



CHAPTER 2

STUDYING HOPI SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND THE ORAYVI SPLIT

The means to establishing what a social structure consists in empirically, and to what extent ideal-typical social structures may be read from observed and interpreted behavior and concepts—how the social grammar is inferred from strings of behavioral utterances—has been a site of extensive theoretical contestation in anthropology. Whether a model be concrete or abstract, operational or statistical, best elucidated by conceptual underpinning in deep mental structures, hard-wired in somatic loci, or read from observed patterns in the transformation of nature by modes of production, are all important questions in argument. Emphasis on kinship systems as the principal structural framework for nonindustrial, nonstate systems became an article of faith in the latter 19th century (e.g., Maine, 1864; MacLennan, 1865; L.H. Morgan, 1870) and remained so until a tide of criticism in the late 20th (e.g., Needham, 1974; Schneider, 1984). In recent years, this core theme of the anthropological discipline has received reawakened interest (e.g., Faubion, 1996; Godelier, Trautmann, and Tjon, 1998; *L'Homme*, 2000).

However else it may be conceptualized, a social structure is fundamentally an ordered arrangement of persons, who construct, produce, and reproduce their lives in conformity with some guiding cultural principles. At Orayvi, a major principle of social organization is matrilineal kinship, in association with matrilocal and uxorilocal residence, producing households that include inmarried affines (see chap. 3 on houses). Households repre-

sent elementary forms in the organization of material production and social and biological reproduction. Expanding and transecting matrilineal and conjugal-residential units, ritual sodalities and kiva groups, especially for males, provide another key social-structural axis. Yet production and reproduction are integral with the well-developed calendar of public and private ritual practices, which are imagined as having direct instrumental effects on economic and meteorological conditions, and on community spiritual and sociopsychological well-being. In short, the cycle of material production is embedded in a social “imaginary” (in Godelier’s [1999] usage of this term) that encompasses exchanges with a vividly represented and informing supernatural world, implicating a total scheme of beliefs and practices that locate metaphysical causes of manifest conditions in human intentionality. Extracting “economic production” from that total scheme and treating it separately, while a commonplace of western social theory, is to distort the reality of local life-forms. This is partly why reductive analyses of the Orayvi split only in material terms are explanatorily inadequate to the structural and historical reality. While adhering to a separation of the material from the ideational for ease of description below, the artificiality of this distinction should be borne in mind.

ORAYVI SOCIETY IN OUTLINE

(I) ECONOMY

Hopi economy in the late 19th century was a mixture of agriculture, foraging, pastoral-

ism, trade (with a wide network of indigenous peoples as well as Euro-Americans), and a very little wage work (chap. 4 addresses Hopi economy in greater detail). The division of labor was primarily framed by gender and kinship. Men did most farming and harvesting of crops, hunted, gathered, herded livestock, and engaged in external trade. Women gardened and gathered, traded internally, and had principal responsibility for processing and distributing produce the men brought in from the fields. Hopi women manage household production and distribution of goods and crops from their households, which are also owned by the women. But I have contested an anthropologically received view of Hopi women as field owners (Whiteley, 1985); on this count, an observer of the early 1890's, noted, "The men are the land holders of the mesas; the women are the house owners in the towns on the mesas" (Scott, 1893: 48). In turn, especially in the past, kivas, underground chambers, were male centers of artisanal labor (including weaving) and ritual activity.

Group labor in economic activities is organized according to structuring principles. So, families own or have usufruct rights in the fields, and households or larger kin groups arrange planting, hoeing, weeding, harvesting of the produce from their fields, etc. Similarly, households own clustered rooms in the villages, and construction labor, both female and male, is often organized along clan and household lines. Pastoralism tends to operate by patrilaterally, or even patrilineally, structured groups. Hunting or gathering parties may be organized by clans, conjugal households, or kiva groups (in the case of rabbit hunts). Gardening and tending orchards tend to be by individuals or small family groups.

