of the ritual activity that informed and created the observable patterns that we see in the material record.

If the Tewa simply needed to seek refuge from the Spanish during the time of the Pueblo Revolt, it seems that they could have sought refuge in a number of places that would have been just as effective as Tunyo as part of their resistance strategy. Instead, a contingent of Tewa deliberately took refuge at Tunyo with the knowledge that Vargas would immediately know where to find them. The Tewa were thus confident that Tunyo was defensible, and prepared it to be one of the most defensible mesas in the region.
CHAPTER 6: RESISTANCE IN THE TEWA HOMELAND

The Tewa people resisted Spanish authority using a variety of strategies. They fought against the Spaniards during the siege of Santa Fe and during the Spanish retaliatory attacks against the mesas. They negotiated with the Spaniards, often trying to secure additional time in the parleys so that Pueblo reinforcements would have time to join them. They adopted a range of mobility practices, included establishing mountain camps and taking refuge with relatives at different mesa villages. In each case, these decisions were made after deliberate consideration, and their success is one of the reasons that Pueblo people have survived to this day.

Adopting a place-based, Indigenous approach combining oral, ethnohistorical and archaeological data, I have located Tunyo specifically, and the Rio Grande mesa villages more generally, at the center of my investigations. I am particularly interested in tracing out the movements of people to and from these villages as a means of understanding mobility strategies, Indigenous acts of diplomacy, and the forging of political alliances. I also seek to humanize the Pueblo Revolt period by identifying some of the Pueblo actors and highlighting their agency, both within the context of the mesa village landscape and during negotiations with the Spanish during this tumultuous time.

In this chapter, I provide a general discussion on the philosophies of Pueblo warfare and spirituality, focusing on leaders who embodied the spirits of the mythical Tewa Warrior Twins. Basic insights into the general intersections of Pueblo warfare and spirituality can help to contextualize the motivations for many of the actions and movements by individual agents and by entire communities during the Pueblo Revolt.
period. Within each of the individual biographies, I discuss the often-overlooked
diplomatic efforts of Pueblo agents who sought remedies to the conflict that pervaded
their world with the return of the Spaniards during the reconquest period. I conclude the
chapter with a discussion on the mobility strategies employed by the Pueblo people as a
form of resistance.

**Warfare and Spirituality**

The archaeological investigations of warfare among the Pueblos (Reed and Geib
2013; Keeley 1996; LeBlanc 1999; Wilcox and Haas 1994) have advanced our
anthropological understanding of the subject. However, these treatments of warfare have
generally relied on limited lines of archaeological evidence including armament,
iconography (rock art), osteology (on excavated human remains), and settlement pattern
data. Haas and Creamer (1997), for example, reviewed a large body of ethnographic
literature on Pueblo warfare that demonstrates a long warfare tradition among the Pueblos
that spans from the deep past to more recent times. However, these anthropological
treatments fall short of explaining the intersections of warfare and spirituality for Pueblo
people.

An Indigenous perspective requires us to move beyond standard anthropological
treatments of warfare to consider complementary Pueblo perceptions and understandings.
Warfare and spirituality among the Pueblos are inextricably linked, and a basic
understanding of the underlying traditions and mechanisms that guide Pueblo people in
times of conflict and war is essential for understanding resistance strategies during the
Pueblo Revolt period. In the Pueblo context, warfare is a highly spiritual act. When
necessary, warfare was structured around a belief system that involved ritual preparation,
the act of war itself, and the ritual purification following the act. In Tewa philosophy, to
engage in warfare was a highly spiritual and deliberate act, that required much more that
the familiar strategic and logistical preparations for war. The spiritual aspects of warfare
were a necessary component of the overall undertaking that helped to ensure success and
positive outcomes, and also helped communities to reconcile with the consequences of
defeat and death.

While the traditional structures surrounding warfare vary among the Tewa
Pueblos, there are some general similarities. The most prominent figures in our oral
traditions regarding warfare are the mythical figures called the Towa é (literal translation:
“little people”), or, the Warrior Twins. They have immeasurable power from which the
Tewa often draw their own strength in times of need. The Warrior Twins are central
figures in Tewa mythology; similar deities are common among other Pueblo and Navajo
traditions in the southwest. For the Tewa, the Warrior Twins are omnipresent in the
sacred landscape and are said to stand guard at each of the cardinal mountains and mesas
surrounding each Tewa village.

At San Ildefonso, this is evident in that each cardinal direction within the local
sacred landscape contains a special place that venerates the spirit and presence of the
Warrior Twins. The fact that these places are maintained and visited by San Ildefonso
people today speaks to the ongoing significance of the Warrior Twins to contemporary
people at the Pueblo. Tunyo, the northern cardinal mesa of San Ildefonso, is the spiritual
home of the Warrior Twins of the north. The conscious decision of the San Ildefonso
Tewa to move north and occupy this cardinal mesa demonstrates the importance of
“north” for the Tewa people. More than just a point on a compass, north is a dynamic
pathway merging time, space, and history into a social claim about identity. In our oral traditions, Tewa “being-ness” is connected to the north, since this is the place of emergence where the ancestors lived before making their journey southward and eventually settling at the villages of today.

A Pueblo perspective also provides valuable insights for appreciating Pueblo understandings of Vargas’s attacks in February and March of 1694. From a Pueblo point of view, Vargas was unsuccessful in taking Tunyo during his February attack because of the prayers of the religious leaders to the Warrior Twins. Their leaders prayed for rain, and when it came, it made the rocky footing slippery, making it impossible for the Spaniards to mount their attack. The rain also dampened the Spanish gunpowder and may have contributed to the explosion of Vargas’s artillery piece. This pattern repeated itself a month later during the March 11 attack, when the Spanish were again unsuccessful in taking Tunyo. Again, the religious leaders had offered prayers to the Warrior Twins and the rain came, making it impossible for the Spaniards to press their attack. And again, an artillery piece exploded. These religious practices protected the people and would have enhanced the status of the traditionalists who led them.

The war chiefs in traditional Tewa society are viewed as the living counterparts to the mythical Warrior Twins. Today, these officials, who are responsible for the governance of the Tewa people, are traditionally selected for one-year terms. Some anthropologists (e.g., Parsons 1996) have asserted that many of the Tewa institutions governing warfare have been downgraded or eliminated with the onset of Spanish and American colonialism. The idea is that the colonial encounter marked the end of warring against traditional Pueblo enemies (e.g. Athabascan and Comanche) and created a
common enemy in colonial authority. While the Tewa Pueblos, as sovereign nations, are no longer actively engaged in warfare against other sovereigns, many of the cultural institutions that facilitated warfare are actually still in place among the Pueblos. For example, the traditional offices of the war captain are still in place in contemporary Tewa society; although they have taken on a new meaning, these positions still embody the spirit and legacy of the Warrior Twins in Tewa oral traditions.

