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Pueblo Pottery: The Present Tradition

In The Pueblo Potter: A Study of Creative Imagination in Primitive Art published in 1929, anthropologist Ruth Bunzel gives a discouraging assessment of pottery making among the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Arizona. The art was nearly extinct in several villages. Among the Western Pueblos—Laguna, Acoma, Zuni and Hopi—only the Zunis and Acomas still made pots for domestic use. But at Zuni the work was inferior to the past and the designs stagnant and stereotypical (5, 64). At Hopi, although a large number of women made pottery, the technical quality of their wares was even worse. Pots were fragile, their surfaces prone to flaking, and they dissolved if exposed to water (7, 60). And at Laguna, pottery was “a dying art, now uttering its last feeble gasps” (64). Pueblo pottery making, Bunzel lamented, had degenerated to the manufacture of cheap souvenirs for tourists.

Others had made equally dire predictions. All have been proven wrong. Nearly a century after Bunzel’s research, pottery making among the Pueblos is flourishing. Nearly every village has its masters whose works receive international acclaim and fine art prices. Pottery making has been revived where it had disappeared and taken to new levels of technical and artistic perfection.

Inexpensive items for tourists are still made, but these are now appreciated as folk art, a genre that does not compete with the production of fine ceramics but often serves to introduce audiences to it. Some of the whimsical items created by Pueblo potters for sale to tourists are now considered “traditional folk art” of the villages where they were invented—the storyteller figures of Isleta, the owls of Zuni (fig. 7), the hens of Acoma, the Koshari figures of Jemez. When master potters apply their skills to these forms, they, too, are sold in galleries and collected by museums. Indeed, Pueblo artists have never accepted limitations on their creativity. Throughout the centuries since the Europeans arrived, they produced items without traditional precedents, often commenting ironically on all traditions—like the dinner plates made by Acoma potter Mamie Ortiz in the late twentieth century in which traditional border motifs encircle fired-on decals of the Virgin Mary and a thorn-crowned Jesus (fig. 8).

Surviving has transformed Pueblo pottery. Today, fewer potters produce works of much higher quality; men are involved in all aspects of pottery making; many works are products of a family enterprise. But modern Pueblo pottery remains viscerally grounded in ancient traditions, in dialogue with the forms and designs of previous generations whose work continues to present itself in shards that emerge from ancestral grounds. At the same time, Pueblo potters have entered into a dialogue with Western art by virtue of their technical skill and striking designs, which resonate with the boldest experiments of twentieth century art.

Pueblo potters continue a tradition reaching back two thousand years. Fired clay vessels first appear in the archaeological record around 300 B.C.E., at sites in the Mogollon and Hohokam areas of southern New Mexico and Arizona. By 400–500 C.E., pottery making had reached northern New Mexico. The technology may have spread from Mexico, or perhaps it was invented locally, evolved from the technique of lining baskets with a clay slip so they can hold liquids and resist heat. Pottery offers many advantages. It can be made in a greater variety of shapes and sizes, and it is more durable. It can be put into direct contact with fire for cooking. It keeps perishable goods safe from insects and rodents. Water stored in semi-porous jars is kept cool as the pots sweat and the moisture evaporates.
All evidence indicates that women were the primary producers of pottery since prehistoric times. The shards that archaeologists find in prehistoric Pueblo ruins are positive evidence of a sedentary lifestyle—of villages and farming—and an economy in which women make important economic contributions by manufacturing utilitarian items that also can be traded (Lammon 2008: 43). When women make pottery, they have access to economic rewards and prestige.

Pueblo pots are sculpted, made entirely by hand. The potter typically begins by pressing a ball of clay into a mold—the bottom of a broken pot or discarded basket or other form. The body of the pot is then built up by adding successive coils of rolled clay, pressed into place. The thinness of the coils and their length—and the size of the vessel—depend on the skill of the potter. If they are not properly joined, air spaces will cause the pot to crack during firing. As the coils are built up, the interior and exterior surfaces of the vessel are burnished with a smooth stone or other tool. Then a fine solution of clay slip is applied to prepare the exterior for painting; variations in the color of slips are one of the primary ways ceramics can be distinguished village to village.

Through most of its history, Pueblo potters decorated their vessels with abstract and geometrically rational designs, although during certain phases of Hohokam and Mogollon pottery naturalistic depictions of animals, humans, and sacred figures appear. As H. P. Mera demonstrated in his classic study of Pueblo design, underlying the impression of limitless variety over the long course of its history is the consistent use of certain very simple elements, such as hooks and curls, which are continuously re-combined to create larger motifs and decorative patterns.

One of the most widely shared motifs is the so-called “rain bird.” Mera suggests it derived from the naturalistic depiction of birds first seen on Mesa Verde pottery (which he believes was itself derived from the older curling elements to which geometric appendages were added). Bird figures were progressively abstracted and reached their most elegant articulation in the Sityatki wares made by the ancestors of the Hopi Indians just before the arrival of the Spaniards. From there, the motif was taken up by Zuni potters, who created a highly formalized version, combining spiraling curls with geometric shapes representing the parts of the bird’s body. Eventually this motif was adopted at nearly all the other Pueblos, a reflection of a widely shared aesthetic sensibility.

In fact, even the most abstract Pueblo designs are interpreted by potters as representing objects or natural phenomena—feathers, plants, animals, and clouds or lightning. A Zuni woman who had been making pottery for forty years told Bunzel that every design suggested a story, evoking a specific circumstance or an object, and they were named accordingly (87). She provided “meanings” for a large number of elements. In many cases they were prayers—“a prayer for beautiful music,” “a prayer for rain,” “a prayer for damp earth” because “the women want soft ground to plant their gardens,” a “prayer of women that the stars may make the darkness light and make the road straight for husbands out at night.”

The Zunis considered clay to be the “flesh” of Mother Earth and pots were considered living beings. Before firing, they were fed bits of wafer bread. As one Acoma potter explains, “You’re always talking to the pot when you are making it—telling it your feelings—and when you finish a pot you blow life into it and it is given life” (Dillingham 8-9).

Among the potters Bunzel talked to dreams were most frequently cited as the source of design ideas.
I often dream of designs, and whenever I am ready to paint, I close my eyes and then the designs just come to me.

One night I dreamed and saw lots of large jars and they all had designs on them.

I think about designs all the time. Sometimes when I have to paint a pot, I can’t think what design to put on it. Then I go to bed thinking about it all the time. Then when I go to sleep, I dream about designs.

I get all my ideas from my thoughts. I think of my thoughts as a person who tells me what to do. (51–52)

In addition to items for daily use, ceramics were also made for ceremonial purposes. These forms “belonged” to certain religious leaders or societies and making them required explicit permission. Vessels for sacred corn meal were painted with supernatural beings and animals and insects associated with springs and water. “If we paint them on our bowls,” a Zuni woman told Bunzel, “our bowls will always be full of water like the springs” (69).

In the Western Pueblo region, pottery making reached a peak in the period coinciding with the arrival of the Spaniards, and production continued throughout the colonial period. The Hispanic settlers became trading partners within longstanding tribal networks. Items flowed in both directions. Native potters made wares specifically for Spanish consumption—soup bowls, candlesticks, chalices, and footed vessels—and the technical quality of their pots was improved by the use of sheep manure for firing, a species introduced by the Spaniards. Before the Pueblo Revolt of 1696, when the colonists were driven out of New Mexico for a decade, certain design motifs were widely shared throughout the region. But when the Spaniards reconquered the area, restrictions were imposed on the Indians’ freedom to travel, and more distinct local styles developed. Production of glazed pottery ceased altogether—likely because access to lead mines had been cut off—but the painted matte ware that developed in its place was some of the most elaborate in form and design ever made by Pueblo potters (Dillingham 122).

At the time that the Americans annexed the Southwest after the Mexican-American War, major creative developments were underway in the Western Pueblos. At Zuni, decorative styles appeared unlike any before them, employing a great variety of motifs and freedom of arrangement (Bunzel 76). Between 1840 and 1860 an exuberant style known as Zuni Polychrome emerged and reached its fullest expression around 1880 (Lanmon 2008: 140). Geometric designs and life forms were painted on white backgrounds in black and red. Capped spiral elements (related to the rain bird motif) were common and came to characterize Zuni pottery generally (Lanmon 2008: 136). Equally characteristic, the so-called “heart-line” deer figure was introduced, in which stylized deer or antelopes, with lines from the mouth ending in an arrow shape at the position of the heart, were painted within a “house” of abstract feathers.

At Acoma and Laguna, abstract geometric and floral designs, often combined with complicated hatching and cross-hatching, became common. In the 1850s parrot figures and novel floral motifs and layouts became popular; the parrot came to characterize the pottery of both Acoma and Laguna. These motifs, perhaps inspired by Pennsylvania Dutch designs or Spanish embroidery, were seamlessly combined with traditional patterns (Dillingham 142). At the same time, potters were producing carefully constructed, thin-walled, vessels. Batkin describes the quality of ollas (large jars using for store water) made at Acoma between 1850 and 1870 as remarkable (138). At Laguna, in the 1890s Zuni-style designs were introduced. At Hopi, the common style was Polacca Polychrome. Its
crackled white surfaces were decorated with stylized birds, flowers, and arabesque motifs strongly influenced by Zuni designs.

