speaking archaeologists have regarded Thomas Kuhn's concept of scientific revolutions as applicable to their discipline. The ability of young radicals, such as Lewis Binford or Ian Hodder and their disciples, to transform archaeology by successfully challenging the beliefs and practices of an older generation of archaeologists appears to conform with Kuhn's concept of a scientific revolution, even if archaeoloqy has always Possessed competing paradigms rather than a single dominant one, as has been the case with the physical and natural sciences. Stephen L. Dyson, in his paper "The role of ideology and institutions in shaping classical archaeology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries" (in *Tracing Archaeology's Past* , edited by A.L. Christenson, 1989), has pointed out that Kuhn's concept does not apply to classical archaeology, where gerontocratic control of resources and mega-research projects has stifled youthful innovation and tended to produce mature scholars who are clones of their teachers. It appears that in Germany a similar situation prevails in prehistoric archaeology.

Yet, in recent years, classical archaeologists in Britain and the United States have shown increasing willingness to transcend their traditional, exclusively art-historical and text-based approach to archaeology and are embracing methods derived from prehistoric archaeology that reveal more about environmental settings, economies, social organization, and everyday life in ancient societies. This suggests that Tom Bloemers is right to hope that German prehistoric archaeology can change and develop. When it does, the efforts of the triumphalist forces that control archaeology in a united Germany to eradicate rather than exploit the intellectual diversity that was inherited from East Germany may finally be recognized as a short-sighted and retrograde policy.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.11205

Grasshopper Pueblo. A Story of Archaeology and Ancient Life, by Jefferson Reid and Stephanie Whittlesey. University of Arizona Press, Tucson. 204 pages, 32 photographs, 8 illustrations, references, index. 1999. ISBN: 0-8165-1914-5. Hardback $29.95, Paperback $15.95.

by

Jonathan E. Reyman
Illinois State Museum
Research and Collections Center
Springfield, IL 62703-3535

Grasshopper Pueblo field school closed after the 1992 summer season. Its closing marked the end of a 30-year period of survey, excavation and analysis of archaeological sites and materials as well as student education. From 1963-1992, hundreds of students were trained in the field methods and analytical models and techniques of the New Archaeology as practiced at the University of Arizona under the direction of Raymond Thompson (1963-1965), William Longacre (1966-1978), and J. Jefferson Reid (1979-1992). By the end of the 1992 summer season, Grasshopper Pueblo was, perhaps, the most thoroughly studied archaeological site in the American Southwest. As the authors note, "Although large pueblos of the American Southwest have attracted archaeologists for more than a century ... Ancient life at these special places will never be understood with as much detail as we have for Grasshopper Pueblo" (x). Much of the detail is reported in the many published papers, nine doctoral dissertations, and two masters' theses cited by the authors, and more reports are likely to follow. As a training ground for archaeologists, Grasshopper is probably comparable in importance to the Chaco Canyon field schools and excavations of the 1920s-1940s.

The authors state in the Preface (x) that there are three reasons why the Grasshopper research is unique: the 105 rooms excavated provide an unusually large sample of rooms and artifacts; the quantity and quality of the artifact record itself; and the changes in excavation practices, notably those of burials, in response to growing Native American (in this case White Mountain Apache) participation and control of cultural resource management on their lands. Consequently, the excavation of burials at Grasshopper ended in 1979, eleven years before passage of NAGPRA legislation.

Some comments on the first two reasons are in order. There are certainly sites in the Southwest where far more rooms have been excavated and many more artifacts have been recovered, e.g., Pueblo Bonito, Chetro Ketl, and Pueblo del Arroyo at Chaco Canyon, and Arroyo Hondo Pueblo outside Santa Fe. The key word is "sample." The Chacoan sites were not sampled; Arroyo Hondo was, though perhaps not as rigorously as was Grasshopper. Furthermore, although the quantity of the artifact record is important, it is the quality of it that is more so. Here the work at Grasshopper is clearly superior, and understandably so given the two-seven decades that passed between the work at Chaco and that at Grasshopper (the first major excavation at Chaco, the Hyde Exploring Expedition, began in 1896, and the last of the field school prior to the work of the Chaco Center ended in the mid 1940s). Indeed, if the Grasshopper work were not technically and methodologically better than that at Chaco, one would have cause to criticize. One of the problems that has hampered and continues to hamper the re-analyses of the data from the work of Pepper, Judd, and others at Chaco prior to World War II is the comparatively poor record keeping of those earlier years. The work at Arroyo Hondo, however, seems to me to be comparable in quality to that at Grasshopper though the fieldwork at Arroyo Hondo was of much shorter duration (1970-1974).