The war chiefs or, “war captains,” oversee many of the political aspects of Tewa life. The individuals appointed to this role are said to take on the characteristics of the Warrior Twins and wield the most powerful civil authority in Tewa society. They imbue many of the strongest “warrior” attributes of the Warrior Twins for use in the governance of their people, and their civil authority is said to supersede that of any other position in the Pueblo. Many of the leaders mentioned in Vargas’s autos and journals and described as “captains” likely held the prominent position of war captain. These leaders thus can be seen as human manifestations of the Warrior Twins, who exerted considerable influence as diplomats during the tumultuous war-torn Pueblo Revolt.

**The Arts of Diplomacy**

The Pueblo Revolt period may be characterized as an extended series of battles in a larger war for Pueblo independence. Beginning with the August 10, 1680 revolt itself, through the subsequent battles in the interregnum period following the revolt, and into the military campaigns of the reconquest and defense of the mesas, this period is unquestionably violent. These episodes of violence have had the unfortunate effect of overshadowing the Pueblo quest for independence and peace during Vargas’s reconquest. As noted earlier, the historical records of Vargas’s thinly veiled acts of diplomacy
towards the Pueblos came to define his reconquest efforts, leading to the popular notion that it was his diplomacy, not the violence of his military campaign, that guided his reconquest. This characterization downplays the diplomatic efforts undertaken by Pueblo leaders during this period.

Pueblo leaders were skilled negotiators with the Spaniards. A common tactic (aimed to delay Spanish military actions) was to promise to come down from their mesas and return to their mission villages within a longer timeframe than that desired by Vargas. By buying themselves extra time, the Pueblo leaders would enable the arrival of reinforcements, even if they sometimes exaggerated their number. This was particularly the case at Tunyo, where the Tewa leaders initially requested fifteen days, claiming that they needed extra time to pack up their provisions and food. Vargas, who was frustrated by this strategy, made multiple visits to each mesa, each time securing promises from their leaders. Finally, when the leaders failed to bring their people off the mesa, Vargas decided to attack them.

The Spanish documents produced during this period offer a particularly amenable source for an analysis of Pueblo diplomacy. Even with their biases and limitations, the journals and letters of Vargas provide remarkably detailed insights into this time period. They reveal aspects of his specific strategies and goals during his reconquest and resettlement of New Spain. They describe the military strength of the various Pueblo villages he visits and identify the alliances between specific groups. They also identify specific Indigenous actors and their changing relationships as they struggled for their survival. Thus, they provide an opportunity to uncover Indigenous historical structures and ways of thinking. Of particular interest is how the mesa villages mediated changing
social and political relationships between the mission communities located along the Rio Grande and the temporary camps located in the remote mountains.

We see that the Pueblos often greeted Vargas with what he interpreted as a “war dance,” sometimes taunting him and throwing dirt into his soldiers’ eyes (Kessell and Hendricks 1992:521). At times, when the Indians saw that the Spaniards were undaunted in their resolve, they quickly feigned allegiance and escorted Vargas to their mesatop villages. There, after witnessing the Spanish proclamations and baptisms, they provided him with a room in which to rest, prepared a shared meal, and exchanged gifts, all indicators of hospitality. These actions give insights into the complex and uncertain nature of situational Pueblo strategies for survival amid conflict. These decisions are among the most telling indicators of Pueblo agency, which in this overall light appears as multi-sited, fragmentary, and subject to serial re-formation. In the following section, I emphasize the agency of some of the individual leaders who were most active during the Pueblo Revolt period.

**Biographies of Three War Captains**

The literature on the Pueblo Revolt typically emphasizes the agency of Popay, the famous Ohkay Owingeh leader (Knaut 1995). However, the Revolt would have not been successful without the assistance of numerous other leaders from the allied Pueblo communities. Here, I highlight three War Captains who were engaged in the arts of diplomacy during the Pueblo Revolt period: Antonio Malacate, a Zia captain; Cristóbal, a

---

23 The biographies in this section were previously published in a chapter by Robert Preucel and Joseph Aguilar entitled “Mesa Villages of the Pueblo Revolt Period: Reconstructing Pueblo Alliances and Social Networks,” in *Pueblan Societies: Cultural Homologies in Time*, edited by Peter Whiteley, pp. 207-236 (2018, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque).
San Marcos captain; and Domingo Tuguaque, a Tesuque captain. Their successes and failures as Pueblo diplomats give us a fascinating glimpse into the tensions and struggles Pueblo people faced during these difficult times, and the choices made as they navigated themselves and their communities through the political and social landscape of the tumultuous Pueblo Revolt period. These biographies, while brief, were drawn from a closer examination of Vargas’s journals, parsing out where their names appear in the documents and reconstructing their lived histories. In this way I attempt to “people” and Indigenize the past by exploring the agency of individual Pueblo people, rather than relying on generalized characterizations across the population.

*Antonio Malacate of Zia Pueblo*

Antonio Malacate was an influential Zia governor and war captain who helped build alliances across the Jemez and Keres districts. He escaped the fate of his fellow Zia people when Cruzate attacked the Pueblo in 1689 and killed 600 people and took 70 captives (Kessell and Hendricks 1992:25-26). He was said to be away from the village at and out hunting when Cruzate attacked, thereby escaping with his life (Kessell et al. 1995:117, 145). He and the remaining survivors founded and occupied Cerro Colorado Pueblo (see chapter 3 for description) between 1689 and 1692, in the wake of the attack in an attempt to rebuild their community.

In an effort to diffuse authority, in 1690 Malacate asked Vargas to select a new governor of the new pueblo on the grounds that he was “old and sick” (Kessell et al.1995:201). He apparently had a very good relationship with Vargas, who described him as a “compadre and very good friend” (Kessell et al. 1995:427, 440), and he forged a spiritual bond when Vargas was asked to serve as the *compadre* (godfather) to his son.
Carlos was the name given to Malacate’s son in honor of the King of Spain at the time. The bond created through the sacred Sacrament of Baptism forged a new, more significant relationship between Malacate and Vargas that transcended any previous enmities, making them brothers in the eyes of the church.

At the end of 1693, Malacate moved to Kotyiti due to his growing advocacy of the Pueblo cause (Kessell et al. 1995:404). He supported calls for war with the Spaniards, despite the fact that his Zia relatives urged him to return home (Kessell et al. 1995:404). According to Bartolome de Ojeda, a Spanish speaking Zia war captain who had allied with Vargas, Malacate was “worshipping the things of the devil every night in order to kill your lordship [Vargas] and the Spaniards” (Kessell et al. 1998:33). Vargas similarly reported that Malacate was “the leader of the disturbance along with another Indian from that pueblo [Cochiti] (probably El Zepe, a leader from that pueblo) and one of those from the pueblo of San Marcos who is living there” (Kessell et al. 1995:540). Malacate was apparently influential enough with the Jemez and Navajo Apache that don Luis el Picuri contacted him to secure their allegiance in a planned revolt for the end of December 1693 (Kessell et al. 1995:67).