American military and settler presence eroded the underpinnings of the Pueblo economy. Everywhere traditional subsistence activities were curtailed—farming, long-range resource gathering, trade (and occasional raids) with neighboring tribes, and production of traditional crafts and arts. These developments were slower to reach the Western Pueblos, but in the 1880s the floodgates were opened with the arrival of two manifestations of the American cultural and economic juggernaut—collecting expeditions and the railroad.

It began at Zuni in 1879 when a government-funded expedition arrived and set up camp. Led by James Stevenson, accompanied by his wife Mathilda Coxe Stevenson and a team of assistants, the expedition’s mission was to collect artifacts for the Smithsonian Institution, and it did so fired by a sense of urgency and the same assumption underlying Bunzel’s judgments—that the Pueblo way of life was doomed to disappear. The Stevensons were practicing what would come to be known as “salvage archaeology.” In fact, they were promulgating a self-fulfilling prophecy.

At Zuni, women lined up outside the Stevensons’ tent, eagerly exchanging their household wares and heirlooms in return for American coin and goods. At that moment the old tribal economy in which items were produced for use and traded for other goods was supplanted by a new marketplace, one directly tied to the burgeoning American capitalism, which, among other things, was financing the project of western expansion.

The scope of the transfer was enormous. In 1879, the Stevensons collected more than 4,000 items at Zuni and shipped them East. In 1881, another 3,700 items were collected, weighing over 21,000 pounds. Altogether, three Stevenson expeditions collected some 5,000 pottery specimens from Zuni alone (Lanmon 2008: 35). In 1882, the Mindeleff expedition removed some 1,200 objects from one Hopi mesa and 1,650 ceramic items from Acoma (Kramer 32; Batkin 137). By the end of the century, so much of the traditional and best pottery had been removed from these villages that the next generation lacked models to learn by. When efforts were made to revive pottery making at Zuni in the 1920s, teachers had to rely on photographs for examples of designs (Lanmon 2008: 37).

Many of the traditional items taken away by the expeditions, including pottery, were never replaced. Instead, a second manifestation of the American juggernaut—the Atlantic & Pacific Railway—began laying tracks near Laguna in 1880. A steady supply of durable, inexpensive manufactured goods began reaching previously isolated villages. Metal tools and containers sometimes contributed to traditional productive activities, but in many cases they replaced traditionally-made items. Production of ceramics for household use declined, as did the intra- and inter-tribal barter in which they once had value.

The combined impact of the expeditions and the railroad nearly spelled the end of Pueblo pottery making. In the federal census of 1890, 365 women at Hopi identified pottery making as their primary occupation; just a decade later, in 1900, only two women still identified themselves as full-time potters (Kramer 34). In the 1910 census of Laguna only two potters were identified. Only Acoma continued producing significant amounts of pottery—the 1910 census listed 76 active potters, an impressive number for total population of barely 700 (Batkin 139; Lanmon 2013: 31).

In the absence of utilitarian value only the possibility of trading pottery for goods or money offset the effort to make it. Trading posts became one site where crafts could be exchanged for goods or credit, and some traders, such as Thomas Keams, who opened a post near Hopi First Mesa in 1875, encouraged pottery making and valued good work. Others pressed potters to make cheap items for sale to the tourist trade. In the western Pueblo area, traders were often limited in their ability to market native-made items due to the long distances goods had to be transported, even
after the arrival of the railroad. Many ended up amassing large unsold inventories, and prices for Pueblo pottery remained depressed well into the twentieth century.

In the end, the railroad, which posed the greatest threat to the art of Pueblo pottery making, also brought a possibility for its survival. On the rails, goods flowed in both directions. Items made by native people could be cheaply shipped to urban markets, and the trains brought not only goods but people as well. The travelers who stepped off to stretch their legs at stops in New Mexico and Arizona were eager buy souvenirs of the exotic lands they were passing through. At Laguna, where trains stopped within sight of the pueblo, women brought their wares to the station and displayed them on the platform. Acoma potters came as well, carefully strapping their wares onto burros for the eighteen mile trek. While some women scorned the idea of selling their products this way, others began making novelty items for sale to tourists. The technical quality of pottery at both Acoma and Laguna declined (Batkin 138).

At Zuni, a day’s travel from the nearest train station, women more often exchanged their wares with the local trader. Some continued to make pottery for household use but it was of less quality and with a diminished repertoire of designs. In 1902 Stewart Culin bemoaned the tendency of Zuni potters to “vulgarize and debase” their work, which was “leading to the ultimate extinction of the art” (in Batkin 1987: 165). The difficulty of shipping pottery to markets eventually led the local trader to discourage women from making it altogether and to take up beadwork instead (Batkin 165).

It was during this ebb, that an American woman name Josephine Foard arrived at Laguna on a mission to “improve” native pottery making. Between 1899 and 1912 she made extended visits to these villages attempting to introduce the use of kilns and encouraging women to paint with brushes instead of traditional yucca leaves. She believed a market could be found for Pueblo ceramics among Eastern homemakers who might use them as decorative vases or flower pots if they could be made watertight—that is, glazed, a technique that had not been used by Pueblo potters since the early eighteenth century. So Foard purchased pieces from Laguna and Acoma women and glazed them herself. “To buy it and help create a market for these really useful wares, this is the truest missionary work one can do for the Indian,” she wrote with evident zeal (Lanmon, Lanmon Coulet du Gard 2007: 76).

In the end, Foard did not find a market for these items; nor could she convince women to adopting glazing. As an unsympathetic contemporary summed up her experience:

All summer she gathered together the chief potters of the pueblo and taught them patiently to glaze their pots. The Indian women watched, followed instructions and made the glazed pottery. When her vacation was over, with a sigh of satisfaction for her successful philanthropy, the young ceramic artist regretfully went on her way. She had scarcely gotten out of sight, when the Indian women—one and all—walked to the edge of the mesa and, with a chuckle of disgust, hurled all of the glazed pots that they had made over the precipice…. “Pots that are not slightly porous make water turn stale! Who wants such pots?” (Lanmon, Lanmon Coulet du Gard 2007: 76)

Revival

Even as late as 1929, the Victorian tones of Bunzel’s study are unmistakable. “The present sterility of Zuni art,” she wrote, “is a natural outcome of contact with white civilization and the general gradual disintegration of Pueblo culture” (78). Predicting the demise of the native people and their cultures—predicting, assuming, imagining, or wishing—is an old trope in the contact literature. On the part of the anthropologist it becomes a conceit: “Lo, for I am the last to witness
these pure and ancient ways.” (In fact, Lanmon points out that many fine pots were made at Zuni in the 1920s, of which Bunzel seems not to have been aware.)

Yet, she found some bright spots. At Acoma, San Ildefonso, and Hopi “new and beautiful types” of pottery had appeared, and she singled out two women, Nampeyo from Hopi First Mesa and Maria Martinez from San Ildefonso, for producing modern wares of extraordinary quality. In fact, the careers of these two women mark the beginning of the Pueblo pottery revival.

**Nampeyo**

Nampeyo (1860–1942) was born in the Hopi-Tewa village of Hano on First Mesa in 1860. She learned pottery making from her mother and was so innately drawn to working with clay that she neglected the normal pursuits of young women, earning the nickname “old lady” (Kramer 14).

No known examples of her early work survive; she likely made pots in the Polacca Polychrome style. The Keams’ post, opened in 1875, provided an opportunity for potters to trade their wares commercially, but even after the railroad arrived in Arizona, it took a daunting trip of nearly seventy miles by wagon to reach the nearest station. As a result, Hopi women did not turn to making tourist wares until World War I.

It was the collecting expeditions that had the greatest influence on Hopi pottery making. As elsewhere their impact was disruptive, but at Hopi it was extended over a much longer period. Between 1875 and 1901 at least 16 purportedly scientific parties visited Hopi lands. Initially, like the railroads, they effectively undermined traditional pottery production; yet they would eventually provide an opportunity for its survival.

The earliest expeditions were government-funded, and their focus was the collection of vast, random samples of every kind of native object in order to preserve the traces of a dying culture—the project of the victorious conqueror. But in 1891, their focus shifted with the arrival of J. Walter Fewkes. Fewkes’ had secured funding from a wealthy Boston philanthropist, Mary Hemenway. Other expeditions that decade would be sponsored by museums and universities. These sponsors were making investments. They expected (and were led to expect) a return; not a random sample of everything Hopi, but rare and special items to be obtained through prodigious effort; items destined for private collections and museums, not warehouses; items rarer than even those made by living Hopis, who had become in the American imagination one of the last tribes living an ancient lifestyle—namely, the ancient pottery to be dug up from prehistoric sites.

At this juncture, the research expedition takes on the character of a treasure hunt. In 1895, when Fewkes excavated Sityatki at the base of First Mesa, he sought above all intact and masterful specimens of ancient works, and he paid his Hopi workers by the piece to find them. Indeed, some of the vessels he unearthed are, in the words of one expert, “among the most exquisite ceramics produced by any culture” (Kramer 56).

This signified a subtle but important change in how Americans view native cultures. The 4,500 items that Fewkes purchased from Thomas Keams on behalf of Hemenway in 1892 were shipped directly from Hopi to Madrid, Spain and displayed in the Columbian Historical Exposition before being accessioned by the Peabody Museum (Kramer 46). In the twentieth century, when items of the quality and antiquity that Fewkes dug up became available for private purchase they commanded...
far higher prices than the work of any living Pueblo potter, and still do in the international “pre-
Columbian” or “primitive art” market.

