

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Multiple Property Documentation Form**

DEC 14 1988

**NATIONAL
REGISTER**

This form is for use in documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms* (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Type all entries.

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

PREHISTORIC WALLED HILLTOP SITES OF PRESCOTT
NATIONAL FOREST AND ADJACENT REGIONS

B. Associated Historic Contexts

Prehistoric Ceramic Period in the Southwest, ca. A.D. 1000 - 1400

C. Geographical Data

Prescott National Forest and adjacent regions. Adjacent regions encompass the Sinagua, Cohonina, and Prescott Culture and Hohokam areas on adjacent lands of various statuses including the Kaibab, Coconino, and Tonto National Forests.

See continuation sheet

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Planning and Evaluation.

Evans S. DeStorvis, Preservation Officer 11-21-88
Signature of certifying official Date
USDA - Forest Service

State or Federal agency and bureau

I, hereby, certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

John J. Kassel 1/27/89
Signature of the Keeper of the National Register Date

E. Statement of Historic Contexts

Discuss each historic context listed in Section B.

INTRODUCTION

The historic context for the prehistoric walled hilltop sites of Prescott National Forest and adjacent Regions will be discussed within the broader framework of the Southwestern ceramic period.

Ceramic Period. In the Southwest, the end of the Archaic and beginning of the ceramic period was signaled by the development of more intensive agriculture, the introduction of ceramics, and the use of the bow and arrow. All three of these important cultural developments seem to have become fairly well established by A.D. 500. The ceramic period in the Prescott area has been dated beginning ca. A.D. 620 (Barnett 1970:85) and continuing to around A.D. 1400 among the Sinagua Culture along the Verde. The transition from Archaic hunting-gathering to Puebloan agricultural sedentism is not precisely understood in the Prescott area, but the mechanism is thought to be the same as in other areas, namely, the development or introduction of genetically improved cultigens, water control techniques, and favorable climatic conditions. These eventually led to a change from simplified horticulture to a lifeway heavily dependent on agriculture for the obtainment of food.

Because agriculture produced greater reliability in subsistence, settlement patterns changed from far-ranging temporary camps of the Archaic, which were the result of a mobile lifeway that exploited a wide range of seasonally available plant and animal resources, to permanent or semi-permanent farming hamlets and villages along drainages with arable land nearby. Agricultural sedentism also led to the storing of crop surpluses and was accompanied by a population increase.

Early ceramic period settlements generally consisted of single or extended family units arranged into hamlets or pithouse villages. Typically, they were dispersed along drainages near tillable land. Water control features utilized in dry-land farming, such as check dams and field terraces, were small in scale, but indicate skill and understanding of water management. Early puebloan social organization was centered around an extended family structure and existed within a framework of a generally dispersed population. This lifeway was not far removed from the preceding band structure of the Archaic period, except for the differences produced by a greater dependence on agriculture and its attendant sedentism. As the archaeological record shows, the early agricultural lifeway did not require complex socio-political organization. Institutions, architecture, and material culture, with few exceptions, became more highly developed in later periods.

The latter portions of the ceramic period saw a change from population dispersal to population aggregation. Multiple families aggregated into groups often exceeding 100 in number. Large masonry pueblos incorporating hundreds of contiguous rooms were constructed. An aggregated population requires more centralized authority to manage increased numbers of people. Complex social institutions and labor organization are needed to undertake large construction and agricultural projects. Irwin-Williams (1984) hypothesizes that during the period of population aggregation, religious societies may have provided the bonding mechanism. That is, the development of complex social institutions, centralized authority, and organized labor, may have been accomplished by lifting religion from its former family-centered position and expanding it into a societal framework. Ritual practices within religious societies may have been a vital element in allowing the harmonious function of large communities.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 2

It is within this time period, the latter portion of the ceramic period--or period of population aggregation, that walled hilltop sites become common in the Southwest. Commonly referred to as forts or fortified sites, they have been roughly dated between A.D. 1000-1400.

CULTURAL AFFILIATION

The four major cultural traditions of the ceramic period in the Southwest are the Anasazi, Mogollon, Hohokam, and Patayan. With respect to cultural affiliations, it seems apparent that walled hilltop sites are little affected by cultural boundaries. They are seemingly cross-cultural. Many cultures, if not the majority, that left significant stone remains during this time period have such sites.

In the Prescott National Forest, archaeologists assign one of the following cultural affiliations to ceramic period sites: 1) Prescott, 2) Sinagua, 3) Cohonina, 4) Hohokam, or 5) Cerbat. According to Euler (1988), the Cerbat are a prehistoric cultural tradition whose descendents are the present-day Hualapai and Havasupai. Cerbat cultural manifestations are not well represented in the Prescott National Forest site files, but have been identified in the western-most reaches of the Forest by the presence of Tizon Brownwares and the absence of stone remains. The scant material culture remains of the mobile Cerbat lifeway do not include masonry architecture, and therefore, no fortified sites. Thus, there are only four known cultures to consider in discussing fortified sites on the Forest. They are: the Prescott Culture, the Sinagua Culture, the Hohokam Culture, and the Cohonina Culture. However, it should be noted that the majority of fortified sites on Prescott National Forest are thought to be Prescott Culture affiliated.

The Prescott Culture Among the four major ceramic period traditions, the Patayan has received the least amount of study. Schroeder (1957) has proposed that it be called Hakataya instead of Patayan. The Prescott Culture has been traditionally considered as part of this tradition. However, the parent culture for the Prescott Branch is under debate. Some feel that it may have derived from the low-desert Hohokam, who colonized up the Agua Fria, Hassayampa, and Verde River drainages during the Pioneer and Colonial Periods, ca. A.D. 700-900 or earlier (Wood 1979:21). Euler (1988) states that archaeological investigations in the area have been too sparse to reliably identify a parent culture for the Prescott Branch, and to definitely affiliate it with the Hohokam or Patayan (Hakataya) is speculative at this time.