*Cristóbal of San Marcos Pueblo*

Cristóbal was a governor and war captain from San Marcos Pueblo (located in the Galisteo Basin) who, in 1693, joined the people living at Kotyiti (Kessell and Hendricks 1992:515). He and his brother, Zue, also a captain, became disenchanted with the resistance exhibited by the people at Kotyiti towards Vargas. They reached out to Vargas on January 5, 1694 to warn him of a pending attack on Santa Fe by a combined force of Jemez and Cochiti warriors (Kessell et al. 1998:30). In his report, Cristóbal describes
Malacate and El Zepe (the leader of Cochiti) as harassing the friendly Indians. More importantly, he reported that he had unsuccessfully petitioned the leaders of San Felipe, Santa Ana and Zia to ally with himself and Vargas.

Aware that Cristóbal was loyal to him, Vargas quickly took advantage of those sympathies by enlisting his help to test the intentions of the Cochiti people (Kessell et al: 1998:61). He instructed Cristóbal to take some beef loaded on mules to Kotyiti to trade for corn and other supplies. Cristóbal dutifully set out with the mules but was warned off by an Indian woman coming at a dead run who explained that she was on the way to San Felipe to warn Vargas that all the nations were coming together. She explained that Kotyiti was divided into factions, and that she was unsure if they would come down and reoccupy their mission villages. Cristóbal, worried for his brother who was living at Kotyiti at the time, proceeded to the village to check on his welfare (Kessell et al. 1995:412).

Upon arrival at Kotyiti, Cristóbal found his brother alive, but their sympathies to Vargas had been discovered by the people living at the village. El Zepe ordered the execution of the brothers as punishment for sympathizing with Vargas and serving as his informants (Kessell et al. 1995:200). In April, Vargas learned that a firing squad consisting of three Cochiti Indians and three San Marcos Indians had carried out the order (Kessell et al. 1998:200-201). Perceiving this act as a threat to his Pueblo allies and his overall recolonizing mission, Vargas responded by attacking Kotyiti on April 17, 1694. *Domingo Tuguaque of Tesuque Pueblo* 

Domingo, also interchangeably referred to as “Dominguillo” or “Domingo Tuguaque” in the Vargas documents, was a war captain of Tesuque Pueblo. The first
accounts of Domingo indicate that he was an adamant leader in the overall resistance to Vargas’s reconquest, but later shifted allegiance and allied with Vargas during what is commonly referred to as the “Second Pueblo Revolt.” This aspect of his history during the period is interesting, since he was a proven leader in the successful defense of Tunyo.

Vargas first met Domingo on September 14, 1692 in Santa Fe, when Domingo came forward to relay the message that village leader don Luis of Picuris Pueblo, “the governor of all the Tewa and Tano pueblos,” was coming to meet him (Kessell and Hendricks 1992:395, 403). Vargas offered Domingo a rosary to present to don Luis to signify peaceful intent.

Domingo was subsequently responsible for the “gathering of nations” (Kessell et al. 1998:228), and at that time, according to the testimony of Agustin (a prisoner from San Lazaro Pueblo), Domingo was described as “the only governor of all the pueblos,” traveling with “his junta” of war captains to Picuris, Taos and other pueblos (Kessell et al. 1998:235). These contradictory claims – that Don Luis of Picuris was “the governor of all the Tewa and Tano Pueblos” and that Domingo was “the only governor of the Pueblos” – cannot be verified based on an examination of Vargas’s documents alone. Further investigation is needed to test these competing claims.

Domingo was unquestionably recognized by Vargas as the leader of the Tewa resistance movement at Tunyo. His influence was far reaching among the pueblos, as was evident when he “went to see everyone” to plot an ambush on the Spanish horses (Kessell et al. 1998:232). Domingo’s proven leadership and diplomatic aptitude in the arts of Tewa resistance were clearly displayed during the 1694 siege at Tunyo.
For example, when Vargas made an expedition to Tunyo on January 10th, 1694, he spoke with Domingo, who “was not coming down because he was not well. He and the others repeated that they were not coming down. They were afraid because of what happened to the Tanos [in Santa Fe]” (Kessell et al. 1998:44). Like Malacate, Domingo stated that he was “not well,” implying that he was sick; this could perhaps be seen as a tactic to gain Vargas’s sympathies. In fact, the Tewa held the strategically advantageous position, and Domingo asserted that they were prepared to stay on the mesa indefinitely and were prepared for war. When diplomatic efforts broke down, as they did during negotiations at the other mesa villages, Vargas attacked the mesa with full force (see chapter 4 for a summary of Vargas’s siege at Tunyo).

Tewa resistance at Tunyo came to an end on September 8th of 1694, via negotiations between Vargas and Domingo. The next day, in an attempt to lure the people down from the mesa, Vargas “told the captains that they should drink the chocolate I was giving them with my complete affection, which those Indians would regret not having known” (Kessell et al. 1998:388). Domingo, however, did not indulge in either chocolate or Vargas’s affection on that day, telling him that he and the Tewa would stay on the mesa another fifteen days (Kessell et al. 1998:389). Domingo eventually negotiated an end to the siege on the agreement that the Tewa peaceably return to occupy their vacated pueblos below the mesa. Through Domingo’s negotiation of a peaceful settlement, the Tewa thus avoided the fate of other pueblos, such as the Keres at Kotyiti (where 342 non-combatants and 13 warriors were captured), or the Jemez at Astialakwa (where 84 Jemez defenders were killed, some having jumped to their death and others burned in their homes). The Tewa were not defeated in battle; instead, they finally came down
voluntarily from their mesa stronghold to begin the long process of restoring order in their home villages.

After the siege at Tunyo, Domingo switched allegiance and became an ally of Vargas. Vargas’s Lt. General, Roque Madrid, reported that Domingo “told him that all the people of the other pueblos had risen up and that [Madrid] should send soldiers to them before the Indians killed the priests; and that only his pueblo of Tesuque, which was under his control (he was appointed Governor there), remained loyal” (Kessell, et al. 1998:727) [see table 5.1]). Where once he was a binding force, leading nine Tewa villages in the defense of Tunyo, Domingo was now a loyal Spanish subject. The Tewa were so discontented with him that they plotted to assassinate him “because he liked the things of God, the fathers, and the Spaniards” (Kessell et al. 1998:771). Through the interjection of Vargas, Domingo’s fate was spared, and he went on to participate in and lead several battles alongside Vargas and his forces against the Tewa in the hills and mesas of Chimayo and Santa Cruz in northern New Mexico during the “second” revolt of 1696.