Meanwhile, the exotic image of the Hopis was drawing another kind of visitor—Americans of
varied impulses eager to witness the living primitive. Sensational accounts of Hopi rites in which
live rattlesnakes were handled had appeared in the American media as early as 1879. Military men,
anthropologists, adventurers, and missionaries were followed by photographers, artists, collectors,
poets, and various “friends of the Indians.” In 1897, nearly 200 onlookers crowded around the tiny
plaza at on the tip of First Mesa to witness the biennial Snake Dance. All these visitors, whether
scientists or travel adventurers, desired items to take back with them that reminded them of the
authentically ancient traditions they had witnessed.

In the 1880s Hopi potters began making wares that borrowed, imitated, or sometimes simply
copied ancient pottery. Women were able to sell these items directly to American visitors by
displaying them on a rug in front of their homes. By the 1890s a new style called Hopi or Sityatki
Revival, developed, and Nampeyo, now in her prime, appears to have been the lead innovator. In
1893 Alexander Stephen referred to her as “the distingui shed Tewa potter,” and added, “she tells me
she makes her designs after some she has seen on ancient ware” (Kramer 44). In the 1920s Nampeyo
told Bunzel:

> When I first began to paint, I used to go to the ancient village [probably Sityatki]
> and pick up pieces of pottery and copy the designs. That is how I learned to paint.
> But now, I just close my eyes and see designs and I paint them. (56)

A photograph by James Mooney in 1893 provides the earliest glimpse of Nampeyo’s style. Two
bowls have interiors painted with a single, highly simplified, abstract motif, clearly related to
ancient Sityatki designs. Another photograph from 1900 by Edward S. Curtis shows that by then
Nampeyo’s revival style was fully developed. She cradles one of her signature pots, a large 18- to 20-
inch diameter, globe-shaped jar with Sityatki-derived designs. The jar is extraordinary for its size;
the extruding shape takes great skill to produce; the quality of the painting is superb.

A year after his excavations at Sikyatki, Fewkes wrote that Nampeyo, “the best potter of East
Mesa,” “begged” his permission to copy the designs of the pottery he was digging up. Twenty years
later, he went further, writing that “much of the pottery offered for sale by Harvey and other dealers
in Indian objects…is imitation prehistoric Hopi ware made by Nampeyo. The origin of this
transformation was due partly to the author,” and he repeated the claim that she had come to his
camp to copy “the ancient symbols found on the pottery vessels unearthed” (Kramer 118). But in
fact, as Barbara Kramer argues, Stephen’s reference to Nampeyo and Mooney’s photograph from
1893 show that she was experimenting with Sikyatki designs well before the 1895 expedition.
Fewkes’ excavations were not the source of the new style but rather, in Kramer’s words, “served to
energize a revival already begun” (60).

Nampeyo’s distinctive vision is evident in the pottery depicted in Mooney’s photograph. In the
earlier Polacca Polychrome style, surfaces were divided into horizontal and vertical panels using
borders; the intervening fields were then filled in, and repetition used to create a visual pattern. In
this approach, elements that might be considered to represent objects or animals are nonetheless
treated as decorative motifs and integrated into an overall, unified design. But in the pot shown in
the Mooney photograph, Nampeyo has painted a single, large, asymmetrical element inside her
bowl, which interacts dynamically with large areas of negative space.

A jar made in the early 1900s (fig. 5) reveals the masterful effects she could achieve. On a rich
burnt orange background, she has placed an “Eagle tail” motif—derived from Sityatki models but
distilled and enlarged. Two long curling arms in solid black, the eagle’s wings, serve to frame the
image, and trail off delicately into an infinite field of glowing orange. These long curling lines and large feather elements are balanced with small internal details. The overall figure appears not only to float upon the expansive negative space of the pot’s surface, the bulging shape of the pot projects the design into three-dimensional space as well.

Perhaps Nampeyo’s boldest gesture was to apply a single, large element over half or more of a pot’s surface, as if it were canvas onto which she was painting a still life (fig. 4). In fact, Nampeyo often blurred the distinction between abstraction and representation, painting abstract kachina masks, animals, sacred clowns, and sometimes whimsical stick figures on her pots.

These characteristics—use of negative space, asymmetry, figuration of a large single element, and semi-representational designs—all have precursors in Sityatki wares (e.g., figs. 2, 3), but Nampeyo’s approach was to use a limited number of these elements in very free and creative ways. As Bunzel observed, “She did not copy Sikyatki patterns, her imagination recreated the Sikyatki sense of form,” and her “unerring discrimination and lively perception vitalized what would otherwise have been so much dead wood” (88). Rather than simply imitating ancient motifs, Nampeyo undertook a creative study of them, lifting them from their original context, distilling them, and redeploying them in a series of experiments. If we take Fewkes at his word—that Nampeyo copied designs from ancient pots that he had excavated—it is significant to note that she was using a Western technology, pencil and paper, to create what amounted artist’s sketches and preliminary studies. Nampeyo engaged in a creative dialogue with the past throughout her career.

Nampeyo’s reached her maturity at a fortuitous time. In the decade beginning in 1900, the Santa Fe Railway and the Fred Harvey Company joined forces to promote the tourism in the Southwest. The Harvey Company began purchasing Hopi crafts wholesale from Lorenzo Hubbell, who had taken over the Keams post, to sell in its hotels and shops. George Dorsey, who had led an expedition to Hopi in 1901, turned seamlessly to writing copy for the Santa Fe Railway’s promotional brochures. Describing the adventure of a visit to Hopi, he singled out Nampeyo, the potter whose wares “have gone far and wide over the curio-loving world” (Kramer 82). Photographs and encomiums of Nampeyo became commonplace in travel literature. She may have been one of the most photographed Native American women of her generation.

Nampeyo travelled two times to the hotel at Grand Canyon to demonstrate pottery making for tourists and to Chicago in 1910. She sold her wares wherever she could, to traders, tourists, and collectors, and, throughout her life, by displaying them on a blanket in front of her stone house atop First Mesa.

Kramer identifies five distinct periods in her career. She experimented with many shapes and styles. Occasionally, she made completely non-traditional items, copying the tourist wares made at other Pueblos. As she began to lose her eyesight, she experimented with tactile effects, using her fingers to create corrugations or shaping the round opening of her jars into squares. Eventually, family members took over painting her pots, although Nampeyo continue to shape them until her last years. Some of her works bear her name, but she herself never learned to speak or write English—others applied her autograph. Nonetheless, she graciously greeted Anglo visitors and accommodated their curiosity and cameras.

Nampeyo—and her many descendants—ensured an unbroken tradition of pottery making at Hopi. Throughout her long her career, she was able to support her love of working with clay by selling items directly and indirectly to Anglo-Americans. She respond to their desire for the authentically traditional not by making facsimiles, but by seeking out new and fresh possibilities in the work of her ancestors. She clearly made pieces that pleased her, and when a style no longer pleased, she turned to another.
A generation younger than Nampeyo, Maria Martinez (1887-1980) at San Ildefonso north of Santa Fe also took inspiration from ancestral traces. As in many villages, the quantity and quality of San Ildefonso pottery had declined in the early twentieth century. But in 1907, items recovered by Edgar Lee Hewitt from prehistoric sites on the Pajarito plateau caught the interest of workmen from San Ildefonso and their wives, including Maria. Hewett encouraged Maria to copy the ancient pottery. She agreed to shape the pots, but she had her husband Julian, a skilled painter, complete the designs. A year later Hewett purchased several of these pieces for the Museum of New Mexico and commissioned more.

The interest in ancient wares among Anglo-Americans like Hewitt and the thriving colony of artists and art patrons that had grown up in Santa Fe, fostered a renaissance at San Ildefonso and other nearby villages. Women who had been making souvenirs for tourists began creating works in traditional polychrome styles (Bunzel 82).

Maria was not satisfied with simply copying ancient pottery. She and Julian began exploring techniques for making pure, monochromatic black-on-black vessels. Blackware had always been made in small quantities at San Ildefonso, but the method for it nearly had been forgotten. Maria’s first pots in 1913 were undecorated and rough, but Hewett purchased them for his museum. It took a long process of experimentation before she was satisfied with the results. In 1921, the couple invented a process of applying dull black paint to the polished surface of the pots. After firing the paint stood out with the quality of intaglio against a glistening jet black surface of boundless depth (fig. 6).

Maria displayed her blackware at the 1922 Santa Fe Indian Fair and received first prize (Bernstein 1993, 1999). It found immediate favor with traders and collectors. With its highly formalized designs and glistening surfaces it appealed equally to antiquarian and modern tastes, a fully traditional ceramic that could be placed without incongruity next to a contemporary object in the popular Art Deco style of the time.

Like Nampeyo, Maria traveled far into the American world. In 1915 Hewett brought the couple to San Diego to demonstrate pottery making at the Panama-California Exposition. Above all, the proximity of her village to Santa Fe, gave her new opportunities to market her work. The Santa Fe Indian Fair had a major impact in transforming Pueblo pottery from a craft into a fine art.