(II) KIN AND CLAN

Groups of maternal relatives are arranged into named exogamous groups anthropologists have mostly termed *clans*, and these are further arrayed into larger clusters—dubbed *phratries*, especially since Titiev's (1944) and Eggan's (1950) works—that are also exogamous. (In the present work, when not discussing the larger clusters directly in terms

of the Titiev-Eggan model [i.e., as phratries] followed by most authors subsequently, I use the term *maximal sets* or *clan sets*.) In 1906, Orayvi comprised nine maximal matrilineal sets, with varying counts, from 21–65, of named groups ("clans") within them (Titiev, 1944: 51–52). Typically, clan totems refer to natural species (Bear, Spider) and elements (Sun); a few are named after cultural products (Bow), and some after religious ideas, like Katsina (a spirit), and Maasaw (a deity). Eliminating more than half the clan names elicited, Titiev identified 30 clans in the 1906 population (Titiev, 1944: 52, Chart VI; see table 2.1). His list included 31 clanhouses and 32 named clans, but he discounted Gray Hawk and Agave (Kwan) as lacking living representatives, and included a Cedar clan, although it evidently lacked a clanhouse. Each of the 30 clans is shown with varying numbers of households, as recorded by Titiev in 1933–1934 and Stephen in 1888, respectively. Notwithstanding Titiev's conclusions, the exact number of clans is difficult to determine (indeed his own "Final List of Third Mesa Clans and Phratries" [Titiev, 1944: 53] on the page following his Chart VI is discrepant in that it records only 29 clans, with Parrot and Crow a single clan, though they appear on the chart as separate clans, with separate houses, households, and living representatives). The number of clans depends partly on definition of clans and lineages (internal subdivisions within clans)—an issue I address further in chapter 3.

Mythologically, each clan was received into the Hopi community following migrations it had undertaken after emergence onto this fourth layer of the world (or, transposing that notion from space to time, from prior stages into a present epoch). In the final passage, each clan followed a route from its most recent village toward the Hopi mesas. Those routes and those particular villages, together with their total assemblages of natural resources, remain vital to the clan's identity and its continuing role within the Hopi community (see chap. 4; and cf. Bernardini, 2005). The first clan to arrive was *Honngyam*, the Bear clan. When other clans appeared, they approached the Bear clan chief, or Kikmongwi ("chief of the houses," village chief), to request admission (this tradi-

TABLE 2.1
Mischa Titiev's Representation of Orayvi Phratries, Clan Houses, and Clans
 (modified from Titiev, 1944: 52, Chart VI)¹

Phratry	Clan houses	Hopi name (std.)	Titiev census	Stephen census	Households	
					MT	AS
I	Rabbit	Tapngyam	Rabbit	Rabbit	13	12
	Katcina	Katsinngyam	Katcina	Katcina	2	1
	Parrot	Kyarngyam	Parrot	Parrot	5	10
	Crow	Angwusngyam	Crow		1	0
II	Bear	Honngyam	Bear	Bear	5	5
	Spider	Kookyangngyam	Spider	Spider	3	2
III	Sand	Tuwangyam	Sand	Sand	9	8
	Lizard	Kuukutsngyam	Lizard	Lizard	4	14
	Snake	Tsu'ngyam	Snake	Snake	2	1
IV	Sun	Tawangyam	Sun	Sun	9	8
	Gray Hawk	Masikwaynngyam				
	Eagle	Kwaangyam	Eagle	Eagle	6	6
V	Greasewood	Tepngyam	Greasewood		14	0
	Reed	Paaqapngyam	Reed	Reed	7	24
	Bow	Awatngyam	Bow	Bow	4	4
VI	Masau'u	Masngyam	Masau'u		7	0
	Real Coyote	Isngyam	Real Coyote	Coyote	10	16
	Water Coyote	Paa'isngyam	Water Coyote		10	0
	Kokop	Kookopngyam	Kokop		3	0
	Millet	Leengyam	Le		1	0
	Agave	Kwanngyam		Kwan	0	1
VII		Hoongyam	Cedar	Burrowing Owl	0	9
	Gray Badger	Masihonangyam	Gray Badger		3	
	Navaho Badger	Tasaphonangyam	Navaho Badger		3	
	Butterfly	Poliingyam	Butterfly		1	0
				Moth	0	1
VIII	Young Corn	Piikyasngyam	Pikyas	Pikyas	7	9
	Water-House	Patkingyam	Patki		7	0
	Rabbitbrush	Siva'pnyam	Siva'ap		1	0
IX	Chicken Hawk	Kyelngyam	Chicken Hawk	Chicken Hawk	2	1
	Crane	Atokngyam	Crane	Crane	1	1
	Squash	Patngyam	Squash	Squash	2	1

¹ Table modified from Mischa Titiev, *Old Oraibi: a Study of the Hopi Indians of Third Mesa*, Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 22, no. 1, p. 52, Chart VI. Copyright 1944 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

tion largely pertains just to the principal villages of the three Mesas: Wälpi, Songöopavi, and Orayvi). The Kikmongwi challenged them to demonstrate their worth, especially in the form of ritual power/knowledge:

