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INTRODUCTION

The Hopi people have strong and abiding cultural ties to the lands where their ancestors lived in ancient times. They recognize these lands as Hopitutskwa (Hopi land), a cultural landscape marked by the numerous archaeological sites and named places that figure into Hopi oral traditions as their metaphorical “footprints.” Today much of Hopitutskwa has passed from Hopi ownership into private property and public lands managed by multiple federal agencies. Access to ancestral sites has thus become increasingly restricted, making it difficult for the Hopi people to maintain their historical traditions based on cultural practices embedded in the land.

To address this situation, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office—the Hopi tribal government’s official department that helps manage, preserve, and protect traditional culture—uses the political and regulatory processes provided by the National Historic Preservation Act (as well as other federal and state laws). The tribe draws on this National Historic Preservation Act in particular to identify traditional cultural properties, evaluate their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places, and document the Hopi history and cultural practices associated with them. Using the research opportunities created by a series of relatively small projects, the Hopi Tribe is building a regional perspective on the tangible sites of its heritage that are associated with the retention and transmission of the tribe’s cultural practices and intangible traditions.
In this chapter we describe how three separate historic preservation projects enabled the Hopi Tribe to trace a physical connection between the Hopi Mesas in Arizona and Glen Canyon in Utah. In collaborative research with archaeological ethnographers, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office investigated Hopi traditional cultural properties along a pipeline right-of-way, along a highway improvement project, and in the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. These investigations relate specific historic properties to larger concepts of landscape and cultural identity. The results of these projects serve to elucidate the connections between individual sites in Glen Canyon and the regional context of Hopitutskwa, including clan migrations and narratives of a legendary boy named Tiyo that encompass the Gulf of California.

The intangible heritage of the Hopi people—the traditional cultural beliefs and practices that are important in maintaining their sense of identity and continuity—is intimately linked to historical events that are situated in different locations across the Hopitutskwa landscape. Contemporary Hopi customs, including ceremonies, largely focus on commemorating the places that contributed to the development of Hopi society and religion. Such places retain power that is activated and enlivened through ongoing cultural traditions. In this way, the Hopitutskwa landscape represents a collection of experiences that cohesively binds the Hopi people to the land and to each other. In a managerial context, the articulation of Hopi land and identity is accomplished by the tribe’s participation in the national historic preservation program.

The projects we discuss below were designed as collaborative, community-based participatory research to advance Hopi scholarship. In each project, members of the Hopi Tribe and non-Hopi researchers worked jointly to identify ancestral archaeological sites, springs, shrines, landforms, and other tangible places with cultural importance to the Hopi people. Documenting Hopi traditional places has wide-ranging benefits, foremost of which is the preservation of historical and place-related knowledge for use by future generations of Hopis. Furthermore, working within the framework of the National Historic Preservation Act provides a means of communicating the importance of specific Hopi places to non-Hopi audiences, thus facilitating the implementation of culturally sensitive land management strategies.

In this chapter, we reflect on the historical role and contemporary politics of cultural memories of landscape, providing a cultural analysis of community engagement that combines archaeological analyses of space with ethnographic research. These issues are particularly timely given the evolving relationship of Americanist archaeology to heritage policy and identity politics.
Hopi ancestors lived in these canyons

Hopi history and Hopi land

The land is really important to us because it’s our ancestral land. That’s where we have been, and I think it’s good to make pilgrimage to various places and leave your prayer feathers... That’s where the spirits live, and that’s how we maintain peace. (Alph Secakuku 2011)

Hopi’s connection with the southwestern United States extends back to the Motisinom (“First People”), who are the earliest ancestors of the Hopi. According to traditional accounts, other Hopi ancestors later emerged into the Fourth World (the present world) through the Sipapuni, a travertine cone located in the Little Colorado River Gorge near the Grand Canyon. Upon emergence, the people encountered Māasaw, the guardian of the earth, who instructed them to go in search of the Tuuwanasavi, Hopi’s spiritual center of the universe. The people formed clans, split apart, and began a long series of migrations toward their ultimate destination at the Hopi Mesas (Courlander 1971, 1982; Crane 1925; Curtis 1922:16–98; Fewkes 1900; Mindeleff 1891:16–39; Voth 1905; Yava 1978:36–40).

