

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to the Social Science Research Council and the Fulbright Islamic Civilization Research Program for supporting the ethnographic fieldwork of the senior author in 'Amran in 1978-79 and 1986-87. We would also like to thank C.S. Churcher, Achilles Gautier, Glenn Hausfater and Eitan Tchernov for their help with the details of hyrax taxonomy. Tinker Dunbar arranged the extensive inter-library loans required for this research. Dona Straley assisted with the development of the etymological data. We are indebted to Paula Wapnish for her critical comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. Nancy Carney Barnhart prepared the illustrations.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup>This involves a comparison of two subspecies, captive *P.c. syriacus* with Burton's hyrax [now *P.c. ruficeps* (Bothma 1971)].
- <sup>2</sup>Despite widespread sitings in Arabia, the Levant, and the Sinai, hyraxes are rare in Holocene archaeological samples (e.g. Noy *et al.*, 1980). However, ancient records contain the Biblical citations [Leviticus 11:5, Deuteronomy 14:7] that include it among species forbidden to the Israelites.
- <sup>3</sup>Psalms 104:18, and Proverbs 30:24, 26 describe the hyrax's habitat as rocky (Meyer 1978: 286). A pre-Islamic poet of the Hadramaut, Muhariq b. Shihab b. Qais al-Tamimi, mocks people who live in the hyrax's habitat while praising those fortunate to live where ibex are common (Serjeant 1976:17), a habitat contrast also struck in Psalms 104.
- <sup>4</sup>In Africa, since the Pleistocene (Brian 1981), the hyrax has been hunted. In modern East Africa the species is a minor meat resource (Dyson-Hudson and Dyson-Hudson 1970:117).
- <sup>5</sup>No rabbit raisers were observed in 1986-87.

## LITERATURE CITED

- BOKONYI, S. 1989. Definitions of animal domestication. Pp 22-27 in *The walking larder. Patterns of domestication, pastoralism, and predation*. Clutton-Brock, J. (ed). Unwin Hyman, London.
- BOTHMA, J. DU P. 1971. Order Hyracoidea. Pp 1-8, Part 12 in *The mammals of Africa: an identification manual*. Meester, J. and H.W. Setzer (eds). Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- BRAIN, C.K. 1981. *The hunters or the hunted?: an introduction to African cave taphonomy*. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago.
- BURY, G. WYMAN. 1915. *Arabia infelix or the Turks in Yemen*. MacMillan and Co., London.
- CLUTTON-BROCK, JULIET, ed. 1989. *The walking larder. Patterns of domestication, pastoralism, and predation*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- DORST, JEAN & PIERRE DANDELLOT. 1970. *A field guide to the larger mammals of Africa*. Collins, London.
- DOUGHTY, CHARLES M. 1936. *Travels in Arabian deserts*. Random House, New York.
- DUCOS, P. 1989. Defining domestication: a clarification. Pp 28-30 in *The walking larder. Patterns of domestication, pastoralism, and predation*. Clutton-Brock, J. (ed). Unwin Hyman, London.
- DYSON-HUDSON, RADA & NEVILLE DYSON-HUDSON. 1970. *The food*

Kelley summarizes the essential issues in Chapter 2, "Navajo Family Land Use and the Political Economy of the United States." Mercantile capitalism during the railroad era (1880–1930) altered a self-sufficient family economy as Navajos became dependent on goods from trading posts. Home industries (weaving, jewelry) and animal husbandry intensified, family sizes grew, and marginal lands became critical to expanding local production.

Federal grazing regulations defined the second era (1930–1950). Federal policies restricted herd sizes, and after World War II welfare and wage labor opportunities expanded. Navajo family sizes continued to increase.

During the third era (1950–present) industrial economic forces predominated. Cheap, mass-produced goods replaced domestic production. Jobs at strip mines and nearby towns provided wages to family members. Family land uses reflected these changes as new communities expanded along transportation routes.

Kelley argues that two themes underlie the changes in Navajo family land use from 1880 to the present. First, a case is made for the conquest and oppression of the Navajo nation by United States mercantile and industrial capitalism. A second case is made for the effect of Navajo "atomistic decision making." Chapters 4 through 18 systematically present evidence for family economy and environmental change, family demography and land tenure, spatial aspects of land use, and technology. Each of these topics is discussed in a separate chapter for each period: 1880–1930, 1930–1950, and 1950–present.

The author collected historical and ethnographic data during a year of fieldwork while living with a local family. Eighty-seven people were interviewed on archaeological sites or at their homes. Archaeological data were collected by separate archaeology crews. Documents and a field census in 1978 are used to reconstruct livelihood, environment, and demographic characteristics. Interviews and archaeological data document land tenure, spatial patterns, and technology.

One of the strengths of this study is the integration of different kinds of evidence. Documentary evidence gives a clear record of the succession of federal regulations and activities by mining interests; oral testimony and archaeological data measure changes in Navajo site locations, diet, and technology. However, the fit is not always perfect. For example, many archaeological sites during the post-1950 period were not studied because they were still occupied.

Kelley believes that the different forms of evidence are effectively combined because they intertwine the same families. On the other hand, a different point of view is possible: the different forms of evidence may be treated as separate avenues, if not independent variables, for exploring the land uses of particular Navajo families. It would be interesting if Kelley would follow this study with another which explores the land use strategies of individual families from 1880 to the present. It also would be interesting to see a treatment of the evidence which evaluates and tests the relationships among variables.

The use of archaeological evidence in this study is particularly noteworthy. The author combines a very complete material cultural record of a 20-square-mile area with oral testimony, family histories, and documents. This type of archaeological evidence, when collected, is usually filed as a technical contract report. These studies are rarely unearthed. *Navajo Land Use* has exhumed an important record.

It is important to emphasize that only one chapter, of three pages, is devoted to an ethnoarchaeological perspective. The references tell the story. Here is a work that uniquely focuses on the Navajo people. Specifically, it draws on evidence for a few dozen families which underwent change from 1880 to the present. For the reader who enjoys focusing on details and can generalize to other cases, this is an exemplary ethnoarchaeological study.

E. Pierre Morenon  
Department of Anthropology and Geography  
Rhode Island College  
Providence, RI 02908