**The Reciprocity of People and Place**

The relationship between Pueblo people and their landscape is a dynamic and enduring one given life by stories, histories, and traditions. It is within this framework of the reciprocal relationship between people and place that we can begin to understand the mesas, the villages built atop them, their occupants, and the roles they played during the Pueblo Revolt era.

Contemporary Pueblo villages are surrounded by sacred mesas, bluffs and plateaus. Each community reveres these places in their own unique way, and thus
ascribes specific meanings and values to them. Long before the dramatic events of the Pueblo Revolt era, these mesas were regarded as significant places on the cultural landscape, serving not only as places of refuge, but as the sites of other significant historical and mythical events. Although the mesa villages likely saw their greatest use as places of refuge during the tumultuous Revolt era, Pueblo people chose to occupy them for a variety of reasons, strategic advantage being but one reason.

In the case of the Tewa world, each village is bounded by four mesas, one in each of the cardinal directions, that define one realm of the physical and spiritual Tewa world (Ortiz 1969). At San Ildefonso, Tunyo is the cardinal mesa for the north. According to Tewa oral histories, the ancestors of contemporary Tewa peoples migrated north to south, establishing their villages along the way. Ancestors and the places they lived and came from are highly revered in Tewa society, so much so that strength can be drawn by invoking ancestral peoples and visiting relevant places on the landscape. In particular, the cardinal direction of north is revered as the direction from which the ancestors came, and the place where their presence is most powerfully sensed. Thus, when Pueblo people chose to mobilize northward, they invoke the power of these ancestors to assist them.

When the Tewa of San Ildefonso and other villages chose to occupy these mesas in their defense against Vargas’s military campaign, the mesas were not just strategically advantageous military redoubts. Each locale was invested with the strength of the ancestors as a sacred place. The name Hanat Kotyiti, for example, refers to Cochiti “in the clouds,” where the clouds are considered to be ancestors involved in ceremonies and prayer. When planning their defensive strategies, Pueblo people were conscious of these powerful places with both spiritual and military strategies in mind. While there were
many upland mesas and plateaus, they could have occupied, their strongholds were principally located in the north, reinforcing these connections.

As symbols of resistance, these mesas were also physically imposing natural features located in rugged or isolated regions away from the mission villages. The same landscape features that made it difficult for Vargas and his allies to summit the mesas presented challenges to the Pueblo people who occupied them. At Tunyo, the Tewa did not have a reliable source of water to sustain their occupation. Only through the bravery of a few select warriors (who descended the mesa at night past Spanish guards) were Tunyo’s inhabitants able to gather the life sustaining water needed for survival (Harrington 1916:294). Food was, however, harder to obtain; the Tewa could only watch as the Vargas and his allies established San Ildefonso Pueblo as his plaza de armas and pillaged the remaining crops in fields below. Despite these challenges, the advantages of living on the mesas far outweighed the difficulties presented.

The mesa villages were dynamic places, constantly in motion, with continual movement of people to and from these communities. For example, as Ford (2018) explains, the units of movement were almost never complete communities, but rather a social subset of a Pueblo, such as a family unit. In Tewa tradition, these units can be comprised of extended families, kin groups, or other social groups known as ko’o ki maati towa (unknown etymology, used to describe a close group of people). Throughout this dissertation, I have described “villages” or “pueblos” as a unit of movement, but it must be noted that the actual movements of people on the ground were far more nuanced than the image of entire pueblos moving from one point to another.
These mesa villages, in effect, influenced and facilitated the restructuring of Pueblo society during this difficult period. The Vargas documents reveal special relationships and alliances between specific villages; some alliances were temporary and contingent while others were enduring. For example, Tunyo mediated the relationships among the nine Tewa villages that occupied it; it is likely that the shared experiences of these people played a key role in their decision to inhabit Tunyo. Likewise, Kotyiti mediated relationships among Cochiti, San Felipe, and San Marcos. This suggests a Keresan speaking network linking into the Galisteo Basin. Elsewhere, people from Santo Domingo traversed the rugged Jemez Mountain range to live with their Jemez allies at Boletsakwa. These movements to mesas are testimony to the agency of place in helping people maintain some sense of social stability and integrity during times of strife and conflict.

While Vargas was engaged with the Tewa at Tunyo in 1694, he paid limited attention to the other areas where the Tewa people sought refuge. His accounts note that he was aware of other “outposts” to which the pueblos mobilized, such as Embudo, which he only describes as somewhere north of San Juan (Kessell et al. 1998:450, fn. 69), but he chose not to engage militarily with such places. The Tewa mobilization across their traditional landscape was, in this sense, an effective strategy of resistance that helped certain segments of the population to evade Vargas altogether, ensuring their safety during the tumultuous reconquest period. The Tewa landscape itself thus provided a means of survival and resistance to Vargas’s campaign.

**Summary**
During the Revolt period, Pueblo people physically moved their habitations to their sacred mesas and other places in their cosmological landscape. They treated these places as strategically advantageous locations to evade the Spaniards (and Spanish allies), and, more importantly, as spiritual sanctuaries from which they could draw on the strength of their ancestors. This second principal is true today among contemporary San Ildefonso people when they return to these places for ceremonial purposes. The spiritual significance of these places must be considered alongside the more practical significance of these places as military redoubts.

The northern Rio Grande mesa villages were key actors in this dynamic social landscape, constituting the core of Pueblo Indian resistance to Spanish authority, and threatening the success of Vargas’s reconquest efforts. In this way, the agency of these people and places serve as a counter-narrative to the stories told by most of the early Borderlands historians. The Revolt of 1680 and the Reconquest of 1692 were not just temporary setbacks in the inevitable push of the Spanish empire into North America (e.g. Bannon 1974; Hackett and Shelby 1942). The evidence of Vargas’s multiple military (and often unsuccessful) engagements with these places testifies to the force of Pueblo resistance.

These mesas were not only the setting of entangled colonial encounters, but were places where Pueblo people mediated their survival in the face of an oppressive settler colonial authority. They were the setting of tense negotiations, as seen in the experiences of the Pueblo war captains Malacate, Cristóbal, and Domingo. They were places of intense conflict throughout Vargas’s reconquest efforts in 1694, and they were places where many people met their destiny. Above all else, the mesas were places where people
mediated their spiritual beliefs, both before and after the Pueblo Revolt period. The mesa
villages, thus, were the bonds that helped keep Pueblo society together through those
tumultuous years. When viewed in this manner, the agency of the mesas themselves
begins to emerge, and we can appreciate the reciprocal relationships between people and
place.

These relationships with the mesas did not, however, work out for all segments of
Pueblo society; there is evidence of political strife within villages as people attempted to
negotiate their individual and group interests. This process can be seen most clearly
through an examination of the war captain Domingo at Tunyo, who fiercely opposed the
Spaniards during the battle of Santa Fe, but then turned around to assist Vargas in his
reconquest of the mesa villages. Domingo, one of the most dynamic leaders during the
Pueblo Revolt period, proved to be both a uniting and dividing figure. His story perhaps
best characterizes the political and social turmoil and unpredictability that pervaded much
of the Pueblo Revolt period.