Around 1923, Maria began to sign her works. After 1925 Julian signed them as well. Her black-on-black (and, later, redware) pottery became the dominant style in her village (Bunzel 88). When Julian died in 1943, other family members began to assist her, including two sons. Like Nampeyo, she became head of a household workshop. In a long lifetime, Maria won many awards. Her works were presented at world fairs and collected by museums. (Yet, like Nampeyo she made smaller items of less technical quality for cheap sale as well.) She was bestowed honorary doctorate degrees and visited the White House four times. Her career bridged the period from the 1920s, when dismal predictions of her art’s decline were commonplace, to the early 1980s, when the revival of Pueblo pottery was ensured.
Observations

That Pueblo pottery would survive in the drastically changed circumstances brought on by the arrival of the Europeans was never a given. Conflict, disease and depopulation, and the loss of traditional modes of subsistence made the very survival of the Pueblo Indians doubtful, let alone their arts. After 1880, the traditional market for pottery based in domestic consumption and inter-tribal trade collapsed. The transmission of the knowledge and skills for making ceramics, which had been uninterrupted in the Southwest for nearly two thousand years, was broken.

For a market to coalesce that could sustain pottery production, Euro-Americans had to acquire an appreciation of its value, whether in its beauty, its rarity, or both. In 1881, James Stevenson reported, “We have been so busy collecting that we could only notice the objects casually as we took them in” (Lanmon 2008: 35). But the Stevensons and others began to appreciate that certain items in the large nets they were casting stood out for their technical and artistic merits. They began to seek out the better items, both old and new, and pay higher prices for them.

Traders had varying impacts, beneficial and detrimental. Often they priced the arts they sold strictly on size or weight. Over-production of low quality items for a limited market resulted in many traders accumulating large, unsold inventories. For decades the prices Pueblo women received for their efforts were abysmal. In 1927 Maria Martinez received only $3.00 for a blackware pot that had received an award at the Southwest Indian Fair; today her best works sell for as much as $20,000. It took two more generations after Nampeyo and Martinez before making high quality ceramics became economically viable for Pueblo families.

Bunzel’s disdain of the tourist market is widely shared, but without the train stations and the demand for souvenirs, potters may have stopped making any kind of ceramics at all, traditional or kitschy. As Dillinghman argues, it was in part the experience gained in selling their works to tourists that enabled Pueblo women to participate successfully in the Indian art market that developed in the mid-twentieth century (158).

The stories of Nampeyo and Martinez underscore the active role that Pueblo women played marketing their work. Both found multiple ways of selling pottery. They took their work directly to the Anglo-American public far beyond their villages and interacted with a wide range of outsiders, from archaeologists to artists to the inquisitive tourist. When it came to the would-be connoisseurs who believed they could better their work by encouraging the revival of ancient styles, potters like Nampeyo and Martinez listened but rarely followed their literal advice. Neither settled for making replicas of ancient pots, although their American admirers likely would have been satisfied if they did. These women were artists, seeking to express themselves in an original way through clay. They turned to the past for inspiration, but created something new. Their accomplishments, as Bunzel observed, arose from “the encouragement of white people interested in reviving aboriginal arts...working upon an individual endowed with technical equipment and creative imagination” (88).

Josephine Foard’s story is a good reminder of conservatism of the Pueblo people. The egalitarian ethos of Pueblo communities constrains individualism. To stand out from others through extraordinary achievements, to succeed where others do not, to win special attention from outsiders all bring the risk of suspicion and envy from fellow villagers. At Laguna, as Josephine Foard noted, “There are certain ones who, even if they are potters, look with contempt upon those who carry their wares to the trains for sale,” refusing to lower the standards of their work to create items for the tourists. If they did sell items to tourists, “they send their brothers or husbands to do the trafficking” (Lanmon, Lanmon Coulet du Gard 53).
From the heyday of the expeditions through the 1930s, the names of native artists were almost never recorded, even when collectors recognized that the work of some was more beautiful than that of others. The impetus came first from traders and curio dealers at the turn of the twentieth century, who saw an opportunity to market items more profitably by promoting the artists who made them. Others had ulterior motives. The official policy of the government at the time was assimilation; promoting individual achievement was seen as a way of weakening tribal bonds, which in turn would hastened the disappearance of tribal society.

In 1927, when the Southwest Indian Fair encouraged artists to sign their works, many resisted. “Our own people knew who made the pots,” they responded. “The old timers never would have thought to sign” (Bernstein 1993: 18). Pueblo potters who signed their work remained a minority until the 1950s. Nonetheless, it was only when pots were signed that they could cross the threshold into a fine art market. In the Western perspective, objects may be beautiful, they may reflect extraordinary skill, but to be displayed the art museum or gallery they had to be the product of an individual.

Keeping this in mind, the boldness of Nampeyo and Martinez is all the more remarkable. They stood out among their people not only for their skill and innovation—they earned money from it, travelled far into the white world, and found friends and colleagues among outsiders. Today, the best Pueblo pottery is made by professional artisans who devote their lives to mastering their craft and whose work provides important income for their families. Their names are well-known and can be said in many cases to constitute “brands”—a pot by “Maria Martinez” is readily recognized and highly valued, as is the work of her descendants who continue her style and techniques. But for Pueblo potters to take their place within the world of art beyond their villages it took a change not only in how Anglo-Americans viewed native arts, but in how native artists saw themselves.

**Pueblo Pottery in the Art-Culture System**

Underlying Bunzel’s assessment of Pueblo pottery in the 1920s is the implicit opposition of “authentic” and “inauthentic.” For her, only the best examples of ancient works untainted by outside influence qualify as Pueblo “art”; anything else was “degraded”—cheap, inauthentic trinkets made for the Philistine tastes of white Americans.

In his perceptive essay, “On Collecting Art and Culture,” James Clifford deconstructs this opposition, revealing it to be a part of a complex system that governs the social meaning of objects within the Western art tradition. In this larger system, the relationship between authentic and inauthentic is destabilized by a countervailing opposition between “art” and “culture.” Clifford’s diagram of this “art-culture system” provides a framework for summarizing the modern history of Pueblo pottery.

In Clifford’s schema, for an object to qualify as “art” it must be both a masterful creation and the original product of an individual, which are the prerequisites of authenticity. Its domain is the art museum and the private collection, and it circulates within a fine art market (zone 1). In the early modern era, when the European colonial enterprise began bringing home trophies from its far flung conquests, native objects were sometimes recognized for their artistry, but they were not “art”—they were collective products, their author was a people not an individual. At first they were received simply as marvels—or monstrosities. They entered the Western art-culture system as cultural artifacts (zone 2) valued for their authenticity in portraying the essence of a mysterious Other. Their domain was the curio cabinet and the ethnographic museum; their commercial value negligible until the twentieth century.
The significance of Nampeyo’s career was her success in creating objects that crossed between the zones of “culture” and “art.” Her work came to be appreciated both because of its artistry and because of the cultural heritage it portrayed. In contrast, the objects created by Pueblo potters for the tourist market enter the system through zone 4, as inauthentic stereotypes of a cultural tradition (zone 4). Even so, they belong to a continuum that includes into to the “authentic” cultural artifacts of zone 2.

In the category of “non-culture” and “not-art” (zone 3) belong the trinkets massed produced overseas and sold today as souvenirs throughout the Southwest—key chains and refrigerator magnets and such. These are culturally inauthentic objects, fakes, and yet their intelligibility relies on a similitude to something vaguely “Pueblo.” Here also belong Josephine Foard’s “hybrid” ceramics—part tourist ware, part sheer invention—objects for a use nobody needed, made with techniques Pueblo potters did not care to use.

At the same time, some of the completely eccentric items that Pueblo potters have made going back to the colonial period—chalices, jugs with political slogans, and the completely novel plates made by Mamie Ortiz using Catholic religious decals—items that have been considered anomalies or even embarrassments make sense when understood as instances of “not-culture/not-art” within this larger system. Some of these items remind one of nothing so much as Pop Art, with its ironic riffs on what counts as authentic, or in this case, “traditional.” And who knows—decaled plates maybe someday be considered the special “folk art of Acoma,” perhaps the subject of a collecting fad, and one will find exhibits of “Native American Pop Art of the Late Twentieth Century” occupying big city galleries.

The multiple poles of art/artifact, real/invented constitute a dynamic and unstable system. Objects migrate from one quadrant to another. Tourist wares of the early twentieth century are now traditional folk arts—and with the application of talent and refined techniques, they find their way...
into galleries—while potters who once made tourists wares sometimes return to traditional forms, as they did at San Ildefonso.

Pueblo pottery today occupies all the domains of art and culture in this system. Its viability is not just a function of having achieved fine art status, but of its continued circulation as objects that tell historical and cultural stories; as mementos of a journey to a faraway place; as cherished heirlooms in Pueblo homes; as historical treasures preserved in museums; as stunning works of art for sale in galleries; and sometimes, as surprisingly contemporary and ironic statements about all of the above. Pueblo pottery occupies all these genres, and Pueblo potters constantly redefine them for their own purposes. Pueblo pottery is today a richer and more multi-layered art tradition than it has been at any time in its history.

And new chapters are being added to its story.
Two-Spirit Pueblo Potters

It was stated earlier that Pueblo woman have been the primary producers of pottery throughout its history. The qualification “primary” is an important one, because there are two exceptions.

In the twentieth century, Pueblo men became involved in nearly all aspects of making pottery. Julian Martinez’s role in painting the pots shaped by Maria is well known, but he was not the first. Jonathan Batkin has identified several men at San Ildefonso involved in some aspect of pottery making going back to the 1890s or earlier (19-20). These men were typically husbands or male relatives of a woman potter, who assisted in a variety of tasks related ranging from gathering and preparing raw materials to painting designs. Actually working with clay still remains mostly a woman’s task, and when others are involved, whether male or female relatives, they work under her artistic direction. Although family resources are essential today in supporting the career of successful Pueblo potters, women remain its primary producers.