The geographic boundaries for the Prescott Culture as established by Gladwin and Gladwin (1930) are: 1) northwest--Hualapai Peak near Kingman, 2) northeast--Oak Creek near Sedona, 3) southeast--New River north of Phoenix, and 4) southwest--the Plomosa Mountains northeast of Quartzite. The city of Prescott is centered in the mountainous eastern portion of this culture area.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 3

The Prescott Culture has been traditionally divided into two phases, the earlier Prescott Phase, ca A.D. 800-1025, followed by the Chino Phase, ca A.D. 1025-1300. However, Prescott Phase activity at Rattle Snake Ruin was cross-dated by intrusive ceramics much earlier, to ca. A.D. 620 (Barnett 1970:85). Contrary to this, Wood (1979:23) believes that the Prescott Phase should have a beginning date of ca. A.D. 1000, because everything before that should rightly be called Hohokam, and that the Chino Phase should begin ca. A.D. 1125. Euler (1988) believes that due to the paucity of archaeological research in the Prescott area, the two phases may have little validity.

From the information available, it appears that demographic and socio-political organization during the Prescott Phase corresponded with the larger general pattern in the Southwest for the early ceramic period, namely, population dispersal. Surface masonry with full-standing walls has not been reported. Recorded settlements consist of small to moderate sized groupings of jacales (pole and clay structures) and pithouses.

During the Chino Phase, ca. A.D. 1025-1300, there was an aggregation of population, again in keeping with a pan-Southwest trend. Surface masonry is common during this period. Multiple families aggregated into groups as large as 50 to 100 people. After A.D. 1150, Prescott Culture people began to inhabit 20- to 30-room pueblos rather than dispersed hamlets (Hohmann et al 1982:44). For reasons yet to be determined, Prescott Culture sites rarely exceed 30 rooms in size. The largest known, the Fitzmaurice Ruin, numbers 51 rooms: the main pueblo contains a block of 27 contiguous rooms while the area immediately surrounding has a scattering of 24 rooms (Barnett 1974). More commonly, however, Prescott Culture pueblos consist of 10-15 rooms. The type of milling stones present at these sites suggests that like other puebloan cultures of the period, the inhabitants relied heavily on dried, stored corn, for subsistence.

Regarding walled hilltop sites, there is general agreement that they proliferate in the Prescott region after A.D. 1100 (Wood 1979:24; Stone 1987:59; Hohmann et al 1982:44). Prescott Culture activities seem to decline around A.D. 1200 and were certainly terminated by A.D. 1300 (Jeter 1977:250). Wood (1987:51) suggests that the Prescott Tradition ceased any independent existence with the abandonment of the Prescott Highlands after A.D. 1300 and may have been absorbed into the continuing population centers of Perry Mesa, Bloody Basin, and the Middle Verde Valley. Jeter (1977:250) states that all Prescott Culture sites which show evidence of population aggregation date to the A.D. 1200's. Thus, based on present information the time range for Prescott Culture walled hilltop sites is the middle to later portions of the Chino Phase, or ca. A.D. 1125-1300. More precisely, forts appear between A.D. 1100-1200 and apparently date no later than A.D. 1300.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 4

Archaeological research in the Prescott area has not been extensive. An important reason has been the absence of 100-room pueblos and the lack of elaborate polychrome ceramics to attract early researchers. Since then, archaeological investigations have been sporadic, small in scale, and often conducted by non-professionals.

The Cohonina Culture The distinctive manifestations of the Cohonina culture are generally restricted to the Coconino Plateau, first appearing there between A.D. 700-750. That culture area is now largely on lands administered by the Kaibab National Forest (south Kaibab). San Francisco Mountain Grayware ceramics are the hallmark of the Cohonina. Three phases, or general time periods based on ceramic cross-dating, are currently being used by Kaibab National Forest archaeologists: the Coconino, A.D. 700-900; the Medicine Valley, A.D. 900-1100; and the Hull, A.D. 1100-1200. However, beginning and end dates for Cohonina occupation cannot be established with any certainty at this time. Most recorded sites occur either in pinyon-juniper woodland or in the transition zone between ponderosa pine forest and pinyon-juniper. Cartledge (1986) notes that in many cases woodland sites cluster on the slopes of prominent mountains. The majority of sites contain evidence of structures, either as masonry outlines or as pithouse depressions, although gathering camps represented by sherd and lithic scatters are present. It is not conclusively known whether habitations were seasonal or more permanent in nature.

Cartledge (1986) suggests that the Cohonina may have been organized as relatively small, generally autonomous local groups, pursuing a subsistence strategy of hunting, gathering, and horticulture. But despite small group autonomy, it appears that as a whole, the Cohonina possessed sufficient uniformity to be differentiated from adjacent groups, namely, the Kayenta Anasazi and the Sinagua. Cohesion between Cohonina groups may have been maintained by exchange networks. It has been recognized that lithic raw materials occurring in the Cohonina area, most notably local obsidians, were widely traded in prehistoric times (Lesko 1988).

Regarding Cohonina walled hilltop sites, Cartledge (1986) believes that the massive-walled structures form a line-of-sight series, suggesting a communication network. Some have external features suggesting large signal-fire hearths. Of the many Cohonina forts recorded three have been excavated: Medicine Fort, Pittsburg Village, and NA5145A (McGregor 1951:86). Dating of forts is uncertain, but according to Ahlstrom (n.d.) they may be early perhaps falling between A.D. 1050-1130 or earlier. Cohonina sites, and possibly forts, are known to intrude only into the northeastern-most reaches of the Prescott National Forest, as far as Hells Canyon (Fig.1). As far as can be determined, no walled hilltop sites of definite Cohonina affiliation have yet been recorded in the Prescott National Forest.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 5

The Cohonina have traditionally been thought to originate from the Patayan tradition but there is little direct evidence for this assertion. The Cohonina may have disappeared from the Coconino Plateau sometime after A.D. 1150-1200. Much like the case previously described for the Prescott Culture, knowledge of the Cohonina is derived almost entirely from surface observation rather than from stratigraphic excavation. As with the Prescott, much of what is presently known is informed speculation.