After the violence ended in 1694, people moved off the mesas to reoccupy their
villages below. In some locales, previously occupied villages were left vacant; in others,
people joined to build new communities together. The village at Tunyo, for example,
enlarged to incorporate people from as many as nine Tewa villages. San Ildefonso, Santa
Clara, Pojoaque, Nambe and Tesuque were reoccupied, while Cuyamungue and Jacona
were not. The people from San Lazaro and San Cristobal Pueblos who sought refuge at
Tunyo during the war did not reoccupy their home villages; instead they chose to
establish new villages in the Espanola Valley, and eventually moved west to found the
village of Hano on First Mesa (Dozier 1966).
For contemporary Pueblo people, these mesas are powerful symbols of their independence, and serve as a reminder of the perseverance and strength necessary to endure to remain sovereign. Above all else, the mesas are sacred locations situated within a larger cosmological landscape to serve as interlocutors among contemporary Pueblo people, their ancestors, and the spirits present at these places. These mesas, where people, place, history and spirituality can interact in reciprocal ways, “offer a remarkable capacity for triggering acts of self-reflection, inspiring thoughts and memories (Basso 1996:107)."
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

The Pueblo Revolt period was a defining era in the formation of the contemporary Pueblo Indian communities as we know them today. Political alliances, population movements, and warfare took place on a scale not before seen in the Southwest. Nearly all of the Indigenous people in the region were involved in, or affected by, the events and relocations provoked by the Spanish occupation and the Pueblo resistance. These processes caused dramatic shifts in pueblo habitation patterns, ranging from temporary movements to places of refuge, to the permanent relocation of entire Pueblo communities to new villages, to the creation of entirely new Pueblo communities and villages. These large-scale movements of people, which served as an effective short-term strategy to evade the resettling mission of the Spaniards, ended when violence of the Revolt period stopped. After 1696, Pueblo Indian people settled into permanent living spaces that have defined the Pueblo geopolitical landscape up to the present time.

This chapter summarizes the results of the Tunyo Research Project and reviews my interpretations of the occupation of Tunyo in the context of the larger Tewa resistance to Vargas’s reconquest during the latter part of the Pueblo Revolt Period. This project had two sets of interrelated research questions: One set was concerned with the archaeological nature and history of the resistance movement based at Tunyo, and the other was to Indigenize the writing of the revolt by exploring the past and present meanings of Tunyo in the context of Tribal Heritage Management practices. The overarching goal of my dissertation is to make steps towards Indigenizing the writing of the Pueblo Revolt.
My research contributes to a greater understanding of the heretofore poorly understood history of Tunyo and provides insights into the agency of the ancestral San Ildefonso and Tewa peoples as they actively resisted Spanish settler colonial authority. Most importantly, I illustrate how the incorporation of Indigenous spirituality and religious beliefs can aid in our interpretation of archaeological data. This is achieved by integrating Indigenous understandings about place into standard archaeological practice. Additional fieldwork will be necessary to document the full extent and nature of the cultural heritage at Tunyo, which will allow for further interpretations. It is my hope that my approach will inspire and guide future research at Tunyo and encourage the consideration of alternate forms of evidence, and ways of knowing to interpret the past.

Guiding this research is a place-based approach that emphasizes the interdependence of time, place and history, whereby place transcends the boundaries of time and history and becomes central to our understanding of the past. For Pueblo people, site location and village architecture both encode and reproduce worldviews. As described by Alfonso Ortiz (1969) and Rina Swentzell (1990), the Tewa world is organized to facilitate the flow of blessings and energy inward to the village plazas, outward to the mountaintops, and back again (Ortiz 1969:21-22). These blessings are mediated by the shrine system, consisting of special places in the landscape where people carry out their ritual obligations. This general principle, if not the specific details, is widespread among all the Pueblos. Knowing this, one can understand that the choice to leave the mission villages following the Revolt of 1680 was not simply for defensive reasons. These mesas are powerful and sacred locations of ritual importance, where Pueblo people can engage with their ancestors; in times of danger, they provided
powerful places of refuge. Similarly, the organization and layout of Pueblo villages was not simply a response to environmental considerations; these places also embodied the values and beliefs of the people who constructed and lived in them. According to this view, all of these places—the location of new villages on sacred mesas, the orientations of the roomblocks, the placement of the kivas and shrines, the entryways into the plazas, and the trail network that links them—are crucial parts of the process of inscribing meaning upon the landscape.

I have thus situated Tunyo within a broader context of Pueblo resistance and consideration of the mesa villages of the northern Rio Grande that constitute this patterned settlement system. Because so few mesa villages of the Pueblo Revolt Period have been studied, Tunyo offers unique opportunities for exploring Pueblo resistance to European settler colonialism and broadens our scope of understanding the modes and processes of resistance, including war, accommodation, and mobility. Furthermore, Tunyo challenges some common understandings of the period which are derived largely from Spanish documents and Western interpretations of them. The Tunyo Research Project also provides a context for the people of San Ildefonso to gather new archaeological information, recover historical accounts, and incorporate Indigenous perspectives into their understandings of history of history.

**Tunyo Research Project Results**

The primary goal of the Tunyo Research Project has been to present and discuss familiar and unfamiliar forms of evidence that should be written into the Indigenous archaeology and history of one of the most defining periods for San Ildefonso and Tewa Peoples. Of necessity, parts of my dissertation rely heavily upon chronologies created
from a Western point of view, but these forms of evidence have been merged with
traditional understandings to create a more robust set of knowledge and data to interpret
the past. A greater understanding of Indigenous resistance to European settler colonialism
was sought using diverse sources of information as a means to enrich our existing
conceptions of the period. This research contributes to a more robust understanding of the
Pueblo Revolt period and Indigenous resistance to European settler colonialism in
general, and Spanish settler colonialism in particular.

The Project’s main focus was the cartographic documentation of Tunyo, its
village, and associated features and the landscape surrounding the mesa. Results of the
project include: the collection of high resolution microtopographic data and the creation
of high-resolution digital terrain models of Tunyo, its village, and its surrounding
landscape using drone photography; the documentation of the village’s associated
defensive features; a pilot rock art and ceramic survey; and a synthesis of documentary
and oral traditions that have been integrated with archaeological lines of evidence.

The cartography documentation is the first systematic archaeological investigation
at the mesa. The project aimed, through non-invasive methods, to help reveal the material
signatures of resistance to aid our interpretation of the Tewa resistance movement based
at Tunyo. The mapping project documented village architecture and defensive features
and aided in our interpretation of the modes and strategies of resistance employed by the
Tewa at Tunyo.