The second exception is the more interesting, for it reveals a special social role in Pueblo society without counterpart in Western culture. Once a footnote in the accounts of explorers and anthropologists, recent research has revealed this role to be one of most distinctive and widespread commonalities of Native American societies.

In the anthropological literature the generic term for individuals who occupied this role has been “berdache”; however, contemporary Native Americans prefer the term “two spirit.” The presence of two spirits has been documented in nearly all Pueblo communities and the names and history of several are known. Each tribal language its own term for this role: lhamana in Zuni, kokwimu in the Keres language of Acoma and Laguna, ho’va at Hopi. These individuals combined elements of both men’s and women’s social roles and traits, along with traits unique to their status. They include men who pursue women’s occupations and sometimes, but not always, dress as women, and women who excel in male activities such as hunting and warfare. Researchers today describe these as “alternative” or “third” gender roles.

That gender is a social construct has long been the creed of gender studies, feminism, history, and the social sciences generally, but two-spirit people are definitive proof that gender does not have to be tied to physical sex and that gender roles can be non-binary, situational, and diverse. Alternative gender roles have been documented in over 150 tribes throughout North America, in every kind of tribal organization, and within every major language group. Among tribes from the Plains to the Pueblos, male two spirits enjoyed the reputation of being the finest artists and craftspeople in their communities. As Ruth Benedict commented, “The Dakota had a saying, ‘fine possessions like a berdache’s,’ and it was the epitome of praise for any woman’s household possessions” (264).

Among the Pueblos, two spirits are known to have been potters since Spanish colonial times, but until recently little documentation regarding them has been available and no surviving examples of their work were known. But in the mid-1980s, Jonathan Batkin came across catalog notes at the School of American Research in Santa Fe that identified a pot in its collections has having been made by a Laguna potter named Arroh-ah-och, who was a “hermaphrodite.” Batkin discussed “men-women” potters in his 1987 book, Pottery of the Pueblos of New Mexico, 1700–1940, and based on similarities to the SAR jar he attributed an additional pot to the Arroh-ah-och.
In 1988, I identified two Pueblo two-spirit potters in *Living the Spirit: A Gay American Indian Anthology*—an Acoma *kokimu* depicted in a photograph from 1900 by Sumner Matteson and Arroh-ah-och, the Laguna two-spirit potter mentioned by Bunzel in her 1929 study, whose name Jonathan Batkin had alerted me to. In 1991, I told the story of the Zuni *lhamana* We’wha, an accomplished potter, in *The Zuni Man-Woman*. Although I uncovered extensive documentation about We’wha, I was not able to undertake research in the vast collections in the Smithsonian Institute warehouses, where it seemed certain that pots made by We’wha existed. Given the sketchy note taking of early collectors, I assumed—erroneously—that the prospects of identifying specific items made by We’wha were dim.

In 1992, Rick Dillingham included an illustration of the SAR pot and provided additional details regarding Arroh-ah-och in his book, *Acoma & Laguna Pottery*. He also attributed an additional pot to Arroh-ah-och. Then, in a major article published in 2005, Dwight P. Lanmon attributed nine vessels to Arroh-ah-och, based on comparison to the SAR jar. This was followed by his exhaustive 2008 study of Zuni pottery, in which he attributed seven pots to We’wha, two on the basis of what appears to be signatures. Most recently, in a 2013 article, Lanmon identified the Acoma *kokwimu* in Matteson’s photograph as Wa-ki and attributed a bowl to him inscribed with that name.

All this amounts to a sudden wealth of resources for the study of two-spirit artistry. For the first time it is possible to contemplate the artistic production of three traditional Native American two spirits—all of whom flourished at approximately the same time and in the same region of western New Mexico and Arizona—and assess the reputation of two spirits for artistic excellence.

What follows is a prolegomena. It simply seeks to introduce these potters and bring together the works that, so far, have been attributed to them. Catalog notes, if available, are reproduced verbatim. A few observations are offered at the end. But with the historical outline of Pueblo pottery given above in mind, these objects tell stories—about the unique role of third gender individuals in traditional native societies and how two-spirit potters at Acoma, Laguna, and Zuni contributed to the survival of Pueblo pottery.
Soon after their arrival in 1879, the Stevensons met an striking Zuni woman who was working for the lonely missionaries attempting to set up a school in the village. We’wah, Matilda Stevenson wrote, “was the most intelligent person in the pueblo” with an extensive knowledge of Zuni history and culture. This made her an excellent informant for anthropological research. But there was something unusual about We’wah. “She” was one of the tallest members of the tribe, male or female, and in Stevenson’s opinion, “certainly the strongest, both mentally and physically.” Nonetheless, many years passed before she discovered the truth. We’wah was a man. His identity in Zuni culture was that of the lhamana, or two-spirit male.

The lhamana role entailed complex interweavings of men’s and women’s traits and occupations. Born around 1849, We’wah demonstrated a preference (and talent) for women’s work at an early age and learned pottery making from female relatives. But he also excelled in weaving, which was usually done by men, and a census made in 1881 lists him as a farmer, another male role. We’wah was also a member of the men’s kachina society, responsible for performing masked dances.

Stevenson formed a genuine and enduring friendship with the Zuni two spirit. In 1886, she brought We’wah to live with her and James for six months in Washington, D.C., where We’wha called on President Cleveland and other political figures, and circulated among Washington society—all believed he was a woman. We’wha assisted Stevenson with her ethnographic research and demonstrated weaving in a series of photographs—one of the first uses of photography to document native arts (twenty years before Nampeyo did the same).

One visitor in the 1890s reported that We’wha’s pottery fetched twice that of any other, and that “her home in Zuni was full of evidences of her skill” (Roscoe 1988). Stevenson identified We’wha as one of the two best potters in the village and commissioned pots from him. In her study of the Zuni Indians, she describes an occasion when she accompanied We’wha on an expedition to collect clay. Her account provides rare insight into the practices of Pueblo potters:

On passing a stone heap she picked up a small stone in her left hand, and spitting upon it, carried the hand around her head and threw the stone over one shoulder upon the stone heap in order that her strength might not go from her when carrying the heavy load down the mesa. She then visited the shrine at the base of the Mother Rock and tearing off a bit of her blanket deposited it in one of the tiny pits in the rock as an offering to the mother rock. When she drew near to the clay bed she indicated to Mr. Stevenson that he must remain behind, as men never approached the spot. Proceeding a short distance the party reached a point where We’wha requested the writer to remain perfectly quiet and not talk, saying: “Should we talk, my pottery would crack in the baking, and unless I pray constantly the clay will not appear to me.” She applied the hoe vigorously to the hard soil, all the while murmuring prayers to Mother Earth. Nine-tenths of the clay was rejected, every lump being tested between the fingers as to its texture. After gathering about 150 pounds in a blanket, which she carried on her back, with the ends of the blanket tied...
around her forehead, We’wha descended the steep mesa, apparently unconscious of the weight. (Stevenson 374)

The works attributed to We’wha—thanks to the research of Dwight Lanmon—provide for the first time an opportunity to assess the basis for his reputation as a potter. These attributions were the result of a remarkable discovery—two vessels in the National Museum of Natural History collections that appear to have been signed by the Zuni two-spirit. If so, these are probably the earliest instances of a native artist signing an object—four decades before Maria Martinez took the bold step of autographing her work.* The writing is crude, “W” seems to be confused with “M,” but this is what might be expected. According to Stevenson, We’wha picked up some basic English in Washington; and he likely saw the missionaries attempting to teach Zuni children the alphabet. Allowing for this, the signature can be read as “Wa-wah,” which certainly falls within the range of phonetic spellings made by writers in that time.

Where did the impetus to sign these pots come from? Perhaps it was for purely practical reasons, a way of identifying the specific items Stevenson had commissioned We’wha to make within a larger shipment. The pieces are dated before We’wha’s Washington trip; but in the nation’s capital the Zuni lhamaña would have seen examples of how Anglo-Americans valued and displayed works of art, including the application of a signature.

That does not diminish the surprise of being suddenly presented with a work of exceptional quality made by an identifiable individual in an era when native artists were still anonymous craftspeople whose works were usually sold on the basis of their weight or size alone.

---

* More recently I have learned of another early instance of a native artist signing a work. An episode of the television series “History Detectives,” first aired in 2010, featured a Modoc basket with the name “Toby” woven into it, probably made in the 1890s. The weaver, the segment concludes, was very likely Toby Riddle (1848-1920), a Modoc woman from the Northern California-Oregon region who lived a remarkable life. As a young woman, she received the Modoc name Winema, or Woman Chief, after joining men on raiding parties. Although no evidence indicates she considered herself or was viewed as a two spirit, she exceeded the social expectations for Modoc women in a number of ways, from her tom-boy reputation as a girl to her marriage to a white man, her role as a mediator during the Modoc War, and her subsequent travels and appearances in the East. Indeed, she is the subject of a book by Alfred Meacham (Wi-ne-ma, 1876), whose life she saved during in violent skirmish between Modoc warriors and American officials. At the same time, Winema fulfilled the traditional women’s of wife, mother, and basket maker.
National Museum of Natural History E111343 (Signed?)

