by Phoebe Sheftel’s detailed discussion of conflict over which country (France or the USA) would get the concession to excavate the iconic site of Delphi, and by Silberman’s retelling of the politics of American archaeology in the Near East. Of course we are now well accustomed to the existence of objectives other than the disinterested pursuit of knowledge in archaeological practice, but these discussions of the social and cultural context of archaeological knowledge are still important to have. One reason is that they allow us to peer behind the veil of rhetoric that governs the activities of all significant archaeological institutions (an example being James Snead’s discussion of the Institute’s on-again-off-again relationship with archaeology in North America). Another reason is that they afford us the chance to explore in depth serious issues that arise with the practice of archaeology in other countries (which are sometimes over-generalised as ‘colonialist’ contexts). Clemency Coggins’ consideration of professional responsibility is a very useful contribution to this exploration. The book is rounded out with more specific studies of the Institute in Canada (Russell), its activities between the Wars (Dyson), and the use of computers (Eiteljorg). Four appendices complete the coverage (lists of Presidents and Editors-in-Chief, award and fellowship winners, lists of local societies and lists of Lecturers).

While it cannot be said that this book constitutes the history of such an important institution (indeed the editor makes no such claims), the papers published here certainly make a significant contribution toward the writing of that history.

James H. Simpson (edited and annotated by Frank McNitt, Foreword by Durwood Ball)

Reviewed by Jonathan E. Reyman

First published as a Senate report during the first session of the 31st Congress (1849–1850), then commercially published (Simpson 1852; note that, in the two-year interval, Simpson changed the spelling from Navaho to Navajo), Simpson’s Navaho Expedition did not receive widespread distribution until edited and annotated by Frank McNitt and published by the University of Oklahoma Press as part of ‘The American Exploration and Travel Series’ (McNitt 1964). The volume reviewed here is a reprint of the 1964 volume with a new, valuable Foreword by Durwood Ball; Richard Kern’s drawing of Jemez Pueblo has been moved back from the 1964 edition to a less appropriate placement (facing p. 166) in this new printing. This 2003 edition is welcome because Simpson’s account of the expedition is an important document in the history of southwestern archaeology and ethnography, and with McNitt’s editing and annotations, ‘… McNitt’s Navaho Expedition [is] a priceless snapshot of the Navajos, survey of Chaco [Canyon], and record of New Mexico’ (Ball, in McNitt 2003:lxxx).

Ball is correct, but his comment doesn’t do justice to the expedition’s success and the importance of Simpson’s journal. The lieutenant was one of 15 officers in the 500-man Navaho Expedition under the command of (Brevet) Lieutenant Colonel John M. Washington. In addition to the work at Chaco Canyon, the expedition parties also explored part of Canyon de Chelly, surveyed Inscription Rock (now El Morro National Monument) where they left a record of their passing and where artist Richard Kern, a member of Simpson’s party, made several excellent panel sketches, visited most of the New Mexican Pueblo villages, made a comparative word list of English, Pueblo, Navajo, and other Native American terms, and completed other tasks during the 587.11 miles marched between August 15, 1849, when they
left Santa Fe, and September 23, 1849, when they returned to the New Mexico capital. What makes these accomplishments all the more remarkable with regard to archaeology, ethnography, geology, and topography is that the undertaking was intended as a punitive expedition against the Navajos (and secondarily against the Utes) to stop their raiding of Rio Grande settlements.

One major reason for the expedition’s success was the presence of Pueblo, Navajo, and Mexican Indians who served as guides, scouts, and members of the volunteer militia (pp. lxx–lxxix). This meant that the expedition was not traveling blind; these men knew their country, especially where water and grazing for the animals were to be found – critical resources in the arid Southwest. They also gave the expedition entry into the Pueblos, where Simpson made and recorded some of his most important observations, and they were an obvious factor in Simpson’s ability to compile his comparative word list. One of the more important men was Carravahal, a Mexican guide who joined the expedition at San Ysidro on August 23rd. Reliable both as a guide and informant, Carravahal provided Simpson with the names of the Chacoan ruins – Pueblo Pintado, Hungo Pavie (now spelled Hungo Pavi), and others – that are still used today (p. lxxvii).

Ball’s Foreword accomplishes several important things. McNitt’s original Introduction discusses in detail the history of the expedition, beginning with the rationale for it, how it was conducted, presents some biographical information in Simpson and other personnel, and briefly discusses what occurred after Simpson returned. Ball puts the expedition in the larger contexts of Frederick Jackson Turner’s ‘frontier nationalism’ argument and that of Manifest Destiny. Ball notes, ‘Lieutenant Simpson’s journal is an artifact of United States Manifest Destiny’ (p. lxxxiv) and then explains this in the pages that follow.

McNitt’s Introduction contains a biographical sketch of Simpson (pp. lviii–lxii), to which Ball adds more information that is useful for understanding the lieutenant. Both note that Simpson did not like the Southwest – its food, people, scenery; nonetheless, this did not prevent him from making the thorough and accurate observations that he put in his reports, with positive consequences both for himself and for American archaeology. As McNitt notes in his Introduction (p. lix), ‘And yet, paradoxically [given his dislike of the Southwest], the only events that lift him from the obscurity of a long career as a builder of roads and supervisor of harbor improvements are the achievements resulting from his brief three and one-half years in the West.’ To which Ball adds, ‘Although Simpson, a conservative easterner and devout Episcopalian, despised New Mexico, his experience launched him on a distinguished army career as a western explorer … and … as a railroad builder’ (p. lxxxviii).

