

BOOK REVIEW



The Orayvi Split: A Hopi Transformation by Peter M. Whiteley. 2 volumes. 1163 pp., 170 figures, 98 tables, 33 plates, Abstract, Acknowledgments, References. American Museum of Natural History, 2008. \$100.00 (Paper). ISSN 0065-9452.

Reviewed by Kurt E. Dongoske, Zuni Heritage and Historic Preservation Office, Zuni



The 1906 dramatic split between the Hostile and Friendly factions at the village of Orayvi had a destructive effect on the politico-religious structure of Third Mesa Hopi society. As a result, the traditional Hopi politico-religious structure was never fully reconstituted even with the subsequent founding of two new villages, Hotvela and Paaqavi. Today, in the Hopi traditional sense, there is no true *Kikmongwi* ("peace chief") on Third Mesa, nor is there an operational *Qale-taqmongwi* ("war chief") or *Wimmomngwit* ("ritual chief"). The Orayvi split has been of particular anthropological interest because it has been perceived as an exemplar of fission in small-scale, kin-based human societies. Over the years, many researchers have attempted to explain Hopi social structure and the antecedent causes of the Orayvi split. Most notable among these researchers are Robert Lowie, Elsie Clews Parsons, H. R. Voth, Leslie White, Fred Eggan, Mischa Titiev, and Jerrold Levy.

Add to this distinctive list Peter Whiteley. Whiteley is, however, unique among these scholars in that he has spent over twenty years researching the Hopi sociocultural context of the Orayvi split. Whiteley's relationship with the Hopi includes many years of ethnographic field research during which time he also collaborated with the Hopi tribe in compiling evidential data to be employed by the Hopi in their former land disputes with the Navajo. *The Orayvi Split: A Hopi Transformation* is the cumulative product of Whiteley's field and archival research that initially began in 1980 as part of his doctoral dissertation. Whiteley believed that a more thorough analysis and use of the documentary record to reconstruct the Orayvi split was needed, but he previously lacked the resources to undertake such research until he received institutional support from the American Museum of Natural History. The current study presented in *The Orayvi Split*:

A Hopi Transformation formally began in early 2001 and focuses on the actualization and transformation of Orayvi social structure in the process of this dramatic social event. In this study, Whiteley contends that past ethnological hypotheses for explaining the split have been of limited usefulness because of their "intrinsic lack of falsifiability" (p. 8). For Whiteley, the Orayvi split presents an opportunity to understand the agents of change in a sociocultural system through testing a variety of hypotheses against a range of knowable social, cultural, and material data.

The Orayvi Split: A Hopi Transformation is presented in two volumes. Part I: *Structure and History* evaluates in detail Orayvi's social forms, material contexts, and demographic structure. Part II: *The Documentary Record* is an appendix that presents the documentary records concerning events before, during, and after the split. The majority of these documentary records are historical correspondence written by federal agents, missionaries, and other non-Hopis.

Part I: *Structure and History* is comprised of 16 chapters. Chapter 1 notes that the purpose of the study is to "present and interpret a detailed social record of that event that has long lain obscure to those interested in Hopi history" (p. 1). A brief description of Hopi life within the context of the village of Orayvi in 1900 is also presented in Chapter 1, as well as a brief description of the split, the Orayvi split's significance to anthropology, and the rationale for the present study. Chapter 2 addresses the general parameters of Orayvi social life. Chapter 3 evaluates Orayvi's social forms, critically evaluates traditional anthropological notions of Hopi kinship structures and the lineage model, and argues for the utility of an alternative "house" model that moves beyond the commonly accepted model of matrilineal descent groups. Chapter 4 examines the material contexts of the Orayvi split including economic and ecological issues, patterns of production, climatic and soil conditions, population size, and emerging social and environmental limitations in the late nineteenth century. Also presented in this chapter is detailed information on two major surveys of the Oraibi Valley that were conducted in 1891 and 1908–1910 both for allotment of the Hopi Reservation in accordance with the Dawes Severalty Act of 1887. These surveys are useful because they present information on accessibility to farmable lands by the two different factions and provide insight on the condition and degree of entrenchment of the Oraibi Wash. Chapter 5 assesses Orayvi's actual houses by kin group in 1906, based on a comparison between Alexander Stephen's house-clan census of 1888, and Titiev's household census of 1933–34. Chapters 6–15 present the demographic and social data by individual persons, their social positions, and their ties of kinship, affinity, and association in Orayvi prior to the split, and among the subsequent fragmented parts of Orayvi's population, especially at Hotvela, Paaqavi, and Mũnqapi. Most of these chapters have little narrative and are principally comprised of tables and charts of data derived from several records, with some introductory explanation and contextualization. Chapter 6 focuses on

Leslie White's 1932 Orayvi genealogies, and Chapter 7 presents Titiev's 1933–34 household census which is the most extensive, and the substantive core for Whiteley's analysis of extant social groups. Chapter 8 presents Titiev's master list alphabetically by names, with all individuals cross-referenced to the government censuses of 1891–1912 presented in subsequent chapters. Chapters 9–13 present government records of population and of leading individuals for both emerging factions, from 1891 to 1912. Chapters 14–15 present a critical examination of previous population estimates generated by White, Titiev, and most recently Levy, and demonstrate their flaws in reconstructing population totals and the concurrent social characteristics of the factions at Orayvi. Systematically correlating multiple census sources, Whiteley then provides a detailed reconstruction of the exact population of Orayvi in 1906 and demonstrates that the primary social units to relocate from or remain in Orayvi were houses and households, rather than matrilineal descent groups (Chapter 16).

The Orayvi Split: A Hopi Transformation is an impressive scholarly work. Whiteley exhaustively examines the documentary record of the split and presents us with a meaningful understanding of the Orayvi split and its multifaceted causative agents. The book is packed with tables of data and historical photographs that significantly add to its value. This publication is an essential addition to the library of any student of Hopi history and culture.