Collected by Col. James Stevenson, May 1885. Bowl is signed on the bottom of the bowl foot: "2882, ma-mah, Male [Made?]" Identified by Dwight Lanmon, 2007, as a Polychrome footed bowl. Maker attributed by Lanmon to be We'wha and Lanmon says bowl probably signed by We'wha (the writing on bottom of bowl foot). Lanmon also speculates that "2882" in signature could be an attempt at writing a date, perhaps 1882? References: p. 89 and 95 in "We'wha: A Zuni Man-Woman and His Pottery", by Dwight P. Lanmon; The Walpole Society Notebook, 2003-2004; Printed for the Society: 2006; pp. 522-5 in Lanmon, Dwight P., and Francis Harvey Harlow, 2008, The pottery of Zuni Pueblo. Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press. [Figs. 34.49a-c]

The number on this bowl appears to be an attempt to write a date, perhaps 1882. (Two “O”s also are written directly below the first “8”.) The word “male” or “made” appears in the inscriptions on this piece as well as E134576. Lanmon speculates that the inscription represents the name We’wha, who confused the letter “M” for “W.” If so, then the inscriptions read Wa-Wah or Wa-Wal, and according to Lanmon no other name in Zuni censuses of this period is remotely similar to these except that of We’wha.

The curled and pointed shapes inside the large X-element inside the bowl are feathered crooks, called pahos by Zuni potters. The slender three-pronged elements attached to the caps of the X figure are feather symbols associated with rain priests and are considered prayers for rain. The disk-shaped foot of the bowl may be derived from European models. The overall shape is similar to that of a ceramic washbasin, an item We’wha may have been seen used by any number of white visitors to Zuni in the 1880s. The bowl shows little wear and may have been one the items Matilda Stevenson commissioned from We’wha (Lanmon 2008: 523; fig. 34.49).
The disk-shaped foot of the jug is similar to that of E111343 above, but otherwise the form has no European influence. The handle is modeled in the shape of a horse, although the tail has been broken off. The deer painted on the front has the characteristic red “heart line,” starting at the mouth ending in a triangle inside the body, representing the animals’ soul or breath. Stylized black birds are painted on the jug’s neck. The pahos on the body of the jug are similar to those on E111343.
This bowl shares several similarities with E111343 above—identical profiles, rim designs, disk-shaped feet, and similar X-designs on the inside. The exteriors, however, are different. This bowl has an elaborate design of interlocking stepped figures, some solid black, others hatched, a design also found on jars and jugs and probably derived from pottery vessels made in the Zuni region some 700 years earlier. Despite the differing treatment of their exteriors, Lanmon believes both bowls were made by We’wha (Lanmon 2008: 524, fig. 34.51).
The X-design with *pahos* on the inside of this bowl is similar to that in E111343 and E134557, and on this basis Lanmon attributes the piece to We’wha. The exterior is unusual for Zuni bowls, however, consisting of rectangular panels with diagonals flanked by sets of three black triangles with red and black triangles in the corners and on the sides. Zuni potters told Bunzel that these forms represent “red and black cloud steps with lightning….Steps for the rain to come down. Lightning always makes the rain come fast. A prayer for rain.” A large olla in a photograph of We’wha’s mother by George Wharton James has identical exterior designs and identical bands of scroll figures on the inside.
The smaller of the two bowls with this C #, EC754-0, is identified by Dwight Lanmon 2007 as a Zuni polychrome dough bowl and attributed by Lanmon to be made by We' wha, circa 1875. Digital image of this bowl is Smithsonian Photographic Services negative # 2007-2225. Bowl has been broken and repaired.

The exterior red crooks are similar to those on E111986 (Lanmon 2008: fig. 16.30) and MIAC 8105/12, and the overall similarity of the exteriors on these three bowls—atypical for Zuni pottery of this period—leads Lanmon to attribute them to We’ wha. The interior X-design is also related to E111343 (Lanmon 2008: 158, Fig. 9.1).
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This bowl (Lanmon 2008: 165-66, Fig. 9.28) and the one in Lanmon Fig. 34.52 have similar double and four-way scrolls. The exterior contains pairs of mirroring capped crooks similar to those in EC754-0. The exterior panels with pairs of mirrored, singly capped crooks are also similar.
Collected by Col. James Stevenson, May, 1885. Identified by Dwight Lanmon 2007 as a Polychrome bowl, perhaps made by We’wha, ca. 1880.

Based on nearly identical decorations on the outside of this bowl and EC754-0, Lanmon believes both were made by We’wha (2008: 243, Fig. 16.30). (The bowl is also illustrated in Hardin [23, fig. 44].) The exterior decoration represents feathers.
TERRACED BOWL WITH HANDLE. WHITE SLIP. EXTERIOR DESIGN OF HORNED TOADS PAINTED IN BLACK ABOVE TWO SNAKES, PAINTED IN BLACK & RED. FOUR DRAGONFLIES (TWO RED, TWO BLACK) PAINTED ON INTERIOR TERRACED RIM. BONHAM'S AUCTION HOUSE LOT #267. ACCORDING TO WILLIAM STURTEVANT, NMNH CURATOR, THE RED "--14" ON THE INTERIOR OF THE BOWL IS A STEVENSON ORIGINAL NUMBER, INDICATING THE BOWL WAS COLLECTED BETWEEN 1880-1884. Maker attributed by Dwight Lanmon to be We’wha. Reference: p. 86, and 93-94 in “We’wha: A Zuni Man-Woman and His Pottery,” by Dwight P. Lanmon; The Walpole Society Notebook, 2003-2004; Printed for the Society: 2006. See also pp. 522-5 in Lanmon, Dwight P., and Francis Harvey Harlow. 2008. The pottery of Zuni Pueblo. Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press. In Fig. 34.48, p. 522, Lanmon illustrates a National Anthropological Archives photo of We’wha holding a vessel, which Lanmon identifies as vessel #E425653. The photo is National Anthropological Archives ref. #SPC Sw Zuni NM No # People 02440800 (SPS neg. # 85-8666). The vessel itself is illustrated in Fig. 23.28, p. 333, in Lanmon 2008.

The Zunis refer to this form as a “cloud bowl,” used on ceremonial occasions to hold sacred corn meal. This is the bowl held by We’wha in the picture taken in Washington, D.C. in 1886 (NAA neg. no. 85-8666; see Roscoe 1991). The serpent on the outside is Kolowisi, who appears in various Zuni myths. This figure, as well as the leaping frog and dragonflies on the interior, are all associated with water and springs. Lanmon speculates that the bowl was made by We’wha (2008: 330-33, Fig. 23.28).
Arroh-ah-och/Arow-awk (ca. 1830-1890)

In her 1929 study of Pueblo pottery Ruth Bunzel wrote:

Zuni pottery is well thought of at Acoma and Laguna, and many Zuni designs are current at the latter village where their origin is fully recognized. At Laguna I saw a pot of typical Zuni feeling and treatment, which I first took to be a Zuni pot. My informant, however, assured me that it was an old Laguna piece. Later she remembered that it had been made by her uncle one of the last men-women of Laguna, a famous potter, now dead, who had once visited Zuni and had been so much impressed by Zuni pottery that he introduced the deer and other typical designs into Laguna. (7, 57)

In fact, the pot Bunzel describes had been photographed in 1925 by Edward S. Curtis and published in his series, The North American Indian. The evidence linking it to her report, however, lay hidden in unpublished notes at the School of American Research until the 1980s, when Jonathan Batkin came across them.

In 1928, Kenneth Chapman, curator at the Museum of New Mexico, was purchasing pottery at Laguna for sale the Santa Fe Fair when he saw an old jar of unusual quality (Bernstein 1993: 47). Determined to add the pot to the Laboratory of Anthropology collections he paid the owner $75, an extraordinary price in that time. According to Chapman, the Laguna elder who owned it remembered seeing it in his mother’s home when he was a child, and he gave the potter’s name as “Arroh-ah-och” (Chapman’s spelling). He believed the potter was about 60 when he made the jar for his mother (Lanmon 2005: 74; Batkin 204). Chapman’s notes go on to identify Arroh-ah-och as the “famous Laguna hermaphrodite,” although elsewhere he wrote that “Oharoch” was a “Zuni transvestite potter” who had moved to Laguna (Dillingham 14).

It has been speculated that Arroh-ah-och’s home was at Zuni, but that he was trained in pottery making at Acoma then settled at Laguna. However, Arroh-ah-och is a distinctly non-Zuni name, whereas various forms of it can be identified in Laguna census records from 1880 to 1892. The Laguna elders that Dillingham talked to in the 1980s remembered Arroh-ah-och as native to their village and a superb potter. According to one, Arroh-ah-och was a member of the Roadrunner clan, which was believed to have “come from Zuni.” Clan relationships may have provided Arroh-ah-och an entre for visits there. He was likely born in 1830s and died sometime before 1900.

As Dillingham notes, the Chapman pot is among a group of atypical jars made at Laguna between 1890 and 1920 using design elements and layouts borrowed from Zuni, and he suggests that “their characteristic idiosyncrasies...identify them as a unique body of work that points tantalizingly to the efforts of an individual artisan” (11-12).

The exceptional artistry and distinctive treatment of design elements are unique to the work of this potter. His work demonstrate the importance of individual contributions and of interpueblo influences on the development of the pottery.
tradition, as well as an interest in experimentation and innovation that continues today. (14-15)

The Zuni-style Laguna and Acoma pots in collections today show little sign of wear, which may indicate that they were made for sale rather than domestic use. Perhaps they were made to fill a demand for Zuni styles popular among Anglo-American buyers that Zuni potters themselves could not meet.