These maps – the first accurate maps of the mesa and its village – are now
formally owned by the San Ildefonso Pueblo nation which, as the proprietor of this data,
has full control over subsequent use and dissemination. This data will aid in the long-
term management of Tunyo in conjunction with the Tribal Historic Preservation Office’s Heritage Management Plan (Pueblo de San Ildefonso 2018). The robust data collected as a result of drone surveys has the potential to offer new and innovative ways of presenting data (e.g. virtual reality, large scale three-dimensional print scale models) that are outside the scope of this dissertation but have exciting potential. This data can be used in a number of contexts in addition to heritage management practices, including education and land management.

The highly eroded state of the village presents a challenge to interpreting the exact nature of the village. Cartographic documentation has greatly enabled the interpretation of how the Tewa living on Tunyo were able to mount a considerable military defense of the mesa. The cartography reveals that the Tewa utilized the natural topography of the mesa and a suite of defensive features as part of their resistance strategy.

The most important finding is that the village on Tunyo is unique. It differs from the well-defined masonry architecture of all other Revolt period villages (e.g., Kotyiti, Boletsakwa, Patokwa). Tunyo is characterized by a series of amorphous mounds and pits that are likely markers of, or related to, habitation spaces. The early archaeological accounts and San Ildefonso oral tradition converge on this interpretation, and the most conservative analysis of the cartographic maps of this mound/pit topography suggests the same. These features, however, do not easily fit into traditional anthropological assessments or documented categories of well-known styles and patterns of habitation. Here, to provide insight, I turn to Indigenous and place-based perspectives that emphasize the ontological interdependence of time, space, and history; I suggest that these
Indigenous patterns of conceptualizing space are integral to constructing more accurate anthropological perspectives.

The construction of place at Tunyo becomes highly important when viewed in this context. For example, the continual movement of people to Tunyo, an ancestral home where the Tewa have always sought strength even in contexts outside of war, is a key understanding. The standard archaeological approaches to describing material culture in detail and locating past events in absolute time are not prioritized by San Ildefonso and Tewa conceptions of Tunyo. For the Tewa, the importance of Tunyo lies not in its historical details, but in its significance as a sacred place where important events in the histories of San Ildefonso and the Tewa continuously occurred and indeed still occur. This place-based perspective collapses the standard distinction between prehistory and history and allows people to engage in an ongoing dialogue with their ancestors to guide appropriate behaviors (Aguilar and Preucel 2013).

My research suggests that Pueblo communities did not merely react in haste to Spanish colonialism. They anticipated the return of the Spaniards and made the preemptive decision to vacate their home villages and occupy mesa villages. This is evidenced by the strategic defense mechanisms at place at Tunyo, including the location of the village on the inner most part of the mesa and the strategic placement of defensive features (fortified walls and stone ammunition caches) at the perimeter of Tunyo where known trails exist, or where the mesa is most accessible.

Mobility to places far from the places of conflict was also a key resistance strategy. In the case of the Tewa, their mobility strategy was advanced by moving, not
only to their mesa stronghold of Tunyo, but also to other areas in their ancestral
landscape; these areas were intimately familiar to Pueblo people, but unknown to Vargas.
Places like Nake’muu provided the haven necessary for the protection of the most
vulnerable of the Tewa population – women, children and the elderly – while the Tunyo
provided a site for the people who were most capable of fighting. Historians and
archaeologists would be entirely unaware of this mobility strategy were it not for the oral
histories maintained by the people of San Ildefonso Pueblo that have only recently been
shared (Vierra 2003:12). For contemporary Pueblo people, Tunyo and Nake’muu are
revered in ways that go beyond their significance as places of refuge during the
reconquest. The relationship between San Ildefonso and place is best described as a
highly structured and spiritual association whereby people and place gather strength and
life from one another. This relationship is renewed when the mesas and their villages are
visited.\(^\text{24}\) As Aguilar and Preucel (2013:279) have stated, “this holistic understanding
exemplifies the value of an Indigenous, place-based archaeology that embraces the strong
connections between place and history and rejects the notion of absolute time embedded
in the conceptualizations of prehistory.”

**Ongoing Meanings of the Revolt**

The Pueblo Revolt occupies a special place in Pueblo Indian identity and culture.
It was an expression of sovereignty of Pueblo ancestors in the face of a European
colonizing power and remains an inspiration to Pueblo people today. In 1980, the Pueblos

---

\(^{24}\) As a part of San Ildefonso Pueblo’s annual ritual calendar, Tunyo is regularly visited by certain members of the pueblo for specific ceremonial purposes; those visits are not discussed here to respect privacy. Nake’muu, an equally important ancestral site, is unique in that it is located on U.S. Federal Government Department of Energy controlled lands; the regular Pueblo visitation cycles to this site have been disrupted as a result.
joined together and commemorated the tercentenary anniversary of the revolt. Their goals were: to provide a focus for Pueblo people to examine their heritage and to reaffirm their beliefs and values; to further a broader understanding of Pueblo culture by promoting cultural identity, human dignity, and social viability; to draw attention to the unique issues and concerns of Pueblo communities; and to clarify issues that structure Pueblo and non-Pueblo relations (Agoyo 2005:95).

On July 18, 1980, representatives from most of the Rio Grande pueblos, plus representatives from the Hopi and Ute nations, traveled to Ohkay Owingeh to commemorate the Revolt. For the next two days, Pueblo people performed a series of dances to honor their ancestors and history. There was an outdoor mass presided over by Archbishop Robert Sanchez held in the north plaza of the village. The Mass also recognized Native Americans who have converted to Catholicism by honoring Kateri Tekakwitha, an Algonquin/Kanienke’haka Mohawk woman who died in 1680, and who was, at that time, the first Native American to be beatified by the Catholic Church. The following day, the second annual Popay run was held to commemorate the runs made by Omtua and Catua, the messenger warriors who spread the word of the Revolt amongst the Pueblos (Agoyo 2005:96).

25 Kateri Tekakwitha was born in Caughnawauga (present-day Canajoharie, New York) to an Algonquin mother and Mohawk father. After converting to Catholicism, she was baptized as Catherine (later Kateri) and her family moved north to join the Catholic mission village of Caughnawauga at Sault St. Louis, on the south shore of the St. Lawrence River, now Kahnawake, Quebec, Canada. See Darren Bonaparte, A Lily Among the Thorns (Akwesasne, NY: The Wampum Chronicles 2009). She is deeply beloved by Pueblo Catholics, and in 2003 a statue of her dressed as a Pueblo woman, created by Jemez Pueblo artist Estella Loretto, was installed in front of St. Francis Cathedral in the center of Santa Fe, New Mexico. Kateri was canonized by Pope Benedict XVI on October 12, 2012.
Since 2004, Jemez Historic Site, in coordination with Jemez Pueblo, has organized an annual commemoration of the Pueblo Revolt called “Pueblo Independence Day.” The event is a commemoration of the start of the Pueblo Revolt in 1680 and includes a ceremonial run that begins in the Pueblo of Jemez, finishing up at the ancestral village of Giusewa, the aboriginal name for the Jemez Historic Site. Site Ranger Marlon Magdalena states that “Celebrating the day pays tribute to the Ancestors and shows appreciation for their sacrifices. Their brave resistance helped preserve the Pueblo way of life: our culture, our languages, and our right to one day reclaim our aboriginal lands.”