One of the first clans to arrive with those mentioned was the Bow clan, which came from the south-west. When the village chief asked the leader of this clan what he brought with him to produce rain, he said, "Yes, I have here the Sháalako Katcinas, the Tangik Katcinas, the Túkwunang Katcina and the Sháwiki Katcina. When they dance it usually rains." "Very well," the village chief said, "you try it." So the

Áoat-wungwa [Aawatwungwa, Bow clan member/representative] arranged a dance. On the day before the dance it rained a little, and on the last day when they had their dance it rained fearfully. All the washes were full of water. So the village chief invited them to move to the village and gave them a large tract of land. He told them that they should have their ceremonies first (Voth, 1905a: 24).

This is the ideal-typical pattern that limns clan identities, rights, and statuses, although there was extensive variance in 19th century Orayvi, as I will go on to show in the following chapters.

Within the “clan,” there may be subdivisions, particularly after a certain population size is reached. Again, since the work of Tietiev and Eggan, the accepted term for these has been *lineages*, specifically meaning “unilineal descent groups” in the accepted anthropological sense as corporate jural groups with joint estates, rather than any looser associations of kindred. Within a lineage, too, there may be subdivisions, into “households”—a term that is inconsistently used to refer to either matrilineal or cognatic units (see chap. 3). In either case, the household is the primary node of economic organization. Some houses, and their associated household kin groups are more marked as clan centers than others: the *-wungwki*, clan-house, is presided over by the clan mother; her brothers or uncles are often principals in ritual activities belonging to the clan, and associated ritual paraphernalia is kept in the house. Accordingly, those clan members most associated with this house may be characterized as the *pas-* (“real,” or, in this context, “most important”) members of the clan.

(III) CLANS, CEREMONIES, AND RELIGIOUS SODALITIES

Mythological history and its re-enactment in ceremony or reiteration in narrative and song are diagnostic features of clan identity in Hopi thought. For example, the Snake clan traveled from Tokdonavi (Navajo Mountain), whence it introduced the Snake ceremony to the Hopi community; the Badger clan introduced Powamuy from its former home at Kiisiwu (northeastern Black Mesa), and, in the example above, the Bow clan brought Sa'lako from its villages in the southwest. Upon acceptance by the Kikmongwi (and many, it is said, were rejected and told to go on their way), and as a condition of admission, a clan agreed to initiate others into its ceremony. Ceremonies are thus performed by religious societies (sodalities) of initiates from numerous clans, although in many cases the chief priests are still from the proprietary clan. Sixteen Hopi religious sodalities were active at Orayvi in 1900 (see table 2.2). The annual cycle of ritual works is explicitly aimed at ensuring or enhancing the produc-

tive viability of ecological and economic resources.

Beginning the ritual year, *Wuwtsim*, “Manhood,” ceremonies initiate postadolescent boys (aged ca. 15–20) into adult male status during a complex set of ritual activities in the late Fall. *Wuwtsim* comprises four sodalities: *Wuwtsimt*, the *Wuwtsim* society proper (of which there were four subdivisions in different kivas); *Taatawkyam*, the “Singers society”; *Aa'alt*, the “Two-Horn society”; and *Kwaakwant*, the “Agave,” or “One-Horn,” society. Each society holds specialized roles, with *Kwaakwant* the most independent. *Kwaakwant* and *Aa'alt* had some policing functions in Orayvi, especially during active ceremonial periods. Of the two, *Aa'alt* was more benign, and would only punish infractions of *Wuwtsim* law mildly; *Aa'alt* is the “philosophical society”, in the words of one Hopi consultant. The *Kwaakwant* served as disciplinary guards, with the authority to kill anyone they caught violating a curfew during *Wuwtsim* initiations, on the night the souls of ancestral initiates return to dance in the village. In Orayvi, the *Wuwtsim* societies were “the Hopis’ government”, in the words of another older consultant. In addition to the Kikmongwi (the “Peace Chief”, in Cushing’s [n.d.] translation), other important politico-ritual officers included the Qal-etaqmongwi (“War Chief”); L.A. White (n.d.b: 77) characterized him as “War Priest—he disciplines Kikmongwi”. The Tsa'kmongwi (“Crier Chief”) was the announcer of ceremonies and other important news. Additionally, the *Wimmomngwit* (sodality chiefs in general) provided an upper echelon of the politico-ritual hierarchy. Authority was articulated especially via the medium of the sodalities, and among these the *Wuwtsim* societies were particularly significant. The clans controlling *Wuwtsim* were especially important, with Bow and Sparrowhawk holding preeminent roles; Sparrowhawk controlled the *Wuwtsim* society, Parrot the Singers, Bow the Two-Horns, and Maa-saw the One-Horns. (The *Wuwtsim* societies nowadays continue to induct initiates only at Songdopavi on Second Mesa, where the clan-sodality relationships differ, though vestiges of the sodalities persist at the other mesas also.)