The authors intend for this volume "to summarize what we know, what we think we know, and what we suspect about life at Grasshopper Pueblo, so that this information can be used as a guide for the next generation of Grasshopper researchers;... To craft a story for the benefit of nonarchaeologists... the Western Apache and other Native American peoples and... the vast audience of non-Indians wishing to understand southwestern prehistory" (xii). It must be noted, however, that to the Apache and other American Indian groups, especially those in the Southwest, this is history, not prehistory.

The authors, however, also provide a history of archaeological research at Grasshopper using a narrative structure in which the history of the research and the history of the Pueblo sometimes are parallel and at other times converge. For example, Chapter 2, "The Establishment Period," covers both the beginnings of the Grasshopper settlement and the establishment of the Grasshopper field school. It's an interesting way of presenting the history, and it makes for a more readable book. For those new to the Southwest, there's some basic history of Southwest archaeology, e.g., that Emil W. Haury recognized and defined Mogollon Culture, per se, in 1931, though publication of it didn't appear until 1936 (11-12); and that the Grasshopper area was surveyed by Leslie Spier, Walter Hough, and Byron Cummings.

Finally, this is a love story. Grasshopper is clearly a beloved place. With joint authorship, it's often difficult to know who writes what, but my guess is that that the love story between the archaeologist and the site is more Reid's than Whittlesey's.

The volume is organized into seven chapters: 1) The Land, the People, and the Place; 2) The Establishment Period; 3) The Aggregation Period; 4) Grasshopper Ecology; 5) Grasshopper Sociology; 6) Grasshopper Ideology, Religion, and Arts; and 7) Dispersion and Abandonment Periods. Both

authors are identified with the New Archaeology. Yet, curiously, their discussions of religion and ritual (especially what call the Arrow Society), ideology, sociology, and other such issues, and even that of pottery-making (88-90) read more like the culture history we associate with Gordon Willey than the work of, say, Lewis Binford (this is not a criticism).

The authors use the Western Apache and the Hopi "as cultural metaphors for the Mogollon at Grasshopper Pueblo" (14). Both are used as models for understanding subsistence at Grasshopper (96-98); Hopi architecture and ceremonial life help the authors to analyze Grasshopper architecture (especially what they infer to be ceremonial rooms), religion, and ideology (e.g., pp. 122-127).

Reid and Whittlesey provide two stories for the origin of the name, Grasshopper. The first is that of a lame Apache woman whom the Indians called "Naz-chug-gee" (Grasshopper) because of her peculiar limp. The second story came from Apache friends of the authors; the site is one where grasshoppers are abundant (5).

Before Grasshopper Pueblo was built, there were two smaller sites, Chodistaas (Apache for "scorpion") Pueblo to the north was occupied from A.D. 1263-1300, first seasonally, and then year-round (33-41). It was destroyed by fire and "was ritually buried after it burned" (38). To the best of my knowledge, this is unique within the Southwest. Grasshopper Spring Pueblo was contemporaneous (ca. A.D. 1270s-1300) with Chodistaas and was located to the south-southeast of it and east of Grasshopper. Grasshopper Pueblo, itself, though more than 100 times larger than Chodistaas and Grasshopper Spring combined, was just as short-lived; it lasted only about a generation, ca. 1300-1330 (62).

Grasshopper Pueblo was not an isolated site. The recovery of the remains of about twenty macaws (83), copper bells, and marine shell are evidence for trade with Mesoamerica, either direct or indirect. Based on their sampling procedure (about 20% of the site was excavated), the authors suggest that approximately 100 macaws might have been present at the site, a number they consider indicative of a fairly simple type of exchange system (83). Whatever the actual number of birds, they consider only numbers and not the issue of value; nor do they consider that feathers might have been imported, as well as live birds. I would argue that the *value* of such commodities is the important factor.

