

Finally, several of the papers present excellent statements of purpose with respect to the theoretical assumptions behind the research. Explication of hegemonic discourse by Beaudry *et. al.* is well developed and articulated as is Henry's discussion of consumer behavior within the context of group decision making. Hamilton's development of the significance of food and the role that rank played in access to preferred resources is illuminating. Taken as a whole this collection of papers illustrates many of the points made in the first two chapters of the volume. They demonstrate a diversity of the uses and orientations researchers take toward historical source material. The archaeology of capitalism is often apparent as a defining paradigm. Attempts to identify interest groups, ethnicity, classes, and subcultures on the basis of the archaeological record is problematized in many of the papers. In several cases, processual methodology is alive and well in the employ of historical archaeologists asking significant social questions that utilize a middle range approach. Finally, issues of scale are addressed repeatedly in research that seeks solutions to difficulties with appropriate units of analysis. Little's assertion that historical archaeology is, and has been its own discipline, is supported by this volume.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.08107>

Pueblo Bonito, by George H. Pepper. Preface by David E. Stuart. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, xviii, Illustration Section, 398 pages, notes, index. 1996. ISBN 0-8263-1735-9, Cloth, \$45.00. ISBN 0-8253-1736-7, Paper \$20.00.

Reviewed by

Jonathan E. Reyman
Anthropology Section
Illinois State Museum
Springfield, IL 62703-3535

Pueblo Bonito was originally published in 1920, twenty-five years after the Hyde Exploring Expedition first began work at the site in 1896. The re-issue of this volume, long out-of-print and difficult and expensive to obtain, marks the 100th anniversary of the onset of the excavation of Pueblo Bonito. The book is a most welcome addition to the list of historically important works on American archaeology and anthropology that have been reprinted during the last several decades. The University of New Mexico Press is to be commended for undertaking to republish this report, especially at such a reasonable price for the paperback.

The Hyde Exploring Expedition was funded by Frederick and Benjamin Talbot Hyde, heirs to the Babbit Soap fortune. Professor Frederick Ward Putnam of Harvard University and the American Museum of Natural History was in charge, but day-to-day field operations were directed by his former student, George H. Pepper, assisted by Richard Wetherill. Pepper was only 23 at the time and had never before been in the Southwest; Wetherill was 38 and experienced in Anasazi archaeology. The two did not get along well. Years later, Pepper expressed neither regrets nor sympathy to Wetherill's widow, Marietta, when he learned of Richard's murder (22 June 1910).

When *Pueblo Bonito* first appeared in 1920, it was thought to be a complete account of the excavations at the site. Clark Wissler of the American Museum of Natural History, wrote in his Foreword, "The author is to be commended for his frankness in thus placing before us his field record in full..." (p. 2). Wissler recognized, however, "that what is here published are his [Pepper's] field notes, supplemented by descriptive data for the most important specimens" (p. 2). We now know that Pepper did not publish the "field record in full" (Reyman 1989). Indeed, knowledgeable readers at the time would have known this as well because Pepper referred to other published reports in the text of *Pueblo Bonito* (e.g., p. 163, p. 194) and did not include most of the data from the earlier publications in the book. He also refers to the work of others at the site (e.g.,

Warren K. Moorehead (p. 216) but did not include their material. Nevertheless, Pueblo Bonito remains one of the most important site reports published for any southwestern site.

Pepper was a relatively careful excavator for the period, though this is not always evident in his publications. He excavated in stratigraphic units in at least some of the rooms (e.g., 32-33, the so-called "Burial Rooms" which contained 14 skeletons and thousands of artifacts, including some of the most spectacular turquoise and wood objects recovered from Pueblo Bonito). This stratigraphic work is only alluded to in his earlier publication (Pepper 1909), and is not mentioned at all in *Pueblo Bonito*. His stratigraphic work pre-dated by about 20 years the work done by Nelson at sites in the Galisteo Basin (New Mexico) and by Kidder at Pecos Pueblo (Reyman 1989:45-48). Pepper's stratigraphic work, however, was not as consistent, systematic, or precise as that of Nelson and Kidder. Pepper made precise counts of the artifacts recovered, room features, and even raw materials, and he provided measurements for the excavated rooms. These data are presented in the text and in tables at the end of the volume (pp. 352-373). These data, and the later data from excavations by Neil Judd (1954, 1964), form the basis for much of our knowledge about Pueblo Bonito and Chaco Canyon and have provided the empirical information the decades of research and the numerous studies that have resulted from it. In fact, research based on the work of the Hyde Exploring Expedition and Judd's later National Geographic Society Expedition is still ongoing and will continue for decades to come. For example, both those who view Chacoan culture history as significantly affected by Mesoamerican-Anasazi interaction, and those who view it as a largely indigenous development, use the empirical data from Pueblo Bonito (and Judd's reports) to bolster their arguments. Thus, *Pueblo Bonito* is one of the seminal works - a touchstone - in Anasazi archaeology and the archaeology of the American Southwest.