Sinagua Culture The earliest appearance of the Sinagua cultural tradition is about A.D. 600 when a people with a general Mogollon cultural background entered what is now the Flagstaff area. Site locations are in the ponderosa pine-juniper transition zone and border parks--open expanses with deep alluvium that offer the best farmlands. Settlements consist of 1-10 unit pithouse villages often with large subterranean structures called community rooms. The presence of tradeware pottery indicates that the Sinagua were interacting with the Hohokam and Anasazi at this early time (Pilles 1987b).

Perhaps in response to drier conditions, by about A.D. 900 there is a population shift up-slope to the lower flanks of the San Francisco Peaks. With this, water control features appear suggesting a change in farming practices. It has also been suggested that individual communities formed at this time on the flanks of the Peaks, between major drainages.

A time of flux began with the initial eruption of Sunset Crater in A.D. 1064. The crater had a long history of eruptions between 1064-1200 causing the displacement of numerous small Sinagua villages. In the past, it has been thought that the post-eruptive cinder cover acted as a mulch, trapping moisture and creating thousands of acres of new agricultural lands. This in turn caused a prehistoric "land rush" into the Sinagua area mixing many cultures. However, recent studies of post-1064 site distributions indicate that the cinder cover was not as important as previously assumed (Pilles 1987b). The post-1064 period is one of rapid change and population dynamics throughout the Southwest, not just for the Sinagua. Changes may have been spurred by increased moisture. At this time, there was a population movement to the lower elevation pinyon-juniper woodlands. Both pithouse and pueblo villages become widespread.

The Golden Age of the Sinagua was the Elden Phase, A.D. 1130-1200, named after Elden Pueblo on the outskirts of Flagstaff. Population reaches its maximum density and extent while canyon cliff dwellings become numerous. There is evidence that the Sinagua possessed a complex social and organizational system that included social stratification and a hierarchy of villages (Pilles 1987b). The high-status Magician's Burial from Ridge Ruin dates from this period. The burial contained over 600 exotic funerary offerings and will be mentioned again later in this document.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 6

By 1200 there were drastic population changes including the abandonment of some areas. Forts appear, suggesting a period of stress and friction, although recent explanations seek to include non-defensive interpretations. Dating of Sinagua forts in the upper Verde is uncertain but they seem to be post A.D. 1100 (Pilles 1976:117). By 1300 the old Sinagua heartland was sparsely inhabited and it is during 1300-1400 that the last of the Sinagua can be recognized. After this they emerge as part of the Hopi. Thus, there is a spiritual and material continuum from the ancient Sinagua of the Sunset Crater/San Francisco Peaks region to the modern Hopi (Pilles 1987b).

Hohokam Culture Elaborate systems of irrigation canals and other archaeological remains indicate that the Hohokam possessed a complex and highly developed social organization which was not exceeded among prehistoric cultures north of Mexico. Key reference sources for the Hohokam are Doyel (1987), Doyel and Plog (1980), and Haury (1976). Hohokam colonies are known to have extended from the Phoenix Basin core area northward up several drainages reaching the Prescott area and the Verde Valley prior to A.D. 1000. An extensive Hohokam pithouse village dating to the Santa Cruz Phase, ca. A.D. 700-900, was investigated by Prescott College at the Henderson Site near Dewey, Arizona. The site is on the upper Agua Fria River 22.5 kilometers (14 miles) east of the Prescott city limits. Approximately one third of the site was excavated yielding 44 Hohokam structures (Weed and Ward 1970).

There is no evidence for Hohokam activity in the region after A.D. 1000--during the time when walled hilltop sites appear. If Wood (1988) is correct, after A.D. 1000 the Hohokam had blended into what is now known as the Prescott Culture. Euler (1978:22) has proposed that the Prescott branch was a mountain extension of the Hohokam, based on his observation that Prescott ceramics bear more similarity to Pioneer and Colonial Period Hohokam than to northern Arizona ceramics.

In any event, no fortified sites of definite Hohokam affiliation have been recorded in the Prescott region and the possibility of their presence is seemingly remote. A firmer determination on this question will be aided by data from future investigations.

WALLED HILLTOP SITE INTERPRETATION

Walled hilltop sites have traditionally been interpreted as being defensive in function. The following literature review presents the defensive interpretation as well as some alternate views.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 7

Conflict and Defense--Pueblo Groups With respect to conflict and defense among the prehistoric Pueblo cultures, Willey (1966:211) interprets certain architectural features to support "the explanation of warlike invasions for both the establishment of large towns and their abandonment at the close of the period." As to the causes of conflict during Pueblo III, ca. A.D. 1100-1300, Willey continues: "What archaeologists can be sure of, however, is that late Pueblo III times were troubled ones - as attested by defensive architecture, burned villages, and mutilated and unburied skeletons - and that there were also years of marked drought". Willey (1966:211) hypothesizes that Pueblo warfare during Pueblo III was more likely the result of drought rather than from the appearance of Athapascans.

Wormington argued that defense was an obvious consideration in the minds of the pueblo builders, but although the role which warfare may have played in architectural development cannot be discounted, there were other factors also at work. Wormington recognized that there was "evidence for violence and bloodshed, but not a great deal" (Wormington 1956:79). Outposts at the edge of culture areas, sporadic fighting, raiding, and intervillage "squabbling", are the likely reason for the few sites which are definitely fortified on the Colorado Plateau (McGregor 1965:323).