One also wonders what the people of Grasshopper exchanged for the macaws, copper bells, and shell. Turquoise comes to mind. It was available locally and was found in Room 113 at Grasshopper "in all stages of manufacture" (81) - raw nuggets, unfinished blanks, and finished pendants. The presumed lack of controlled access to the turquoise deposits is interpreted by the authors as further evidence that the trading system was not closely managed or complicated (82).

Chapter 5 (Grasshopper Sociology) and Chapter 6 (Grasshopper Ideology, Religion, and Arts) are the most interesting chapters, and in some ways the most speculative. For example, the authors infer that "about half the adult men at Grasshopper belonged to ceremonial societies that crosscut kinship groups" (126). They base this on objects found with the excavated burials and Hopi ethnographic burial practices. Based on my own work among the Pueblos, including the Hopi, I would have thought that the percentage would have been considerably higher than about 50%. Furthermore, given the size of Grasshopper Pueblo, I'm a bit surprised that the mortuary data indicate the presence of only four men's ceremonial societies (130). Nevertheless, that these two chapters raised many

questions in my mind that led me to re-read materials I hadn't looked at for some time is indicative how engaging the authors' presentation is.

There are a few noteworthy omissions. The authors state that the turquoise mine was apparently unguarded but don't provide the evidence for this inference. Perhaps I missed it, but nowhere could I find the basis for dating the sites, e.g., C14 or tree-rings. The discussion of charred beams at Chodistaas and other data presented provides the possibility that both techniques were used, as well as others. Though reference is made to Joe Ben Wheat's 1955 synthesis (12), Wheat's monograph (*Mogollon Culture Prior to A.D. 1000*) is not in the Bibliography. The discussion of Room 246, its floor "packed with tools and equipment that reflect the fabrication of special objects with ritual significance" (123) requires illustration with either a photograph or a drawing.

The argument that there was a "shift to complete dependence on agriculture" (94) is an overstatement. I doubt that any farming people in the Southwest was ever completely dependent on agriculture; hunting-gathering, though diminished in importance, still must have contributed to the subsistence base, and trade for foodstuffs might also have been a factor. I do not want to push ethnographic analogy too far, but it seems to me that the ethnographic and ethnohistoric data from the Southwest are clear on this and cannot be ignored. This is certainly the case at Hopi, the Pueblo cultural metaphor that the authors use.

These last comments are not meant to discourage anyone from buying and reading this book. Reid and Whittlesey have produced an excellent, thought-provoking work that belongs on the bookshelf of every Southwest archaeologist and Pueblo ethnographer. By today's standards, it's "dirt cheap" for the wealth of information provided about the culture history of Grasshopper Pueblo and the history of the project. There are valuable lessons to be learned here about the site, its people, its history, and the scientists who interpret the data to provide the story.

Prehistory of the Carson Desert and Stillwater Mountains: Environment, Mobility, and Subsistence in a Great Basin Wetland, by Robert L. Kelly, University of Utah Anthropological Papers Number 123, Salt Lake City, 2001.

by

Todd Bostwick
Pueblo Grande Museum, Phoenix

The Great Basin of Western North America is one of the legendary deserts of the world. This rugged, wide open, and apparently harsh landscape has long served as a backdrop for human drama. Gold seekers and immigrants of the 19th century immortalized the rigors of traveling across the Great Basin on their way to greener grass in California and Oregon. But archaeological research has shown that human occupation of the Great Basin dates back for thousands of years, and ethnographic accounts of Native Americans who lived in this desert have played an important role in the development of concepts of hunter-gatherer subsistence and settlement patterns. It is the Indians of the Great Basin that Julian Steward (1938) studied for his well-known model of socio-political organization and evolution (Steward 1955; also see Service 1975). Jesse Jennings (1957) later used Steward's model in his development of the Desert Culture concept, which was widely adapted to other North America deserts.