During their migrations, these clans came into contact with the Hoopoq’yaqam (Those Who Went to the northeast), another group of Hopi ancestors who trace their origins to Mesoamerica (Ferguson and Lomaomvaya 1999; Washburn 1995). Upon leaving Mesoamerica, the Hoopoq’yaqam traveled to Palatkwapi (the Red Walled City), where they stayed until floods and social unrest prompted them to continue their migrations northward. They eventually joined the other clans and settled new villages as they journeyed to the Hopi Mesas (Teague 1993). Collectively, these groups are considered to be Hisatsinom, Hopi’s ancient ancestors (Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006:97; Kuwanwisiwma 2004).

Today, the Hopi people are organized as a federally recognized tribe with a reservation in northeastern Arizona, within the core of Hopitutskwa (figure 3.1). Hopis continue to orient themselves with their ancestral lands through oral traditions and ceremonies. From certain religious perspectives, Hopitutskwa encompasses a complex geographical and temporal span that includes all places Hopi ancestors resided in the past (Balenquah 2008; Bernardini 2005; Ferguson et al. 2009; Ferguson and Lomaomvaya 2011:166; Jenkins et al. 1994; Kuwanwiswma and Ferguson 2009; Lyons 2003). This landscape is dense with culturally important locations, including landforms associated with deities and historical events, sacred springs, rivers, trails, and ancestral sites (Koyiyumptewa and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2011). The land is remembered through stories, ceremonial reenactments, and pilgrimages. Hopitutskwa remains vital in the daily life of the Hopi people.

As Hopitutskwa passed from Hopi ownership into private property and federally managed land, varying historical representations of Hopitutskwa were developed.
to respond to political-geographical needs to assert and defend contemporary political and cultural rights. In the early twentieth century, for example, the people of Second Mesa presented a letter to the commissioner of Indian Affairs petitioning for access to traditional lands encompassed by a series of shrines that constitute points along a homvìikya (pilgrimage route) that is used in ongoing Hopi traditions (Whiteley 1989:7–39). Tribal leaders explained that the land has “been a most vital subject of our people or tribe at present and for generations past” and that they are concerned because surrounding areas are no longer easily accessible because of the encroachment of outsiders. “For centuries the Hopi shrines at the distance points, which borders the Hopi people from every direction, marked and designated the Hopis’ tribal land boundary lines. Before the other peoples came the Hopis’ essential needs at away places were all obtainable.” The Hopis conclude the letter with an appeal for the return of “our land we love so well . . . for the benefit of our future generations” (Hopi Tribe 1930).

Hopi aboriginal lands as determined by the Indian Claims Commission (ICC), a judicial panel established in 1946 that addressed Indian land losses, ultimately did not encompass the entire area claimed by the leaders of Second Mesa. The
ICC reduced the extent of the Hopi claim using a judicial standard of exclusive use and occupancy for the period following the entry of the United States into the Southwest in 1848 (Indian Claims Commission 1970). The area described by Second Mesa leaders, however, has come to be viewed as the extent of Hopitutskwa by many non-Hopis. Meanwhile, Hopi traditionalists maintain that the homviikya encircles the contemporary core, or “plaza,” of the Hopi homeland, while the greater domain of Hopi stewardship extends outward to encompass a much larger area—one that includes all of Hopis’ ancestral lands (Hedquist et al. 2014; Jenkins et al. 1994:8; Kuwanwisiwma and Ferguson 2009:92). The area and associated pilgrimage are significant because they demonstrate the ongoing role of the land and its features in contemporary Hopi life (Eggan 1994:15). The preservation of Hopi culture depends in part on continuing the traditional uses of Hopitutskwa, including respecting the ancestral sites it contains.

The Hopi people continue to defend the traditional lands that lie outside their reservation. In recent years, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has become increasingly involved in the research needed to implement the National Historic Preservation Act to identify Hopi traditional cultural properties on federally managed land. This approach enables members of the Hopi Tribe to maintain their historical traditions and cultural practices associated with the land and to use scholarly standards in documenting Hopitutskwa at a regional level. Hopis consider all of their ancestral places as integral in understanding the broader picture of Hopi history and religion. The salient features of the Hopi cultural landscape identified during these projects illustrate the depth and complexity of Hopi culture and the role of individual elements in shaping notions of Hopi identity and well-being.

**THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF HOPI TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

The Hopi Tribe never accepted the monetary payment for its aboriginal lands provided by the Indian Claims Commission. Those funds remain in a trust account accruing interest. Many Hopi people feel strongly that they have a moral right to use their traditional lands, even if that right is not formally recognized by the United States. In order to protect its cultural interests in Hopi aboriginal land, the Hopi Tribe has turned to participation in the historic preservation planning process to make sure Hopi cultural sites are considered during federal undertakings.

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, was passed to preserve the historical and cultural foundations of the United States as a living
part of community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people. Section 106 of this act requires federal agencies to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties included on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) prior to any federal undertaking, to assess the potential adverse effects of the undertaking on those historic properties, and to consider how adverse effects can be resolved. Federal agencies are required to consider such properties in planning actions and to consult Indian tribes, interested parties, and the State Historic Preservation Office. Section 110 of the NHPA makes agencies responsible for preserving historic properties owned or controlled by the agency.

Historic properties are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP when they meet one or more of the following criteria set forth in NRHP regulations: (a) association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history, (b) association with the lives of persons significant in our past, (c) embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or representative of the work of a master, or possession of high artistic values, or representative of a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction, and (d) history of yielding, or potential to yield, information important in prehistory or history. In order to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, properties must also have integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Traditional cultural properties are historic properties whose significance derives from their association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community’s history and (b) are important in the retention and transmission of the cultural identity of the community (Parker and King 1998:1). Hopi traditional cultural properties are important because they comprise the tangible sites and places involved in passing down Hopi culture through generations by oral transmission and practice. As part of their contemporary lifeway, Hopis continue to commemorate thousands of places that are associated with deities, shrines, historical events, water sources, mountains, ancestral villages, and other historical and religious traditions.

Prior to the 1992 amendments to the NHPA, it would have been difficult for tribes to argue the significance of traditional places. However, with these amendments, which formally acknowledged the significance of traditional cultural properties as historic properties, tribes have had greater opportunities to argue for the values of these sites. Nevertheless, the significance of individual properties still has to be determined on a case-by-case basis.
RECONSTRUCTING HOPITUTSKWA: BUILDING A REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE

I think there’s a tendency to lock ourselves into the political boundaries of a project area . . . But in terms of good management, [federal agencies] need to create a long-term, if not a short-term, goal to sponsor ethnographic overviews regionally . . . [Every place] represents a chapter in our history, but the regional interest of the Hopi people is really, really huge. During my tenure with the office, I’ve learned to appreciate the breadth of our cultural and clan history, and it’s our job to try to continue to represent the Hopi people’s interest regionally. (Leigh J. Kuwanwiswma, Director of Hopi Cultural Preservation Office [Kuwanwiswma 2011])

The Hopi cultural landscape was created through generations of experience and encounters with the world. Like other communities, members of the Hopi Tribe understand the land in relation to specific events and historical conditions that provide the context for cultural comprehension (Bender 1993:2). In Hopi society, knowledge is privileged and hierarchical, and multiple accounts of history and religion exist. Individual clan histories, gender, and the cultural and religious standing of a person influence the way he or she understands the world. The participation of the Hopi Tribe in cultural preservation projects enables tribal members to identify and reconnect with places on the land that they know through oral traditions, and the Hopi Tribal Council recognizes and encourages the role of villages, clans, and religious societies in their efforts to do this (Hopi Tribe 1994).

The history of Hopi people embedded in the land creates a storied landscape. Features on the land serve as metonyms for cultural concepts; they evoke images of named places, the values associated with them, and the stories embedded in them (Whiteley 2011; Young 1988). In this sense, each place has a far-reaching impact on the Hopi people. Ancestral villages and other archaeological sites represent metaphorical footprints, marking the migrations of Hopi ancestors to the center of the universe on the Hopi Mesas. These ancient footprints continue to provide spiritual strength to the Hopi people, and they are integral in understanding the history of the land (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2006; Gumerman et al. 2012).