As for archaeology and ethnography, the importance of Simpson’s accomplishment is reflected in the numerous citations of his journal by prominent southwestern scholars such as Bandelier (Lange and Riley 1966:258), Judd (1954:4–6), Parsons (1925:75–76), and Pepper (1927:14–15, 25). For Bandelier, Simpson’s notes on Jemez Pueblo were a significant source of information as early as 1880.

Finally, Ball provides a brief biographical account of McNitt (pp. lxxx–lxxxiii) that complements McNitt’s discussion, in his Introduction, of how he came to edit Simpson’s journal. Of note is that McNitt edited and annotated Simpson’s journal and did the research for other books (e.g., McNitt 1957, 1962) while an active journalist and a Massachusetts newspaper owner (Southbridge Evening News). With this as background, let’s consider what makes Simpson’s journal so important to the history of southwestern archaeology and ethnography.

The first Pueblo visited was Santo Domingo, followed by Jemez. There a camp was
established for several days from which the party reconnoitered the surrounding area. Simpson’s descriptions of Pueblo architecture and Richard Kern’s drawings are historically important because the villages then had many two-story sections, whereas today they are mostly a single story high. The descriptions of Pueblo clothes and behaviors are similarly useful, both in their own right and for comparative purposes. At Santo Domingo, for instance, Simpson describes the production of paper bread that we, today, using the Hopi term, refer to as piki or piiki. Piiki was and is a common food at Hopi and Zuni ceremonies, but I have never had it or even seen it at Santo Domingo. Simpson’s account of its production there is one of many examples of culture change that occurred since the mid-19th century.

As the expedition moved on they reached Pueblo Pintado and then the ruins in Chaco Canyon, per se, where Simpson provides the first published descriptions of the sites, notes the presence of rock art, and Kern makes the first drawings. After Pueblo Pintado, they visited Weje-gi (Wijiji), Mesa Fachada (Fajada Butte), Una Vida, Hungo Pavie (Hungo Pavi), Chetro Kettle (Chetro Ketl), Pueblo Bonito, Pueblo del Arroyo, and finally Peñasca Blanca (Peñasco Blanco).

Simpson’s descriptions of the tabular sandstone masonry, his estimates of room numbers (e.g., p. 47: 641–800 for Pueblo Bonito), the numbers of estufas (kivas), and other details are quite accurate, especially considering that the nine-man party did not clear away the debris or excavate other than to determine the depth of the masonry footings at Pueblo Pintado (more than two feet; p. 39). Simpson notes the probable presence of a quarry area behind (north?) of their camp from which the sandstone for Pueblo Pintado was obtained. He reports that the Chaco River was flowing – eight feet wide and a foot and one-half deep (p. 42) – but, curiously, makes no mention of the arroyo that is present today and was there when the Hyde Exploring Expedition began its work in 1896 (Pepper 1927). Yet, that Pueblo del Arroyo was so-named by Carravahal on August 28, 1849, when Simpson’s party reached the site, is evidence that the arroyo must have been present.

Kern was an artist, not an architect, and his drawings of the ruins and scenery are more impressionistic than precise. Nevertheless, one has no trouble identifying Pueblo Pintado (facing p. 48) and other sites from his drawings, and his drawing of a restored Hungo Pavi (facing p. 97) is quite similar to renderings by later illustrators. This is, perhaps the place to note one of the shortcomings of this reprint: Kern’s drawing of Pueblo Pintado and Hungo Pavi, as presented here, are significantly darker and less clear than in the 1964 edition. Important details such as the presence of windows and doorways in the 1964 print of Pueblo Pintado are almost entirely obscured by the dark tone of the print is this 2003 edition. This is a serious loss of information. The same occurs with Kern’s drawings of Zuni and Inscription Rock, both of which lose clarity and details in the new edition.

Simpson provides translations of the carved inscriptions found at Inscription Rock. McNitt notes (p. 134, footnotes 154–155) that we now have more accurate translations of some of the inscriptions. But Simpson’s record, and Kern’s accompanying drawings are primary data and especially important because some inscriptions are now almost illegible.

Kern’s impressionistic drawing of Zuni seems, at first glance, to overemphasize the topographic importance of the Zuni ‘sacred mountain’ on the east side of the pueblo, a large mesa known as Dowa Yallane. But as those who have worked at Zuni know, the importance of this landform cannot be overemphasized from the Zuni religious perspective. Among other things, Dowa Yallane is the location of several shrines, including that of the Zuni war gods. Did Kern know the importance to Zuni of Dowa Yallane? We have no evidence that he did. Simpson mentions the mesa only in passing, noting that he hoped to climb it but was unable in the time allotted to him (p. 120).
The expedition returned to Santa Fe on September 23, 1849. As McNitt writes (p. 163):

‘From a military point of view ... [the] ... expedition against the Navahos was a qualified success ... [Washington] ... secured information of the Navaho people and their terrain that would be invaluable to others later ... [but] ... As a punitive expedition, designed to impress upon the Navahos the power of United States authority, Colonel Washington's campaign was a failure. The Navahos were not impressed.’

But it was a success in terms of providing important information for generations of archaeologists and ethnographers to come. Simpson's journal is a 19th century treasure of which so many of us have partaken. There is room for improvement, however: this edition would have benefited from placement of the drawings of Jemez, Zuni, and Inscription Rock with the appropriate text; and the press should have had an archaeologist or ethnographer go through the 1964 edition to correct some of McNitt's (admittedly few) errors such as his citation of Stubbs (1950:59) that Jemez is the last Tewa-speaking pueblo. Jemez is the sole remaining Towa-speaking pueblo; Stubbs knew this, and wrote that it was on p. 59. Finally, it would be wonderful if some press would undertake publication of Simpson's journal with the inclusion of the entire corpus of the Kerns' drawings. This is probably too much to hope for, but one can dream.
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