Indeed, many Pueblos in New Mexico have taken a cue from these types of Revolt commemorations and celebrations, and have chosen to replace the American national Columbus Day holiday, opting to honor the Revolt by observing their own forms of “Pueblo Independence Day” instead. The San Ildefonso Tribal Government, for example, gives its employees the option of observing either the Christopher Columbus Holiday or the Pueblo Independence Day. Santa Clara Pueblo Community School also has a similar practice of observing the occasion. This is in line with a larger trend among Indigenous communities in North America who choose to celebrate “Indigenous Peoples Day” by rejecting national observances that they would describe as celebrations of settler colonialism.

---


In 1997, the Pueblos again joined together for the Popay Statue Project. Herman Agoyo and other Pueblo Indian leaders petitioned the New Mexico State Legislature to select Popay as the subject of the state’s second statue to be installed in the National Statuary Hall Collection at the U.S. Capital Building (Agoyo 2005). The legislature agreed and created the New Mexico Statuary Hall Commission to raise the necessary funds. A competition to sculpt the statue was held and in 1999, Clifford Fragua of Jemez Pueblo was awarded the commission. He chose to carve it from pink Tennessee marble to better represent the texture and color of Pueblo Indian skin. According to Fragua, the bear fetish in Popay’s right hand stands for Pueblo religion, which is at the core of the Pueblo world. The water jar symbolizes Pueblo culture, and the deerskin robe is a symbol of his status as a hunter and provider. The shell necklace is a constant reminder of the sacred lake where life began. His back is scarred by the whipping he received from the Spaniards in the Santa Fe plaza for his participation in Pueblo ceremonies. On May 21, 2005, the statue was unveiled at Ohkay Owingeh, and then placed in the rotunda in Washington DC on September 22, 2005 (Sando and Agoyo 2005).

**Broadening Indigenous Archaeology**

My approach integrates Pueblo Indian philosophy, Indigenous archaeological theory and practice, and tribal cultural heritage management principles in order to create an Indigenous history of the Pueblo Revolt period. The merging of these inherently Indigenous aspects of my research design allowed for an Indigenous archaeology that is informed first and foremost by Indigenous ways of knowing and doing. This practice, coupled with innovative archaeological methodologies that help to make the practice of
archaeology more responsive to Indigenous people, are steps towards indigenizing the method and theory of archaeology.

An important aspect of my research is to present Indigenous narratives on equal footing with Western archaeological and Borderlands histories. I have attempted to position Pueblo narratives at the forefront of this research, not as an alternative, but as a primary narrative of their own history. In this way I hope to contribute to my own communities’ interest in our past by presenting it in new ways while at the same time respecting traditional ways of knowing. As a member of my community conducting research on a village occupied by our ancestors, I am committed to carrying out research in a manner that is in line with the morals and values of my community. This dissertation, therefore, is not an attempt to validate or challenge previous Pueblo understandings of the revolt. My hope is that it illustrates a method for exploring Indigenous and archaeological understandings side by side, if not together, to provide a broader understanding of some unique locally-situated Indigenous perspectives on the Pueblo Revolt.

The underlying spiritual motivations that guided the wholesale movement away from mission villages to the sacred mesas during the Pueblo Revolt period still guides Pueblo People today. This is the reverence that we hold for our ancestral homes and places where our ancestors live. This same sense of reverence for place structured our ancestors’ engagement with these same places in the past. The spiritual motivations that compelled Pueblo People to persevere in the face of adversity should be considered as part of a holistic approach to understanding the movement of people during the Pueblo Revolt Period. These motivations were expressed in the cultural revitalization movement
that advocated the rejection of Spanish colonial authority and the return to traditional beliefs and values, including a return to ancestral places.

I seek to expand Indigenous archaeology by incorporating spirituality and religious beliefs in the interpretation of archaeological data. Indigenous scholars, such as Laluk (2014) have applied this approach and have argued that it is an important way to aid in our interpretation of the archaeological record. My approach involves incorporating oral history and archaeological data in ways that highlight ritual agency in understanding Pueblo actions. For example, I have suggested that Pueblo people understood the Tsaviyo story as a framework for interpreting the battle with Vargas. In both cases, the people were saved through the intervention of the Hero Twins. During the two main battles with Vargas, Tewa religious leaders and war captains (embodying the Hero Twins) prayed for snow and rain. When it came, it made Vargas's sieges impossible to maintain. I’ve also suggested that the Tewa ancestral homeland, the Pajarito Plateau and the ancestral villages of Nake’muu and Navawi, served to safeguard Tewa women and children. By moving people away from the battle zone, the Pueblo warriors were able to fight more effectively, assured of their families’ survival.

In my research, I have become acutely aware that the significance of Tunyo transcends the events of 1694, and the Pueblo Revolt Era and has much deeper meanings that are informed by our ongoing cultural practices. For example, Tunyo is the sacred mesa to the north for San Ildefonso Pueblo — this is the direction from which our ancestors came, and this is the place where our elders go to pray. It was our sacred mesa to the north before the Pueblo Revolt period, and it remains our sacred mesa to the north today. The events of the Pueblo Revolt period add another layer to the deep time
significance of this place. The individual people who interacted with the place in the past — like those who interact with it in the present and will continue to do so in the future — add to the agency of the mesa.

This understanding is embedded in the words of Alfonso Ortiz when he states that the Pueblo Revolt should be “understood first and foremost as a religious restoration. All the events of 1680 and in subsequent Pueblo-Spanish relations in New Mexico are better understood in relation to this fact” (Ortiz 2005:4). Scholars must take this consideration into account, in order to gain deeper understandings of multilayered Pueblo religious acts of restoration and obligation. My study concludes that the Tewa resistance at Tunyo was contingent on mobility to ancestral places, not only for strategic purposes, but for spiritual reasons that were unknown to Spanish colonizers. Pueblo survival strategies and engagements with the ancestral landscape in general, and with Tunyo in particular, have long been shaped by reciprocal relationships that transcend colonial settler spans of history and time.
APPENDIX A: TUNYO DRONE MAPS

Figure A.1: Orthophoto map of Tunyo and surrounding landscape.
Figure A.2: Orthophoto map of Tunyo and surrounding landscape with 1-meter contours.
Figure A.3: digital terrain model (color ramp) of Tunyo and surrounding landscape with 1-meter contours.
Figure A.4: Digital terrain model (color ramp) of Tunyo and surrounding landscape.
Figure A.5: Orthophoto map of Tunyo mesatop.
Figure A.6: Orthophoto map of Tunyo mesatop with 50-centimeter contours.
Figure A.7: Digital terrain model (color ramp) of Tunyo mesatop with 50-centimeter contours.
Figure A.8: Digital terrain model (black and white) of Tunyo mesatop.
Figure A.9: Digital terrain model (color ramp) of Tunyo mesatop.
APPENDIX B: GENERAL DRONE PROCESSING DATA

Figure B.1: Camera locations and image overlap.