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has participated in numerous historic preservation projects as part of the compliance process with the NRHP. Tribal members corroborate traditional knowledge with archaeological information to identify Hopi traditional cultural properties and evaluate their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. Here we discuss three projects conducted near the Hopi Reservation, including the Black Mesa Project, the US 160 road improvement project, and a traditional land use study in Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. These three projects identified traditional cultural properties in relation to
Hopi concepts of landscape and cultural identity, elucidating the connections between individual sites and the regional context of Hopitutskwa.

The Black Mesa Project

The Black Mesa Project was designed to develop a new source of water for use in conveying coal from the Black Mesa Mine, located north of the Hopi Mesas, to the Mohave Generating Station at Laughlin, Nevada. The Black Mesa Project is a federal undertaking because it requires a permit from the Office of Surface Mining. The proposed undertaking entails several distinct project components (figure 3.2), one of which is the development of a proposed Well Field with up to twelve wells adjacent to Canyon Diablo near Leupp, Arizona. Another component includes the construction of a water supply line, approximately 173 kilometers (108 miles) in length to convey between 6,000 to 11,600 acre feet of water from the Well Field to the Black Mesa Mine. The preferred route for this water supply line runs northward up the Oraibi Wash through the Hopi Reservation, while an alternative route runs entirely through the Navajo Reservation to the west of the Hopi Reservation. In order to pump water uphill to the mine, two pumping stations need to be constructed along the water supply line, requiring the construction of a sixty-nine kilovolt power line along much of the route. The final component of the project is the reconstruction of the coal slurry pipeline of 439 kilometers (273 miles) from the Black Mesa Mine to the Mohave Generating Station.

The Black Mesa Project runs through the heart of Hopitutskwa and includes areas within and around the Hopi Reservation. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office conducted a study to identify traditional cultural properties in the project area to facilitate compliance with Section 106 of the NRHP and provide environmental information for implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act. A total of fifteen Hopi tribal members participated in fieldwork, representing thirteen clans from seven villages on Second and Third Mesa. The research teams that worked on different project components varied in order to include Hopi consultants knowledgeable about clan interests in different areas (Ferguson and Koyiyumptewa 2007). Interviews were conducted with twenty-eight Hopi tribal members representing thirteen clans from five villages on Second and Third Mesa.

As a result of the study, the Hopi Tribe identified sixty-nine traditional cultural properties, including ancestral sites, pilgrimage routes, farm fields, eagle-collecting areas, plant- and mineral-collecting areas, landforms, shrines, and offering places. A cultural landscape perspective was used to evaluate the results of fieldwork and place individual traditional cultural properties in a broad cultural context. While the land and its features were delineated using traditional cultural properties as
discrete elements, many Hopis discussed the inextricable relationships between natural landforms, history, animal life, human society, and the spiritual realm. Hopi concerns encompassed both the land itself and how individuals perceive the land given their particular values and beliefs. Hopi cultural advisors recommended for the traditional cultural properties they identified in the project area to be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for their association with important events in Hopi history, and under Criterion D for yielding, or having potential to yield, significant information about Hopi history.

In 2007, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office participated in a study along a stretch of US Highway 160 slated for improvement from its junction with US 89 to the Four Corners, north of the Hopi Reservation (figure 3.2). This project was conducted in compliance with Section 106 of the NRHP because the highway easement passes through land that is under federal jurisdiction. A total of twelve Hopi tribal
HopKins, KoYiYUMpteW a, HedQUist, fergUson, and coL WeLL members participated in the fieldwork, representing seven clans from eight villages on First, Second, and Third Mesa. Oral interviews were conducted with six Hopi tribal members representing four clans from five villages on Second and Third Mesa.

The US 160 project corridor passes through a region that is culturally significant for the Hopi people, both in the past and the present. During the project, Hopi cultural advisors identified 122 traditional cultural properties, including numerous ancestral sites, eagle-collecting areas, ceremonial collecting areas, hunting areas, pilgrimage routes, and landforms with cultural significance. Sixty-nine Hopi place-names were also documented in the area surrounding the project corridor (Ferguson et al. 2007). As with research conducted during the Black Mesa Project, Hopi cultural advisors discussed the complexity of the cultural geography in the project area and its inextricable relationships with natural landforms, history, animal life, human society, and the spiritual realm. The traditional cultural properties identified in the US 160 corridor were recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and D by the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office.