Given the importance of Pueblo Bonito for Chacoan, Anasazi, and southwestern archaeology, the last especially from the standpoint of the archaeological history of the region, it is somewhat surprising (at least to me) that David Stuart was chosen to write the Preface to the re-issued volume. By his own admission (p. v), he had never before read the volume in its entirety (and there is no reference to it in *Prehistoric New Mexico: Background for Survey* [Stuart and Gauthier 1981]). Nor, to the best of my knowledge, has Stuart done much, if any, archaeological fieldwork at Chaco. Thus, although Stuart discusses the shortcomings of Pueblo Bonito and what Pepper did not do, he is ill-prepared to discuss the importance of the book (some aspects of which are discussed above), especially from an historical perspective, except to note that the approximately 70,000 items shipped to the American Museum of Natural History ". . . remain the largest single, coherent, 'provenience' collection of Anasazi artifacts available for research" (p. viii). This last statement is not entirely accurate. The bulk of the materials excavated by Pepper are at the AMNH, but significant portions of the collection are dispersed among several museums, e.g., the former Heye Foundation - Museum of the American Indian (most of it now in storage), the National Museum of the American Indian, the Peabody Museum at Harvard, and the Field Museum of Natural History, among others. Furthermore, given the fact that Pepper's work continues to provide primary data for archaeological research, Stuart is dead wrong when he writes (p. viii), "In short, as a scientific document the reissue of Pepper's field notes is not particularly important." Indeed, his statement is contradicted by the sentence that follows it: "What is important about this book is that it is the first and best primary record of Pueblo Bonito. . ." (p. viii). Stuart's subsequent comments on p. ix also contradict his assessment about its lack of scientific importance.

The re-issue of *Pueblo Bonito* also contains a short essay by Stuart, "The Chaco Anasazi Era." It is reprinted from his 1985 book, *Glimpses of the Ancient Southwest*, a work intended for popular audiences. It provides a brief overview of Anasazi culture history. Inasmuch as the audience for Pueblo Bonito is largely a professional one, a more comprehensive synopsis would have been preferable.

Finally, I have a small complaint about the final production of the book. The original volume had color plates for several of the more spectacular objects such as the painted board from Room 32. The re-issue has

only black-and-white illustrations. The additional cost of color would have been worth it, especially because few archaeologists will ever have a chance to see the original artifacts. Regardless, this is a book worth owning. If readers do not have a copy of the original, this book, in paper or cloth, deserves a place on their bookshelves.

References Cited

Judd, Neil M.

1954 *The Material Culture of Pueblo Bonito*, Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, Vol. 124, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.

1954 *The Architecture of Pueblo Bonito*, Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, Vol. 147, No. 1., Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Pepper, George H.

1909 "The Exploration of a Burial-Room in Pueblo Bonito," in *Putnam Anniversary Volume*, G.E. Stechert, New York, pp. 196-252.

1920 *Pueblo Bonito*, American Museum of Natural History, Anthropological Papers, Vol. 27, American Museum of Natural History, New York..

Reyman, Jonathan E.

1989 "The History of Archaeology and the Archaeological History of Chaco Canyon, New Mexico," in *Tracing Archaeology 's Past: The Historiography of Archaeology*," edited by A.L. Christensen, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, pp. 41-53.

Stuart, David E.

1985 *Glimpses of the Ancient Southwest*, Ancient City Press, Santa Fe.

_____, David E. and Rory P. Gauthier (with Thomas W. Merlan, Contributor and Editor) 1981 *Prehistoric New Mexico: Background to Survey*, Historic Preservation Bureau, Santa Fe.