TABLE 2.2
The Basic Pattern of Orayvi Ceremonies (Sources: Frigout, 1979; Stephen, 1936; Titiev, 1944; Voth, 1903a, 1903b, 1912a; Whiteley, 1980–2006)

Ceremony	Translation/ Significance	Sodality	Translation/ Significance	Owning clan	Kiva	Lunar month
Wuwtsim	“Manhood”	Wuwtsimt	Wuwtsim society (proper)	Sparrow-hawk	Hawiwi Sakwalenwi (>Tawa’ovi) Tsu’ Hano	Kyel’muya (Fledgling/Initiate, mid Oct–Nov)
Soyalangw	Winter solstice ceremony	Sosyalt	Winter Solstice society	Bear	Sakwalenwi (>Tawa’ovi)	Kyaamuya (Awe, Nov–Dec)
Mosayru	Buffalo/other Social Dance	None		None		Paamuya (Water, Dec–Jan)
Katsina	Katsina night dances	None		None	Multiple	Paamuya (Water, Dec–Jan)
Powamuy	Purification/Katsina initiation	Popwamuyt Katsinwimikyam	Powamu society Katsina society	Badger Katsina	Hotsitsivi Maraw	Powamuya (Purification, Jan–Feb)
Katsina	Katsina night dances	Katsina/Powamuy		Badger/Katsina	Multiple	Ösömuya (Wind-whistling, Feb–Mar)
Katsina	Katsina Plaza dances	Katsina/Powamuy		Badger/Katsina	Varies w. sponsor	Kwiyamuya (Windbreaks, Mar–Apr)
Katsina	Katsina plaza dances	Katsina/Powamuy		Badger/Katsina	Varies w. sponsor	Hakitonmuya (Waiting, Apr–May intercalary)
Katsina	Katsina plaza dances with	Katsina/Powamuy		Badger/Katsina	Varies w. sponsor	Tala:kyelmuya (Summer fledgling, May–Jun)
Tsukulalwa	Ritual clowning	Tsutskut	Ritual Clowns	Eagle	Hano/varies	(May–Jun)
Niman	Katsina home-going dance	Katsina/Powamuy	Katsina	Katsina/Badger	Rotates	Tala:kyamuya (Summer awe, Jun–Jul)
Tsu’	Rattlesnake	Tsuutsu’t	Snake society	Snake	Tsu’	Tala’powamuya (Summer purification, Aug–Sep [even years])
Tsöp	Antelope	Tsöösöpt	Antelope society	Spider	Naasavi	Tala’powamuya (Summer purification, Aug–Sep [odd years])
Leenangw	Flute	Sakwalelent	Blue Flute society	Spider	Sakwalenwi	Tala’powamuya (Summer purification, Aug–Sep [odd years])
Poli	Butterfly/other Social Dance	Masilelent	Gray Flute society	Patki	Hawiwi	Tuho’osmuya (Fall, Sep–Oct)
Maraw	Women’s society ceremony	Mamrawt		None	Varies w. sponsor	(Sep odd years:Voth 1912a)
Mots	Warriors’ ceremony	Mömtsit	Warriors society	Lizard	Maraw	Tuho’osmuya (Fall, Sep–Oct)
Owaqölow	“Basket Dance”	O’waqölt	Women’s society	Sand	Wiklavi	early Kyel’muya (Fledgling, Oct/Nov [odd yrs])
Lakon	“Basket Dance”	Lalkont	Women’s society	Parrot	Hawiwi	early Kyel’muya (Fledgling, Oct/Nov [even yrs])