A drawing of a jar collected at Zuni in 1879 contains several elements characteristic of Arroh-ah-och’s pottery (Lanmon 2005: 83). Stevenson reported that in the 1880s two of the five lhamanas in the village were “the finest potters and weavers in the tribe.” One was We’wha. Could the other have been the maker of the spectacular piece Chapman collected, with its creative reworking of Zuni designs? If so, as Lanmon suggests, Arroh-ah-och influenced pottery at three pueblos—Zuni, Acoma and Laguna.

Figure 7. Jar collected at Zuni, 1879 (NMNH E41154)
According to Lanmon, Chapman erroneously dated this jar to 1850. Dillingham dates it around 1900. Lanmon, based in part on having identified Arroh-ah-och’s name in Laguna census records, believes the jar was made between 1870 and 1880.

Dillingham describes it as a “jar of exceptional size and beauty.” Lanmon considers the piece “magnificent” and declares, “In my opinion, it is one of the most beautiful Pueblo pottery jars in existence.”

It is a spectacular example of Pueblo pottery, no matter who made it or where or when it was made. It is relatively thin walled for its size, and the darkened cream-colored slip on the surface is finely tone polished and has little surface crackling. They layout of the design is somewhat uneven, but the painting of the individual design elements is clean and sure. The extraordinary control seen in the individual motifs, particularly the fine crosshatching, may be characteristic of Arroh-a-och’s pottery. (2005: 77)
ATTRIBUTED WORKS

The SAR jar is the only work that can be definitively attributed to Arroh-ah-och. However, based on a close analysis of its form and decoration, Lanmon identifies 12 elements characteristic of the jar, then uses these to attribute eight other pieces in a various collections to the Laguna two-spirit, and he believes that additional pots might be attributable to him as well. Many of these elements are found on Zuni jars from the same period, but they are given a distinctive treatment by Arroh-ah-och.

1. The large quatrefoils spanning the body of the jar between the shoulder band and underbody
2. The three bands of decorations on the sides with related motifs in the upper and lower bands
3. The three types of capped spirals on the sides and in the neckband
4. The elaborate double-domed structures on top of the spirals on the neckband
5. Extremely fine crosshatching (likely to have been painted with a single yucca fiber as a brush)
6. Various feather motifs in red and black with red leaves
7. The unusually wide middle band. While the deer depictions on the jar are a common Zuni motif, Zuni potters typically placed them in the upper and lower bands.
8. The animals on the jar are a borrowing from Zuni and unusual at Laguna. At the same time, they have several features that distinguish from Zuni motifs, and these may be characteristic of Arroh-ah-och. Most significantly, Lanmon believes they represent antelope, while the animals depicted on Zuni jars are more like deer or elk.
9. The numerous red leaves
10. Gaps in the broad lines encircling the jar at the base of the neck; the lines have gaps or barred breaks which are typical of Zuni jars.
11. The bottom and underbody are covered in a dark reddish brown slip
12. The rounding of the rim on the inside

In addition to the eight pots attributed to Arroh-ah-och by Lanmon, other attributions have been made by Batkin (1987) and Dillingham (1992). More recently, pots have appeared on auction house websites attributed with to the Laguna two spirit, but little or no evidence. I include these at the end of this section but I find their attribution specious.
Fig. 8. Jar attributed to Arroh-a-och, probably made at Zuni, 1870-1880. Collected at Zuni in 1911 by H. J. Spinden. 11-7/8” high, 15-3/8” diameter (30 cm x 39 cm).
Fig. 2. Jar attributed to Arroh-a-och, Laguna, 1870-1880. 13-2/8” high, 11-7/8” diameter (34 cm x 30.2 cm). Private collection.
Catalog Notes


Bruce Bernstein confirms Laguna identification 9-21-1999. Illus. Fig. 5, p. 77 in Lanmon, Dwight p., 2005, *Pueblo Man-Woman Potters and the Pottery Made by the Laguna Man-Woman, Arroh-a-och,* American Indian Art Magazine 31(1): 72-85. Identified there as “Jar attributed to Arroh-a-och, probably made at Zuni or Laguna, 1870-1880, 10 ¼” high, 12 ¾” diameter (26 cm x 31 cm).”
Southwest Museum/Autry Center: Object ID 491.G.808

**Date** circa 1880-1901. 11 1/2 in x 13 in (29.2 cm x 33 cm). The Brigadier-General Lionel A. Sheldon Collection. Southwest Museum of the American Indian Collection, Autry National Center. Laguna Pueblo black and red-on white earthenware jar, attributed to Arroh-ah-och, Laguna Pueblo, New Mexico, circa 1880-1901. Fewer than ten known ceramics can be attributed confidently to Arroh-ah-och, a two-spirit person from Laguna, who was an active potter in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Vessels made by Arroh-ah-och are similar to those of Zuni potters, but differ in significant ways: they are shaped differently, and designs include red leaves or petals, which rarely appear on Zuni vessels.

**Dillingham 1992: 14**

Fig. 1.9. Laguna Polychrome variant jar, ca. 1890. The catalog card reads “copy of a Zuni pottery jar, Laguna, probably.” 5-1/4” x 8-1/2.

Dillingham attributes this jar to Arroh-ah-och and dates it to approximately 1890. The banded design is similar to Zuni pots. A chalky red unbordered slip is used for some design elements, and a bold capped spirit break appears at the shoulder (1992: 14, Fig. 1.9).
**Peabody Museum: 36-94-10/6546**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display Title: Pottery olla. Globular with large orifice, thick white slip with decorations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions: Inventory Description: Ceramic jar, brown on buff exterior, straight neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Description: Pottery olla. Globular with large orifice, thick white slip with decorations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Ethnographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: ca. 1870-1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture/Period: Zuñi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/Provenience: North America/United States/New Mexico/County/City/Pueblo of Zuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials: Ceramic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions: Overall: 35 x 38 cm (13 3/4 x 14 15/16 in.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor: Dr. Alfred Vincent Kidder (1907-1930 - 1936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor: Mrs. Madeleine Kidder (1907-1930 - 1936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector: Dr. Alfred Vincent Kidder (1915 - 1936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector: Mrs. Madeleine Kidder (1915 - 1936)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lanmon 2005: 78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 6. Storage jar attributed to Arroh-ah-och, probably made at Zuni (1870–1880. Purchased in 1915 by A. V. Kidder in Santa Fe, New Mexico. 13-3/4” high, 15-3/8 “ diameter (35 cm X 39 cm).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 7. Storage jar attributed to Arroh-ah-och, probably made at Zuni (1870–1880. Purchased in 1915 by A. V. Kidder in Santa Fe, New Mexico. 13-3/4” high, 15-3/8” diameter (35 cm X 39 cm). Private collection.
The capped spirals in the lower side band and the antelope figures are similar to those on the Chapman jar. [NOTE: The jar in Lanmon’s figure 9 is different from the photograph posted on the museum’s on-line database for the catalog number he cites (below). In an email, Lucy Williams, a museum curator, reported that the pot has undergone cleaning and that this explained the difference in appearance in the two photographs (Nov. 3, 2014). I remain convinced these are different pots entirely.]
Fig. 12. Jar attributed to Arroh-a-och, probably made at Zuni or Laguna, 1870-1880. 13-1/8” high, 14-9/16” diameter (33.5 cm X 37 cm).

Laguna Polychrome olla, possibly by the man-woman Arroh-ah-och, ca. 1900. Small unoutlined leaflike elements in gritty red paint appear in Laguna copies of Zuni jars; these motifs are rare in Zuni ceramics. The element near the center of this illustration, with cross-hatched interior, appears only a Laguna pottery. Diameter 10½”.
Laguna Polychrome Jar Made by a Berdache
2003 American Indian Arts. Sept. 12-13
ca 1890-1900. Typical Laguna shape, with concave base, but with Zuni motifs and design layout painted in black and red on white. Body and neck elegantly decorated with stylized images of rain birds, base and internal portion of neck painted red; 12.5" high x 13.5" diameter.

This vessel was almost certainly potted by the Laguna berdache Arroh-ah-och. An acknowledged master, this Laguna native was apparently trained at Zuni, and is credited with introducing a number of Zuni design elements to the potters of Laguna. His work is well-documented (See Dillingham 1992:12-15; and Bunzel 1929:57 as quoted in Dillingham) and examples are located in the collections of the School for American Research and other institutions. A rare, and historically important vessel. Vessel collected by William A. Titus (1875-1950). According to family members, Titus, a State Senator from Wisconsin, collected this vessel on a trip to the southwest around the turn-of-the-century.

Condition: Wonderful patina, remnant of tag within bottom medallion, EXC.
Est $15000 - $20000
Arroh-ah-och is representative of a traditional, accepted gender role reversal in Native American culture, known in anthropological literature as berdache; he was a man who adopted the ways and dress of women in the pueblos around the turn of the 20th century. As a pottery-maker, he created a distinctive style using Zuni design motifs with Laguna clay and paints. In the case of this ollah, the overall shape is essentially Zuni but with a neck that is taller and more characteristic of Laguna. Interestingly, the large hatched designs used in variation on both the neck and body are a true marriage of design concepts from both pueblos, and though the black painting of the base is used here in deference to the Zuni Pueblo, the indented base has been left unpainted, revealing the true nature of the clay and in this case, the identity of the artist. Ollah comes with documentation by Robert Bauver. 10" high x 12" diameter.
A LAGUNA POLYCHROME STORAGE JAR
Arroh-ah-och, c. 1895, painted in deep red and black over a white slip, with four large-scale stepped elements, each enclosing a diamond, all against a hatched ground, surmounted by three bands of geometric designs, dark brown underbody
Provenance: The Valentine Pasvolsky Collection
Diameter: 13 ½ inches
Condition Report*: In overall very nice condition. One restored area beneath the rim, approx 2" x 5", with only 3 - 5% of that area not original. Surface with vibrant colors and nice patina.
Wa-ki (ca. 1860-?)