Plog directs attention to the casual manner in which the term "defensive site" has been used, but identifies Anasazi sites which "can be defined as defensive based on relatively firm criteria" (Plog 1981:121). Plog further indicates:

Representational art can provide clues to the existence of more or less formally defined groups of warriors which must, as described above, at least strongly suggest a substantial concern with defense of territory (Plog 1981:151).

In the Protohistoric period there is ample evidence for Pueblo warfare. When Coronado attacked the defenses of Zuni pueblo in A.D. 1540, the Zunis quickly organized and fielded a large force of armed warriors (Hodge 1937:33). Likewise in A.D. 1700, because the Hopi community of Awatovi returned to Christianity, it and its inhabitants were destroyed by another Hopi group. Bandelier's account of the event makes reference to "butchery" and "slaughter" (Montgomery et al. 1949:21). Mutilation of some of the Awatovi captives has been verified by osteological analysis of remains excavated on Polacca Wash (Olson 1966). In this incident, a mass burial was found of at least 30 individuals of both sexes and all age groups. Analysis of the bones revealed that all had been "intentionally and violently mutilated at the grave site. Skulls, jaws, and long bones were broken with multiple crushing, splintering, and fracturing blows while the bone was still vital" (Turner and Morris 1970:330). The osteologists reported that some of the bones indicated cannibalism.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 8

Cordell (1984:306) agrees that the characterization of Pueblo groups as peaceful is inaccurate and that internecine conflict and warfare may have been prevalent prior to European subjugation.

The Protohistoric instances of warfare are examples of a militia-style military, rather than a standing army. Leadership in such activities came from priests of a religious society--a Warrior Society. The leaders of this society held considerable power and prominence in each village. The archaeological record indicates that a similar situation may have existed among the prehistoric Sinagua, whose descendents are the modern Hopi.

Conflict and Defense--Sinagua The most well known and perhaps the most elaborate prehistoric burial to be excavated in the Southwest is a Sinagua burial, the "Burial of the Magician" from Ridge Ruin, east of Flagstaff, Arizona. Some of the 600 exotic artifacts from the grave were examined by Hopi elders in the 1940's. They concluded that the so-called "Magician" belonged to a Sinagua Warrior Society and, among other things, was a "war leader" (McGregor 1943:296).

Among the Sinagua, Pilles (1987a:9) interprets forts of the Honanki and Tuzigoot Phases, A.D. 1100-1425, as a possible indication of difficult times. Forts are compound-like constructions having perimeter walls with rooms inside or adjacent to the encircling wall (Pilles:1976:117). They are distinguished from plaza-oriented pueblos due to the fact that fort plazas are not delineated by room walls, but by a perimeter (compound) wall. They are also distinguished from true compounds because they are consistently found atop hills or mesa points often with walls conforming to eminences (Pilles 1976:117). Pilles does not favor a defensive interpretation for Sinagua forts for several reasons: 1) no evidence for Sinagua warfare has yet been found and 2) the quantities of tradeware pottery at forts does not suggest a cessation of trade, a cessation which would be expected during hostile times (Pilles 1987a:9). Furthermore, the defensive posture of such sites could be a response to a perceived threat rather than to actual conflict. Rather than being used for warfare, forts may have served as communal storehouses, elite residences, or astronomical observatories (Pilles 1987a:9). Another alternate interpretation Pilles considers is that during this time a sense of community evolved that resulted in the delineation of distinct territorial boundaries. Forts may have served as way stations or guard posts for those entering the territory of another group (Pilles 1987a:9).

Pilles does not discount the defensive concept as a possible function for fortified sites, but points out that every walled ceramic period site situated on a high topographic feature does not necessarily signify conflict or defense. The defensive interpretation should be considered only as one of many possible functional interpretations (Pilles 1988).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number E Page 9

Colton (1946:66) presents a defensive description for a Sinagua site (NA486) located on New Caves Hill (Red Peak) northeast of Flagstaff. According to Colton's account, the site is a fortified hilltop habitation that has a complex of masonry walls forming an "outer line of defense", and an "inner line of defense", for "a kind of bastion" at the apex. The entire "acropolis" is fortified by a 1000 foot long "protective wall" (Colton 1946:66). Euler (1988) has visited the site on numerous occasions and is without reservation in interpreting the architecture as defensive in function. Pilles has not visited the site but from Colton's site map he questions the defensive interpretation (Pilles 1988).

Conflict and Defense--Hohokam The Fortified Hill Site near Gila Bend, Arizona, is perhaps the most extensively excavated hilltop fortification in the Southwest (Greenleaf 1975). Known as the "Fortaleza" it was nominated to the National Register in 1969. Dating to the Hohokam Classic period, it is a 56-room defensive habitation that had a building sequence from A.D. 1200-1275. Greenleaf's conclusions regarding it are similar to those generated by Spoerl's (1984a) observations of defensive sites in the New River area, namely that the late Sedentary to early Classic periods were a time of transition and considerable change throughout the Hohokam region. Conflict may have been one of the contributing variables that substantially altered the Hohokam system at that time. In support of this, DiPeso (1956:507) viewed the Hohokam as a society that engaged in armed conflict and may have introduced a military class system and organized warfare. Likewise, Spoerl (1984a:290) indicates that habitation and storage occurred at some defensive sites in the Hohokam northern periphery and that this circumstance suggests that conflict was not merely an isolated or occasional occurrence, but rather, a common aspect of the times. She speculates that perhaps smaller forts were constructed during the early days of conflict as purely defensive refuges. As conflict became more common, site locations may have been selected that could also be used for habitation and storage as well as for defense. This may explain variations among different forts as the result of changing cultural influences. By around A.D.1300, it appears that defensive sites were no longer constructed in the northern periphery.