Table B.1: Photo processing data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of images</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>Camera stations</td>
<td>2,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying altitude</td>
<td>265 m</td>
<td>Tie points</td>
<td>557,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground resolution</td>
<td>6.53 cm/pix</td>
<td>Projections</td>
<td>6,175,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage area</td>
<td>1.92 sq. km</td>
<td>Reprojection error</td>
<td>0.519 pix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.2: Camera data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera Model</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Focal Length</th>
<th>Pixel Size</th>
<th>Pre-calibrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GR(18.3mm)</td>
<td>4928 x 3264</td>
<td>18.3 mm</td>
<td>4.78 x 4.78 um</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.2: Image residuals for GR (18.3 mm).
Figure B.3: Camera locations and error estimates. Z error is represented by ellipse color. X,Y errors are represented by ellipse shape. Estimated camera locations are marked with a black dot.

Table B.3: Average camera location error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X error (m)</th>
<th>Y error (m)</th>
<th>XY error (m)</th>
<th>Z error (m)</th>
<th>Total error (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.136552</td>
<td>0.169426</td>
<td>0.217604</td>
<td>0.152157</td>
<td>0.265524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.4: Reconstructed digital elevation model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B.4: Processing Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Point Cloud</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS reprojection error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max reprojection error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean key point size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment parameters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair preselection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key point limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie point limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrain features by mask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimization parameters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimization time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth Maps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconstruction parameters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtering mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dense Point Cloud</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconstruction parameters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth filtering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Model
| Faces       | 3,999,999 |
| Vertices    | 2,003,325 |
| Texture     | 18,000 x 18,000, uint8 |

### Reconstruction parameters
| Surface type    | Arbitrary |
| Source data     | Dense     |
| Interpolation   | Enabled   |
| Quality         | Low       |
| Depth filtering | Moderate  |
| Face count      | 4,000,000 |
| Processing time | 6 minutes 47 seconds |

### Texturing parameters
| Mapping mode    | Generic |
| Blending mode   | Mosaic  |
| Texture size    | 18,000 x 18,000 |
| UV mapping time | 1 minutes 1 seconds |
| Blending time   | 6 hours 56 minutes |

### DEM
| Size            | 2,819 x 2,375 |
| Coordinate system | WGS 84 (EPSG::4326) |
Figure C.1: Camera locations and image overlap.

Table C.1: Photo processing data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of images</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>Camera stations</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying altitude</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>Tie points</td>
<td>119,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground resolution</td>
<td>8.16 cm/pix</td>
<td>Projections</td>
<td>1,531,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage area</td>
<td>3.14 sq. km</td>
<td>Reprojection error</td>
<td>0.509 pix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.2: Camera data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera Model</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Focal Length</th>
<th>Pixel Size</th>
<th>Pre-calibrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GR (18.3mm)</td>
<td>4928 x 3264</td>
<td>18.3 mm</td>
<td>4.78 x 4.78 um</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure C.2: Image residuals for GR (18.3 mm).
Figure C.3: Ground control point locations.
Figure C.4: Reconstructed digital elevation model.
APPENDIX D: MULTI-ROTOR DRONE PROCESSING DATA

Figure D1: Camera locations and image overlap.

Table D.1: Photo processing data.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of images</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>Camera stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying altitude</td>
<td>112 m</td>
<td>Tie points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground resolution</td>
<td>2.76 cm/pix</td>
<td>Projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage area</td>
<td>3.71e+05 sq. m</td>
<td>Reprojection error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D.2: Camera data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera Model</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Focal Length</th>
<th>Pixel Size</th>
<th>Pre-calibrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GR(18.3mm)</td>
<td>4928 x 3264</td>
<td>18.3 mm</td>
<td>4.78 x 4.78 um</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure D.2: Image residuals for GR (18.3 mm).
Figure D.3: Ground control point locations.
Figure D.4: Reconstructed digital elevation model.
APPENDIX E: TUNYO ARCHITECTURAL DATA

Table E.1: Individual pit area estimates (in square meters).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pit No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Pit No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Pit No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Pit No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>p30</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>p58</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>p87</td>
<td>10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p2</td>
<td>30.66</td>
<td>p31</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>p59</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>p88</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p3</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>p32</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>p60</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>p89</td>
<td>36.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p4</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>p33</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>p61</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>p90</td>
<td>18.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p6</td>
<td>31.81</td>
<td>p35</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>p63</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>p92</td>
<td>26.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p7</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>p36</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>p64</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>p93</td>
<td>39.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p8</td>
<td>31.99</td>
<td>p37</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>p65</td>
<td>84.57</td>
<td>p94</td>
<td>44.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p9</td>
<td>140.05</td>
<td>p38</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>p66</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>p95</td>
<td>72.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p10</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>p39</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>p67</td>
<td>86.16</td>
<td>p96</td>
<td>49.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p11</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>p40</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>p68</td>
<td>121.62</td>
<td>p97</td>
<td>17.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p12</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>p41</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>p69</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>p98</td>
<td>34.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p13</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>p42</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>p70</td>
<td>44.84</td>
<td>p99</td>
<td>195.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p14</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>p43</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>p71</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>p100</td>
<td>46.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p15</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>p44</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>p72</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>p101</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p16</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>p45</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>p73</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>p102</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p17</td>
<td>181.00</td>
<td>p46</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>p74</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>p103</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p18</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>p47</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>p75</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>p104</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p19</td>
<td>59.46</td>
<td>p48</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>p76</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>p105</td>
<td>16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p20</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>p49</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>p77</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>p106</td>
<td>23.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p21</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>p50</td>
<td>57.32</td>
<td>p78</td>
<td>55.76</td>
<td>p107</td>
<td>27.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p22</td>
<td>47.71</td>
<td>p51</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>p79</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>p108</td>
<td>17.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p23</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>p52</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>p80</td>
<td>58.35</td>
<td>p109</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p24</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>p53</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>p81</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>p110</td>
<td>11.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p25</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>p54</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>p82</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>p111</td>
<td>154.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p26</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>p55</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>p83</td>
<td>37.11</td>
<td>p112</td>
<td>110.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p27</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>p56</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>p84</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>p113</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p28</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>p57</td>
<td>30.68</td>
<td>p85</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>p114</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p29</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p86</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of pits</th>
<th>Combined square area (meters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 114</td>
<td>= 3378.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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