On September 2, 1900 Sumner Matteson, an amateur photographer who crisscrossed the country on his bicycle, taking pictures with an early Kodak, stopped at Acoma pueblo. He sought out, as he often did, photogenic scenes and individuals that evoked the kind of traditional Native American life Americans liked to see. On this day he chose for his subjects “the finest potters of Acoma.”

Matteson was exceptionally forthcoming for his time, for his notes go on to add that the center figure in one photograph, who is also depicted alone in a second picture, was “the Mojaro of Acoma.” “This man,” he continues, “has elected to dress like a woman and do woman’s work rather than fight. He is far more particular of dress than the women.” The women with him are his sister and niece.

The word “mojaro”—also spelled “mojarow,” “mujerado,” “amejerado,” and “amugearado”—derives from the colloquial Spanish term “mujerado,” which indicates a man who has assumed a woman’s sexual role. In colonial New Mexico it became a jargon word for referring to two spirits, whom the Spaniards encountered in various tribes and villages—otherwise known by different terms in each native language. In early nineteenth century census records, Pueblo males are occasionally identified as potters with names like “Juan Amejerado” (Olmstead 156). In the Keresan language of Acoma and Laguna, two spirits are called kokwimu or kok’we’má.
The “mojarō’s” dress in these photographs not only indicates a “particular” taste, the finery indicates his success as a potter. He wears moccasins, white wrapped cloth leggings, a European cloth under dress, a dark jumper, a woven belt, a shawl, a bead necklace, and a silver bead necklace with a horseshoe pendant.

Matteson’s picture of the three potters was published in 1983 and reprinted in 1987 in the gay American Indian anthology, *Living the Spirit*, with an explanation of the term “mojarō” as a reference to a traditional tribal role. The identification of the Acoma two spirit potter’s name, however, is a result of the historical detective work of Dwight Lanmon. Carefully reviewing the 1910 U. S. census of Acoma, Lanmon was able to determine the identities of all three potters in Matteson’s picture: Pablita Wanya/Sarracino, her daughter Pablita Wanya/Pino, and the “mojarō,” Juana Wanya. The records show that the three lived together at the small outlier village of Acomita. Lanmon dates Juana’s birth between 1860 and 1864. He belonged to the same generation as Nampeyo (Lanmon 2013). From Acoma elders, Lanmon learned that “Juana’s” native name was Wa-ki or Wagai.

Prior to this discovery, Lanmon and two co-authors had published a history of Josephine Foard’s efforts to commercialize pottery at Laguna in the early twentieth century (2007). They noted that one of the items Foard purchased and glazed was inscribed with the name “Wa-Ki” (73). With this new information identifying Wa-ki as the individual in Matteson’s photograph, Lanmon was able to finally connect the dots—the “mojarō of Acoma” not only had a name, but a surviving work could be attributed to him.

There is another photograph that may depict Wa-ki and his relatives. It is an iconic image of Pueblo women awaiting the arrival of a train at the Laguna stop in order to sell their pottery alongside the tracks. Different writers have identified the women as being Laguna and dated the photograph anywhere from 1890 to 1898. However, the resemblance of these women to those in Matteson’s photograph seem undeniable.

If so, Wa-ki and his relatives were making the trek to Laguna to take advantage of the opportunity to sell their wares to tourists and travelers. Judging from the stunning array of pieces shown in the photograph—large ollas born on their heads and pots of various sizes and styles laid out at their feet—their reputation as the “finest potters of Acoma” was well-deserved. It may have been at the Laguna stop that Matteson met or learned of the Acoma potters, before travelling to their village to photograph them, and Josephine Foard may have purchased the bowl that she glazed and inscribed with the name Wa-ki there as well—directly from him (Lanmon, Lanmon, Coulet du Gard 2007: 53-55). Foard does not mention the Acoma *kokwimu* in her writings, but she was well aware of Laguna two-spirit potters and wrote of them with evident disdain (“fortunately there are but few” [61]).

For now, this is all that is known about Wa-ki.
Figure 10. Laguna (?) women, 1890s (SWM neg. no. 20269)

The decoration includes unusual small birds with curled top-knots and multiple wings and tail feathers, perched on stems with foliage and berries.

Lanmon (2013), fig. 4. Acoma Polychrome bowl, inscribed with the name Wa-ki (Juana Wanya), 1900-1910. 6¼” x 8 1/8” (17 cm x 21 cm). Gift of Mrs. A. W. Trenholm, 1928. Science Museum of Minnesota, St. Paul cat. No. 1-111.

The bowl is decorated with a pattern of linked, curve-sided red and black diamonds...in addition to small black-headed birds, flowering and fruiting plants, and three-lobed motifs.

The name Wa-ki is inscribed in fired black pigment on the bottom of this bowl. The bowl is decorated with a pattern of linked, curve-sided red and black diamonds. Lanmon notes, “It is the only known piece of pottery identifiable as the work of Juana Wanya; others may exist, but none have been identified.”
TWO-SPRIT CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF PUEBLO POTTERY

What has been presented here does not amount to a study of these newly identified works by any means, but is merely an effort to launch that study by bringing together as much of the primary evidence and documentation available, and to provide an historical framework for it.

Earlier, a somewhat ingenuous suggestion was made that having a portfolio of works known to have been made by traditional two-spirit artists before us would make it possible to assess the reputation they enjoyed for artistic excellence. But that kind of assessment would require an aesthetic and stylistic study of each work, a vocabulary for identifying distinctive features, postulations about the development of the artists’ work, and aesthetic judgments based on systematic comparison to the pottery in general from the same time and place. That is beyond the scope of this effort and the skills of this writer.

Letting the works of We’wha, Arroh-ah-och, and Wa-ki speak directly at first, by bringing them together in a single place, seems at least a good start.

Consideration of artistic merits aside, certain observations can be made from the historical evidence these items provide and the recent research regarding their makers.

The history and revival of Pueblo pottery given earlier was to intended to provide a framework into which the often fragmentary evidence we have about these two spirit potters might be placed and understood. With the oldest of the three, Arroh-ah-och, born in the 1830s and the youngest, Wa-ki, surviving into the first decade of the twentieth century, they belong to the last generation of potters who learned and practiced the art before the cultural and economic disruptions of the late nineteenth century and then lived to experience their full impact.

In the midst of social turmoil, all three continued making utilitarian and traditional wares. Wa-ki, however, living near the Laguna train stop, seems to have taken advantage of the commercial market there. The small, cup-shaped bowl that Josephine Foard glazed has the look of an object made quickly to sell at a low price point, although the pots depicted in the photographs of Wa-ki and his female relatives appear to be fully traditional and expertly made.

Indeed, each of these potters can be seen engaging in the kind of experiments that proved formative in the careers of Nampeyo and Maria Martinez. Both We’wha and Wa-ki took advantage of opportunities to sell their work to Americans. Arroh-ah-och innovated, but in a way distinct from Nampeyo (who refined an ancient style) and Martinez (who created a new type of pottery altogether). Arroh-ah-och synthesized the styles of two village traditions. But like Nampeyo and Martinez, while in dialogue with the larger world, these “men-women” potters remained fully traditional in how they lived and worked.

Then there is the Zuni lhamana We’wha. In the 1880s, this self-confident two spirit preceded both Nampeyo and Martinez in reaching out to Americans, making works for commercial sale, cooperating with photographers and anthropologists to document traditional arts, and traveling far in the white world. Now we can add to this picture the striking evidence Lanmon has uncovered in the form of two works signed by this remarkable individual.


### Table 1. Basis of Attribution—We’wha (after Lanmon 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Fig. 34.50 – E134576</th>
<th>Fig. 34.49 – E111343</th>
<th>Fig. 34.51 – E134557</th>
<th>Fig. 34.52</th>
<th>Fig. 9.1 – EC754-0</th>
<th>Fig. 9.28 8105/12</th>
<th>Fig. 16.30 – E111986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disk-shaped foot</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior X-design with double and 4-way scrolls</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahas/crooks</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rim design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrored capped crooks on exterior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior decoration with red crooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Basis of Attribution—Arroh-ah-och (after Lanmon 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 3</th>
<th>Fig. 2</th>
<th>Fig. 4</th>
<th>Fig. 5</th>
<th>Fig. 6</th>
<th>Fig. 7</th>
<th>Fig. 8</th>
<th>Fig. 9</th>
<th>Fig. 12</th>
<th>Fig. 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAR1026</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>IAR/SAR 1994.4.609</td>
<td>NMNH 273442</td>
<td>Peabody 36-91-10/6546</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>AMNH 191113</td>
<td>UPMAA 20352</td>
<td>NMAI 9/7131</td>
<td>NMNH E41154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large quatrefoils</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 exterior bands, related motifs in upper/lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capped spirals (3 types)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-domed structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely fine crosshatching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red and black feather motifs with red leaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide middle band with animal depictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope figures; •</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>• in feather houses</td>
<td>[•]</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>[•]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red leaves not outlined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barred break gaps in lines at the base of the neck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not on SAR 1026)</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Birds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>