Additional work has been done by Wilcox (1979), whose study of the fortifications on Tumamoc Hill was comprised of detailed mapping and surface investigation. Activity at the site was late dating from the Sedentary and Classic period Hohokam. The remains apparently reflect a time of flux or stress and have implications about warfare. Wilcox hypothesizes that such fortifications were by nature not effective against surprise attack and likely did not function against small-scale raiding activities such as were known among the aboriginal people at the time of the Spanish Contact. He suggests that an early-warning system or communication network must also have been part of the pattern. This implies coordination among a series of communities, and therefore, inter-community organization. From this he infers that attacking groups may have been quite large (Wilcox 1979).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 10

Additionally, Holiday (1974:47) has discussed fortified hilltop sites in the Cave Creek drainage north of Phoenix. According to that study, the sites are part of an elaborate interconnected look-out and signaling system. Other sources are cited to confirm the wide occurrence of similar sites in southern Arizona and northwest Mexico. Schroeder (1947:237) is cited as a proponent of the defensive fortress concept but Holiday refutes this hypothesis on three grounds: the sites are without water, are not associated with arable land, and there are no signs of warfare (Holiday 1974:47). Supporting evidence for the necessity of on-site water and nearness to arable land for fortified sites is not presented.

As part of the Central Arizona Ecotone Project (CAEP), two fortified hilltop sites were partially excavated in the Cave Creek area. One was a 70-room fortified habitation, Az. T:4:8, and the other a smaller hilltop retreat, Az. T:4:5. The former was a large multifunctional site similar to the "Fortaleza" but dated earlier, to perhaps A.D. 1050 (Raveslout and Spoerl 1984:100). Smaller Az. T:4:5 fulfilled temporary or specialized functions including storage and possibly defense (Spoerl 1984b:157).

Conflict and Defense--Prescott U.S. Army Lieutenant Amiel W. Whipple was the first to encounter and describe the fortified sites in the Prescott area. In 1854 he led an exploration to locate a railway route from Arkansas to Los Angeles. Along Walnut Creek, he observed

It would seem, therefore, that in ancient times there existed here a large settlement, and that the inhabitants were obligated to defend themselves by strong works against attacks from a powerful enemy (Whipple et al. 1855; Foreman 1941:196).

Some 50 years later, Jesse Walter Fewkes located several of the fortifications described by Whipple (Fewkes 1912). Fewkes' investigation took place in 1906 and 1907 and involved mapping, photography, and description of sufficient detail to still be of value today. Fewkes (1912:218-219) called the Prescott-area forts trincheras, noting their similarity to prehistoric defensive works in southern Arizona and northern Mexico. He observed that they were positioned high to provide a wide view, and believed them to be defensive retreats serving a large pueblo population living below. Regarding the function of communication, he noted:

One rarely loses sight of one of these hill forts before another can be seen. By means of a system of smoke signals news of an approaching foe could be communicated from settlement to settlement from one end of Walnut Valley to the other, giving the farmers in their fields skirting the stream opportunity to retreat to the forts for protection (Fewkes 1912:207).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number F Page 11

In support of Fewkes, Austin (1977) determined that the sites did in fact form an extensive line-of-sight network (Fig 2) in what he referred to as the Mountain Patayan area around Prescott.

A prime example of a defensive fortress on the Prescott National Forest is site AR-03-09-05-39, located in the Verde Ranger District a few kilometers south of Cherry, Arizona. [REDACTED]

The succession of walled compounds provide outer and inner lines of defense for a bastion at the apex. The outer protective wall incorporates a "slit" entry, narrow enough that one must turn sideways to enter. Upon entering, one is immediately impeded further by a short, linear, "baffle" wall. Positioned low in the walls are loop-holes, small openings in the masonry forming windows, the orientation of which does not suggest an astrological function, but rather, that they provided a view down slope over the ground approaching the fort. They seem to be too small to permit the launching of arrows or other missiles. The evidence for a defensive interpretation at this site is four-fold: 1) successive walled compounds providing outer and inner lines of defense for a bastion at the top, 2) a "slit" entry with a baffle wall, 3) loop-holed walls, and 4) a lofty topographic situation providing ease of defense. These lines of evidence, together with the absence of artifacts and presence of only a few small rooms, suggest that the archaeological remains are those of a special-function site rather than a habitation. Thus, there are a number of factors which lend themselves to the interpretation that the site was in fact a defensive refuge or fortress. This conclusion must be qualified slightly by recognizing that such interpretations have so far been based solely on surface observation.

Conflict and Defense--Cohonina Wormington (1956:168) describes Cohonina fortified sites as "large rectangular buildings with thick walls and parapets which were probably loop-holed. The building of such structures would suggest unsettled conditions". On the other hand, Cartledge (1986) observed that none of the "forts" are situated in particularly defensible locations. Although one is generally winded after walking to them, the hills upon which they sit are not especially difficult of access. They are best interpreted as nodes in a communication network involving the use of signal fires rather than as "forts". The term "fort" seems an inappropriate label since it indicates a form of defensive architecture and implies conditions of warfare (Cartledge 1986). Not enough is known about Cohonina "forts" to assign function.

Medicine Fort is strategically located on a travel route and mountain pass north of Flagstaff. Colton (1960:62) interpreted its architecture, granaries, and storage jars, as evidence that it was a defensive refuge used during siege, but further suggests that the structure may also have had a function in regional exchange.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 12

Conflict and Defense--Summary From the preceding discussion, it is obvious that the relationship of conflict, defense, and walled hilltop sites has not been systematically nor comprehensively studied with respect to the ceramic period in the Southwest. There has been disagreement among researchers as to the extent and nature of conflict and also as to the function of walled hilltop sites. There has also been a tendency in the past to casually ascribe the function of defense to walled hilltop sites without adequate consideration of other interpretations. In spite of this fact, the archaeological record contains ample evidence that certain sites "can be defined as defensive on relatively firm criteria" (Plog 1981:21). Furthermore, the first appearance of such sites in the Southwest generally seems to occur at the beginning of the twelfth century. It therefore seems logical to infer that serious conflict may have made its first appearance then, or that there was at least a serious escalation at that time. Current hypotheses regarding the nature of the conflict range from the "perceived threat" concept, all the way to "a military class system with organized warfare".