The next major ceremony is *Soyalangw* at the winter solstice, a master ceremony involving the leaders of several sodalities and presided over by the *kiikyam*, the Kikmongwi's matrifamily. *Soyalangw* plans out and determines the ensuing seasons, and brings back the sun from the furthest point on its southern arc. Centered in the *mong.kiva* ("chief kiva") this Bear clan ritual was the principal legitimating ceremony of the *kikmomngwit*, the village chief and his close relations, in their capacity as the "fathers" and "mothers," the "peace chiefs", of the Orayvi people. A split in this ceremony in the 1890's was especially significant. At that point the *mong.kiva* was Sakwalenvi, and its *kivamongwi* ("kiva chief") was Lomahongiwma of the Spider clan. Owing to the severity of factional disagreement, Loololma and his older brother Sakwhongiwma, the *Soyalmongwi* ("*Soyalangw* chief"), relocated their ceremony to Pongovi kiva, by the Bear clanhouse, while Lomahongiwma led a "Hostile" *Soyalangw* from Sakwalenvi (Dorsey and Voth, 1901). The chief kiva was then doubled, with the Friendlies treating Pongovi as the proper site.

In late December and January come Social Dances, typically *Mosayru* (Buffalo). The next major ceremony, *Powamuy* (Purification), occurs in January-February. *Powamuy* purifies the earth for planting, and predicates the success of the agricultural cycle by mimetic forcing of bean sprouts in the kivas (hence its English designation, "Bean Dance"). Two sodalities, *Powamuy* (controlled by the Badger clan), and *Katsina* (controlled by the Katsina clan), perform initiations of all children, aged approximately 8-10. *Patsavu*, a special ceremony to close *Powamuy*, occurred after *Wuwtsim* initiations had been conducted the previous fall, involving many different types of Katsinas who retrace the Badger clan's route of arrival into Orayvi. Even before *Powamuy* (Purification month), in Paamuya (Water month, December-January), there might be a Katsina night dance in the kivas. From this time on until *Niman* ("homegoing," referred to in English as the Home Dance) in July, members of the *Powamuy* and *Katsina* societies perform a series of Katsina ceremonies, first in kiva night dances, and then as the weather gets

warmer, in the plaza during the day. Katsina spirits are multiplex, but include representations of species and forces in the natural world, and in general are ancestral spirits who may achieve manifest form as clouds and rain, as well as in the masked ritual figures personated by initiated men. In general, Katsina rituals seek to produce rain to help nurture the growing crops. Especially toward midsummer, a Katsina dance frequently includes *Tsutskut* (unmasked ritual clowns) who perform a two-day ceremony in ragged, licentious counterpoint to the orderly, dignified Katsinas. At Orayvi in 1900, the *Tsutskut* was still a formal sodality of initiated members, but only a few remained; the ceremony, owned by the Eagle clan, was shifting to its present form, with clowns chosen for a particular performance, but not requiring formal initiation. *Powamuy* and *Niman* are the most important Katsina ceremonies. *Niman* is a first-fruits ceremony, with the Katsinas distributing early corn, and other crops, like watermelons. *Niman* closes the Katsina season, and the spirits, having dwelt around the village for the previous seven months, fly off to their homes in the high and moist, especially mountainous, areas around Hopituskwa ("Hopi country"). *Niman* was another nexus of factional conflict at Orayvi, with two separate performances occurring in 1906, one of which saw the Second Mesa Bluebird clan leader, Tawahongniwa (recently invited into Orayvi by the Hostiles), taking a leadership role, to the chagrin of the legitimate Kikmongwi, Tawakwaptiwa.

After *Niman*, the next major ceremony at Orayvi, in even years, was *Tsu'*, the Snake ceremony, and in odd years, *Leenangw*, the Flute ceremony. The Snake ceremony was performed by two sodalities, and indeed there are two ceremonies on successive days, named after each in turn: *Tsöp-* (Antelope) and *Tsu'-* (Rattlesnake), the former controlled by the Spider clan, the latter by the Snake clan. Their principal aim is to produce rain at the hottest time of the year as the majority of the crops are reaching maturity. These sodalities also became notably important in the factional conflict. By the mid-1890's, most Friendly members had withdrawn, and the ceremonies were conducted exclusively by the Hostiles, with the Snake

kiva (important also as one of four kivas where a branch of the *Wuwtsim* society met), becoming a major factional center. After returning from Alcatraz in 1895, at the first Snake Dance the following year, Yukiwma of the Kookop clan, future factional leader at the split, was initiated into the Antelope society at Naasavi kiva by his Spider clan allies.