The US 160 Hopi traditional cultural property study is important because it demonstrates how ancestral sites, sacred areas, and other places with traditional cultural significance are used in the retention and transmission of Hopi culture. These traditional cultural properties are integral components of the cultural landscapes that figure prominently in Hopi history, ceremonial life, and subsistence practices. When the results of the US 160 project are combined with those of the Black Mesa Project, the richness of Hopis’ cultural landscape becomes increasingly evident.

Glen Canyon

A third project, undertaken by the Hopi Tribe in 2011, was sponsored by the National Park Service (NPS) at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (GLCA) and Rainbow Bridge National Monument (RABR). This project was conducted as part of an ongoing process by the National Park Service to maintain relationships between traditionally associated peoples and park resources. The project was carried out in compliance with Section 110 of the NRHP and other NPS policies. A total of four Hopi tribal members participated in the fieldwork, representing four clans from four villages on First, Second, and Third Mesa (figure 3.3). Oral interviews were conducted with fifteen Hopi tribal members representing thirteen clans from seven villages on Second and Third Mesa (Hopkins et al. 2013).

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area encompasses the area around Lake Powell in Utah and Arizona, covering 1.25 million acres (505,868 hectares) of Colorado Plateau desert (figure 3.3). Approximately 13 percent of GLCA is currently inundated by the waters of Lake Powell as a result of the construction of
Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River, which was completed in 1966. Rainbow Bridge National Monument covers 160 acres (64.75 hectares) near the southern boundary of GLCA, in the foothills of Navajo Mountain. Hopi ancestors settled the land now encompassed by GLCA and RABR during the time of clan migrations, and many of the sites and topographic features in this region now serve as landmarks commemorating this history.

As a result of the project, Hopi cultural advisors identified ancestral sites, plants, animals, minerals, and landforms with significance in Hopi history and traditions. The study also enriched the scholarly understanding of a cultural landscape related to the story of Tiyo, an oral tradition that entails the migration history of Hopis’ Rattlesnake Clan. The landscape described in this story is particularly important because it covers an area that ranges from the southwestern United States to Mesoamerica, revealing the expansiveness of certain understandings of Hopitutskwa (Hopkins 2012).

Toko’navi, or Navajo Mountain, is located at the southern edge of GLCA, east of Rainbow Bridge (figure 3.4). This mountain is an important landmark in the
region and is a primary feature of the viewshed in this area. Toko’navi is the location of one of ten shrines delineating the Hopi homvikya, or pilgrimage route, illustrated in figure 3.1. Several traditions about Hopi clan migrations reference Toko’navi, and prayers and traditions involving this mountain are ongoing. Hopi people recount that the Mountain Lion and the Dove people were among the first to arrive at Toko’navi during ancestral migrations, followed by the Rattlesnake Clan, and the Sand Clan (Stephen 1936:1084). The late Ferrell Secakuku, a member of the Rattlesnake Clan, was taught that Hopi clans initially settled at Toko’navi because of its resemblance to Palatkwapi, (the Red Walled City) a place where many clans lived previously (Secakuku 2006).

Hopi ancestors who lived at Toko’navi are associated with the story of Tiyo, the legend of a boy who traveled the full length of the Colorado River to Mesoamerica, returning with a snake wife, establishing the Rattlesnake Clan, and introducing the Snake Dance into Hopi religion (Anyon 1999; Bourke [1884] 1984:177; Ferguson 1998:107–19; Hopkins 2012; Parsons 1939:975; Secakuku 2006). Oral traditions describe Toko’navi as the place where Tiyo lived before embarking on his journey down the Colorado River (Courlander 1971:82; Fewkes 1900:588–89; Yava 1978:55).

The Colorado River is known to Hopis as Pisisvayu, and it is one of the two principal drainages in GLCA. While looking at the river, one Hopi cultural advisor participating in the project remembered that there were several deities who helped Tiyo during his arduous journey, including Huru’ingwùuti (Hard Objects

Figure 3.4. Toko’navi (Navajo Mountain) with Colorado River and Lake Powell in the foreground. Photograph by Maren Hopkins, June 29, 2011.
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(Old Spider Woman), Kòokyangwo’wùuti (Old Spider Woman), and Pöqangwhooya and Palöngawhooya (the Warrior Twins). Viewing the land vividly recalls the spiritual beings associated with it.