With respect to walled hilltop sites, function is the issue most in need of data from stratified excavation. The value of the sites is belied by this fact, however, because their importance is in the data potential that they embody.

THEMES--RESEARCH ISSUES

The theme for the walled hilltop sites of Prescott National Forest is contained in the research potential which they offer. Relevant research issues which sites bring to the Multiple Property Group are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Site Function Many walled hilltop sites were habitations, that is, masonry compounds or complexes of walls associated with dwellings, constructed in defensible locations. This type of fortified site was obviously multifunctional: 1) artifact scatters and the presence of rooms indicate that it was a habitation; 2) site location and architecture suggest defense; 3) many such sites were nodes in a communication network; and 4) there may have been importance in regional exchange and socio-political systems as well as other functions typical of pueblid occupations of the period. A prime research issue in the case of multifunctional fortified habitations is to define the hierarchy of functions that they embody and to determine the presence and importance of defense within the hierarchy.

A second broad category of fortified sites are those which lack artifacts and have no evidence for habitation. These generally consist of masonry walls or compounds that are constructed in hilltop or other defensive locations. They are special activity sites and are most often interpreted as defensive refuges. As has been discussed, the defensive interpretation is based on relatively firm

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service****National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**Section number E Page 13

criteria in many cases. In other cases, such special activity sites may not have been defensive, but rather, astronomical observatories, civic-ritual sites, look-outs, way stations, or may have had any number of other functions, or combination of functions, excluding habitation. There has been very little research with respect to special function walled hilltop sites and the tendency in the past has been to call them defensive refuges. Research is needed to provide a more solid basis for the assignment of function.

Architecture The term compound is used here to denote encircling perimeter masonry walls, with or without associated rooms. Compounds are the salient architectural feature of many walled hilltop sites. It is apparent that compound architecture appears in the Southwest at approximately the same time as walled hilltop sites, both being post A.D. 1000-1100. The relationship of the two has not been investigated.

Loop-holed walls, slit-entries, and entry baffle walls, are commonly interpreted as defensive architecture when present at walled hilltop sites. More investigation will confirm or deny the defensive interpretation of these features.

Another architectural concern at walled hilltop sites is simply the walls themselves. Their arrangement often suggests outer and inner lines of defense, seemingly protecting a bastion or citadel. However, some researchers who observe the same walls conclude differently, that they may have served functions other than defense. Such a wide diversity of opinion among professionals should be eliminated through intensive research.

Communication The communication network concept has been proposed by numerous authors (Cartledge 1986; Holiday 1974; Austin 1977; Wilcox 1979) and among the many different functions attributed, it is the least controversial. Perhaps the best evidence for it is at the Cohonina sites where external features suggest signal-fire hearths (Cartledge 1986). Whether the Cohonina signaling networks and those of other cultures were defense-related is a matter for discussion. In this regard, Wilcox (1979) hypothesizes that a defensive retreat is of little value without advance notice alerting people when to use it. In other words, communication networks may have been early warning systems. In this view, the communication function is integrated with the defensive interpretation.

An investigation of communication networks in the Prescott area was conducted by amateur archaeologist Ken Austin (1977). Austin reportedly visited over 100 hilltop forts and smaller look-outs determining that they were linked together into six major and four minor line-of-site chains. Austin's map illustrating these chains has been included in this document after being modified by additional labeling (Fig. 2). Wood (1979:24) suggests that the Prescott communication network may possibly have extended nearly 200 kilometers (125 miles), from the Juniper Mountains south of Seligman, to the Salt River Valley in

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 14

the Phoenix Basin. Austin (1977) speculated that the networks may have been inter-cultural.

A research objective should be to ascertain whether communication was the sole function at certain hilltop sites or whether it was among a hierarchy of site functions. The relationship between communication networks and defense-related early warning systems should also be explored. The contemporaneity of individual sites within networks needs to be supported by more evidence.

F. Associated Property Types

I. Name of Property Type Prehistoric Walled Hilltop Sites

II. Description

See Continuation Sheet F-2

III. Significance

See Continuation Sheet F-3

IV. Registration Requirements

See Continuation Sheet F-3

See continuation sheet

See continuation sheet for additional property types

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 2

II.

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

Site Location Walled hilltop sites are consistently located in easily defensible, lofty, topographic situations on isolated buttes, hilltops, ends of mesas, or similar situations which make access difficult and provide a wide view. Typically, a great amount of energy is required in getting to and from the sites because they are positioned high above the surrounding terrain.

Architecture The sites employ masonry walls and/or masonry compounds, the aspect of which reflect an apparent concern to control and restrict access. For example, on a small mesa or butte having sheer walls on three sides, only one side is walled, the one providing access. Topographic features where a narrow restricted access is naturally present could be fortified without great effort on the part of the builders. In places with less difficult natural access, often labor intensive massive-walled compounds were constructed. Prescott National Forest site AR-03-09-06-145 (NA13549; Austin Survey Hunt Site) has standing walls that are still 4.5 meters (15 feet) high. Aside from the height of its walls, this site is remarkably similar to Fewkes' Fort Below Aztec Pass, one of the initial properties in this nomination.

Site designs are site-specific, being subject to micro-topography, available building materials, builder custom, and site function. Walls commonly make use of bedrock, large boulders, and cliff edges. Masonry generally reflects the nearest available building material with both dry-laid and earthen mortar having been observed.

Site Types Because walled hilltop sites are not precisely understood, a formal typology will not be attempted. For the purposes of this document, sites will be separated into two broad, general, categories based on function: 1) those that exhibit evidence for habitation, and 2) those that do not. The two groups can be distinguished by the presence or absence of dwelling rooms and artifact scatters. Those that exhibit evidence for habitation and have topographic and architectural aspects indicating that they were fortified can be called "fortified habitation sites". Those that do not evidence habitation can be called "special-function sites". The latter can be further broken down into defensive refuges, hilltop observatories, signal-fire communication sites, and so forth, where the archaeological remains and physical setting permit such interpretation. Both types may be multifunctional.

The two types, fortified habitation sites and special-function sites, can be considered as representing variation within a single property type--walled hilltop sites.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 3

III.

SIGNIFICANCE

Prehistoric walled hilltop sites are significant under criterion "D" because they have the potential to yield information important in the prehistory of the Prescott National Forest and adjacent regions with respect to a number of research issues identified in the historic context section. Since significance is based upon an understanding of historic context, reference should be made to that section.

IV.

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

To be eligible for inclusion in the multipleproperty documentation, properties must possess specific characteristics that relate to and are likely to yield information about the research issues as discussed.

Integrity Sites must not be disturbed by natural processes or artificial impacts such that deposits and architecture are no longer intact. The site must offer excellent potential to yield important information with regard to the research issues.

Geographic Area Sites within the boundaries of the Prescott National Forest (Fig. 1) and also those within adjacent regions will be eligible for inclusion in this documentation. Adjacent regions will encompass the Sinagua, Cohonina, Hohokam, and Prescott culture areas on lands of various statuses including the Kaibab, Coconino, and Tonto National Forests.

Eligible Properties Eligible properties should be walled hilltop sites that fit into the general categories presented in this document for a "fortified habitation site" or for a "special function site". Reference should be made to section F, part II, Physical Description, and to section E, Themes--Research Issues, under the heading 'Site Function' for criteria.

G. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.

Previous Research Walled hilltop sites are known in various parts of the American Southwest and Northern Mexico. South of the Gila River drainage they are called trincheras. In the literature they have been referred to variously as forts, walled hilltop sites, fortified hill sites, or simply as defensive sites. Previous research and interpretation of these sites has been presented in the historic context section and will not be reiterated here.

Identification and Evaluation In the Prescott area, a survey of walled hilltop sites has been conducted (Austin 1977). The Austin survey materials are laconic from a professional perspective but Austin sites have received Forest Service and MNA site numbers, have been described, and are accurately plotted on quadrangle maps. Additional sites will be identified by archaeological site-file and literature searches and by field reconnaissance. Eligible properties will receive detailed mapping, recordation, and interpretation of surface archaeological manifestations. No archaeological testing or excavation is planned at this time.

The existing data base for walled hilltop sites is limited. As additional sites are entered into this document expanding the data base, it may be necessary to modify this document by amendment and updating.

See continuation sheet

H. Major Bibliographical References

See Continuation Sheet H-1

See continuation sheet

Primary location of additional documentation:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> State historic preservation office | <input type="checkbox"/> Local government |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other State agency | <input type="checkbox"/> University |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Specify repository: USDA Prescott National Forest Supervisor's Office, Prescott,
Arizona

I. Form Prepared By

name/title	<u>Richard M. Ryan Archaeologist</u>	date	<u>09/30/88</u>
organization	<u>USDA Prescott National Forest</u>	telephone	<u>(602) 445-1762</u>
street & number	<u>344 South Cortez</u>	state	<u>Arizona</u>
city or town	<u>Prescott</u>	zip code	<u>86303</u>

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 1

References Cited

Ahlstrom, Richard V.N.

n.d. Tree Ring Dating the Cohonina. Ms on file, Kaibab National Forest, Service Supervisor's Office, Williams, Arizona.

Austin, Ken

1977 The Mountain Patayan People of West Central Arizona. Ms on file, Prescott National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Prescott, Arizona.

Barnett, Franklin

1974 Excavation of Main Pueblo at Fitzmaurice Ruin: Prescott Culture in Yavapai County, Arizona. Special Publication, Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff.

1970 Matli Ranch Ruins: A Report of Excavation of Five Small Prehistoric Indian Ruins of the Prescott Culture in Arizona. Technical Report No. 10. Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff.

Cartledge, Thomas, R.

1986 Prehistory and History of the Coconino Plateau Region, Northern Arizona: A Cultural Resource Overview. Ms. on file, Kaibab National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Williams, Arizona.

Colton, Harold S.

1960 Black Sand: Prehistory In Northern Arizona. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

1946 The Sinagua, A Summary of the Archaeology of the Region of Flagstaff, Arizona. Museum of Northern Arizona Bulletin 22, Flagstaff.

Cordell, Linda S.

1984 Prehistory of the Southwest. Academic Press, Orlando.

DiPeso, Charles

1956 The Upper Pima of San Cayetano del Tumacacori: An Archaeo-historical Reconstruction of the Ootam of Pimeria Alta. Amerind Foundation No. 7. Dragoon, Arizona.

Doyel, David E.

1987 The Hohokam Village: Site Structure and Organization. David E. Doyle, Editor. American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Doyel, David and Fred Plog

1980 Current Research in Hohokam Prehistory. David E. Doyle and Fred Plog, Editors. Anthropological Research Paper No. 23, Arizona State University, Tempe.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number H Page 2

Euler, Robert C.

1988 Personal communication with the Multiple Property nomination preparer.

1978 Comments in Proceedings of the 1973 Hohokam Conference, Donald E. Weaver, Jr., Susan S. Burton, and Minnabell Laughlin, eds. The Center for Anthropological Studies, Contributions to Anthropological Studies No. 2, Albuquerque.

Fewkes, Jesse Walter

1912 Antiquities of the Upper Verde River and Walnut Creek Valleys, Arizona. Annual Report No. 28, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington D.C.