Tiyo brought back, Qa’toya, a dragon-like deity, from his journeys to the south. Qa’toya is associated with the Rattlesnake Clan and possesses the powers to make rain. Turkey-like tracks depicted in petroglyphs are said to be the footprints of this deity. A cave located on Toko’navi was once the residing place of Qa’toya. When the Rattlesnake Clan left Toko’navi, the creature flew out of his cave and traveled down the Colorado River to the Little Colorado River, ending up at Wupatki, a Hopi ancestral site located along the Little Colorado River west of the Hopi Mesas. The Rattlesnake Clan followed Qa’toya to Wupatki and stayed there for some time before continuing toward the Hopi Mesas. Rattlesnake Clan members believe that Qa’toya still resides at Wupatki.

A pictograph at an ancient site in GLCA reminded cultural advisors of Qa’toya (figure 3.5). A snake image and a migration symbol were also present at the site, as were the images of anthropomorphic figures holding weapons (figure 3.6). Members of the Rattlesnake Clan today are known as “Hopi warriors,” and cultural advisors participating in fieldwork at GLCA believed that these images were all related to this clan’s history in the area. Toko’navi, the ancient home of the Rattlesnake Clan, is visible from this site. We found that talking about the land with Hopi research participants provided a meaningful context for talking about Hopi history.

The Glen Canyon study revealed a tangible connection between Hopi history and the resources in GLCA. Equally important were the cognitive associations made by Hopi tribal members between natural and cultural resources of GLCA and distant places known and maintained through Hopi oral traditions.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Those [tracks] are our connections to [our ancestral] places, and we still honor those places today. We make prayer feathers for all of those places and deposit them and give thanks to all the places that we still remember. And those are the reasons why we have shrines around our communities; they become these places that we make our prayers to. (Leonard Talaswaima [Talaswaima 2011])

As access to Hopi traditional lands has become increasingly restricted due to changes in land tenure over time, the Hopi people have struggled to maintain their historical traditions based on cultural practices associated with the land. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office uses the political processes inherent in compliance
with the National Historic Preservation Act and other laws as a way to enable members of the tribe to reconnect with their ancestral lands. By combining archaeological analyses of space with ethnographic research, Hopi tribal members are building a regional perspective on the tangible sites of their heritage and connecting individual sites to larger concepts of landscape and identity. Restoring Hopi place-names on maps helps restore the Hopi history that was erased as non-Indian cartographers imposed alien names on the landforms and watercourses that constitute Hopitutskwa (figure 3.7).

The Hopi Tribe’s participation in historic preservation projects for the Black Mesa, US Highway 160, and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area projects has identified numerous traditional cultural properties within and outside the Hopi Reservation. Specific sites and landforms in Glen Canyon articulate Hopi land and identity through their relationship with the story of Tiyo and the Rattlesnake Clan’s migration history. As Richard Clemmer (1993:86) noted, “Hopiis identify their ancestral dwelling places as much by symbols etched into rock and architectural ruins as by clan legends and traditions. In a sense, knowledgeable Hopis ‘read’ an archaeological landscape with reference to the fundamental principles of their cosmological system.”
Figure 3.6. Warrior images depicted on the cliff walls in GLCA are thought by Hopi cultural advisors to be associated with the Rattlesnake Clan’s history. Photograph by Maren Hopkins, June 29, 2011.

Figure 3.7. This sample of locations with Hopi place-names along US Highway 160 demonstrates the deep connections Hopis maintain with their ancestral lands.
The process of linking places through stories, connecting past and present, requires Hopi traditionalists to be present on the land. Visiting places not only reaffirms Hopi responsibilities of land stewardship but can also serve as a process of historic revelation. A comparable moment was recorded in Australia by Howard Morphy (1995), who documented how Narritjin Maymuru, a Yolngu man, discovers that a mythic event had transpired in a place he had never been before. Maymuru knew because he believed that he was not moving into a new country, but that the land was revealing itself to him. In other words, the past—real and tangible—was being transmitted through the physical place. Such processes of blending stories, experience, and landscapes have been documented in other cultural contexts (e.g., Basso 1996; Cruikshank 2005; Wyndham 2011). The Hopis use a similar mechanism. The retention and transmission of Hopi culture depend largely on the Hopis’ ability to connect to their ancestral landscape.
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