Foreman, Grant

1941 A Pathfinder In The Southwest. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Gladwin, Winifred, and Harold S. Gladwin

1930 The Western Range of the Red-on-Buff Culture. Medallion Papers No. 5, Gila Pueblo, Globe.

Greenleaf, J. Cameron

1975 The Fortified Hill Site near Gila Bend, Arizona. The Kiva 40:213-282

Hanson, John A., Teri A. Cleeland, Lawrence M. Lesko, Marietta A. Davenport, and Charles Nelson

1988 As Assessment Plan for the Cultural Resources of the Kaibab National Forest, Arizona. Ms. on file, Kaibab National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Williams, Arizona.

Haury, Emil W.

1976 The Hohokam, Desert Farmers and Craftsmen. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Hodge, Frederick Webb

1937 The History of Hawikuh, New Mexico. Frederick Webb Hodge Anniversary Publication Fund and the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, The Southwest Museum, Los Angeles.

Hohmann, William D., Greg L. Bowen, Paul R. Fish, Filipe Jacome, and Anne Hoy

1982 Cultural Resource Management: A Report to the Prescott National Forest for Land Management Planning. Ms on file, Prescott National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Prescott, Arizona.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 3

Holiday, William, G.

- 1974 Archaeological Investigations in the Cave Creek Drainage, Tonto National Forest, Arizona. Archaeological Report No. 1. U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Southwest Region, Albuquerque.

Irwin-Williams, Cynthia

- 1984 Field lecture to the Archaic Oshara Project II, taped by the Multiple Property nomination preparer.

Jeter, Marvin, D.

- 1977 Archaeology in Copper Basin, Yavapai County, Arizona: Model Building for the Prehistory of the Prescott Region. Anthropological Research Papers No. 11. Arizona State University, Tempe.

Lesko, Lawrence M.

- 1988 Sources of Conjecture: A Re-examination of Northern Arizona Obsidians. Ms. on file, Kaibab National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Williams, Arizona.

McGregor, John C.

- 1965 Southwestern Archaeology. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

- 1951 The Cohonina Culture of Northwestern Arizona. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

- 1943 Burial of an Early American Magician. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 86 (2): 270-298.

Montgomery, Ross G., Watson Smith, and John Otis Brew

- 1949 Franciscan Awatovi. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol 36, Harvard University, Cambridge.

Olsen, A.P.

- 1966 A Mass Secondary Burial From Northern Arizona. American Antiquity 31(4):822-826.

Pilles, Peter J.

- 1988 Personnel communication with the Multiple Property nomination preparer.

- 1987a The Sinagua, Ancient People of the Flagstaff Region. In, Wupatki and Walnut Canyon: New Perspectives on History, Prehistory, Rock Art. Exploration, Annual Bulletin of the School of American Research.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number H Page 4

1987b Hisatsinom: The Ancient People of Sunset Crater. In, Earth Fire: A Hopi Legend Of The Sunset Crater Eruption. Ekkehart and Lomatuway'ya, editors, Northland Press, Flagstaff.

1976 Sinagua and Salado Similarities As Seen From The Verde Valley. The Kiva 42(1)113-124.

Plog, Fred

1981 Little Colorado Area, Arizona. Cultural Resources Overview. Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests and the Arizona Bureau of Land Management.

Raveslout, John, C. and Patricia M. Spoerl

1984 A Fortified Hilltop Site, Az.T:4:8. In Prehistoric Cultural Development In Central Arizona: Archaeology Of The Upper New River Region. Spoerl and Gummerman editors. Occasional Paper No. 5, Center For Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Schroeder, Albert

1957 The Hakataya Cultural Tradition. American Antiquity 23:176-178.

1947 Did the Sinagua of the Verde Valley Settle in the Salt River Valley? Southwestern Journal of Anthropology Vol 8, No. 3, pp 230-245.

Stone, Connie L.

1987 People of the Desert, Canyons and River: Prehistory of the Patayan Country in West Central Arizona. Arizona BLM, Cultural Resource Series No. 5.

Spoerl, Patricia, M.

1984a Prehistoric Fortifications in Central Arizona. In, Prehistoric Cultural Development In Central Arizona: Archaeology Of The Upper New River Region. Spoerl and Gummerman, editors. Occasional Paper No.5, Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

1984b A Small Fortified Site, Az. T:4:5. In, Prehistoric Cultural Development In Central Arizona: Archaeology Of The Upper New River Region. Spoerl and Gummerman, editors. Occasional Paper No.5, Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Turner, Christy, G, II, and N.T. Morris

1970 A Massacre at Hopi: American Antiquity 35(3):320-331

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 5

Whipple, Amiel, W., Thomas Eubank and William W. Turner

1855 Report Upon The Indian Tribes. Vol. III, parts i-iv, in Reports of Explorations and Surveys for a Railroad to the Pacific Ocean (11 Vols.) Senate Executive Document No. 78, 33rd Congress, Washington D.C.

Weed, Carol S., and Albert E. Ward

1970 The Henderson Site: Colonial Hohokam in North Central Arizona, A Preliminary Report. The Kiva 36(2):1-12.

Wilcox, David R.

1979 The Tumamoc Hill Survey: An Intensive Study of a Cerro de Trincheras in Tucson, Arizona. The Kiva 45(1,2).

Willey, Gordon R.

1966 An Introduction To American Archaeology: North and Middle America (Vol. 1). Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Wood, Scott, J.

1988 Personal Communication with the Multiple Property nomination preparer.

1987 Checklist of Pottery Types for the Tonto National Forest. Arizona Archaeologist 21.

1979 Chaparral Conversion and Cultural Resources on the Prescott National Forest: An Experimental Study of the Impacts of Surface Mechanical Treatment by Marden Brush Crusher. Cultural Resources Report No. 27, U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Southwest Region, Albuquerque.

Wormington, Marie H.

1956 Prehistoric Indians of the Southwest. Denver Museum of Natural History, Popular Series No. 7.