Leenangw was performed conjointly by the Blue Flute and Gray Flute sodalities. This ceremony too is important to the agricultural cycle, with solstitial associations, and serves as a summer counterpart to *Soyalangw*. *Leenangw* also became a focus of conflict, with the Blue Flute society (senior of the two sodalities), controlled by the Spider clan and under the leadership of Hostile chief Lomahongiwa, while the Gray Flute sodality, controlled by the Patki clan, remained mostly Friendly. Underscoring the Flute ceremony's appropriate associations with village leadership in Hopi social thought, it still serves as the principal legitimating ritual for the Kikmongwi at Wälpi, who belongs to the Flute clan (not present at Orayvi; *Lenngyam*, Flute clan, is distinct from *Leengyam*, Millet clan, although anthropologists have often confused them). In the 1890's, Lomahongiwa's leadership of the Flute ceremony may well have been a ritual basis for the Hostiles' choosing him to be their alternative Kikmongwi to Loololma. In this regard the dual interplay of *Soyalangw* and *Leenangw* echoes the Rio Grande Tewa Summer and Winter moieties that provide alternating village leadership by a Winter Chief and Summer Chief; at Orayvi, however, any sense of alternating complementarity was being converted to oppositional alternativity. After the subfaction of Hostiles returned to Orayvi in November 1906, Tawakwaptiwa, from his exile at Sherman Indian School in California, was particularly concerned about Lomahongiwa performing the Blue Flute ceremony (inferentially, as a ritual representation of leadership authority), but he failed to prevent its occurrence (e.g., Forrest, 1929, II: 183). When Tawakwaptiwa returned to Orayvi in time for the next performance in 1909, it appears that the Flute ceremony was performed only by the Gray Flute society (Talayesva, 1942: 141–142).

After the Snake or Flute ceremonies came

Social Dances, generically referred to as *Poli-*, or “Butterfly (Dances)” (although nowadays these dances, which celebrate emergent female fertility, may actually take place before the Snake or Flute). The next major ceremonies were those of three women's sodalities. Generally, women's sodalities were more open than the exclusive male orders, with many women belonging to all three: *Mamrawt*, *Lalkont*, and *Owaqölt*. Each sodality also had male chief-priests, and women's social power was less linked to their membership of sodalities than to their ownership of houses, management of economic distribution, and biological and social reproduction. *Mamrawt*, the *Maraw* society (named after an unidentified insect species [perhaps a damselfly] similar to a dragonfly), performed the *Maraw* ceremony in September of odd years in Orayvi (Voth [1903b, 1912a] contradicts himself on the years, but his diary makes plain that the main fall ceremony was performed in odd years [see Part II, chap. 19]). Owned by the Lizard clan, this sodality is a counterpart to the men's *Wuwtsim*, and, focusing on fertility, especially, includes satirical performances aimed at the *Wuwtsimt*. *Motswimi*, the ceremony of *Mòmstsit* or *Moomotst*, the (male) Warriors' society, occurred shortly after *Maraw* (Titiev 1944:156). Controlled jointly by the *Kookop* and Spider clans, and aligned with the authority of the *Qaletaqmongwi* (War chief), *Mòmstsit* was another major nexus of factional activity. Besides *Mamrawt*, the other two women's societies performed “Basket Dances”, in alternating years (*Lakon* in even years, *Owaqölow* in odd years; neither name is directly translatable) in late October–early November, closing the annual liturgical cycle. Both are regarded as more recent introductions to the Orayvi ceremonial order, although long-established by 1900; *Lakon* was owned by the Parrot clan, *Owaqölow* by the Sand clan. Occurring at the end of the harvest season, both involved ritual redistribution of crops and manufactures (notably wicker plaques at Third Mesa, the “Basket” reference), to crowds of men who gathered outside the circle of dancers to tussle over objects thrown by younger society women from the center of the circle.

At Orayvi before 1906 (by far the largest

village at that time, with the highest number of clans), ownership of ceremonies is regarded as having been inalienable, except in dire circumstances, such as the dying out of the proprietary clan; by contrast, at Second Mesa, kin group relationships with sodalities are more fluid (see Eggan, 1950: 89–106). Only *Katsina* performances and *Owaqölow*, as well as Social Dances, persist at Third Mesa in the present, with much-abbreviated observations of *Soyalangw* at Orayvi, Hotvela, and Paaqavi. The last initiations into the *Wuwtsim* sodalities at Orayvi occurred in 1909; the resumption of *Wuwtsim* initiations at Hotvela in 1923 was accompanied by much controversy (Whiteley, 1992b: 58–59); three full initiations occurred into the 1930's, and two small initiations into the One-Horn society in the 1950's and 1960's. The principal Snake and Antelope priests removed to Hotvela or Paaqavi after the split; regular performances were maintained at Hotvela until the last one in 1980. After the split, a group of Snake initiates was patched together at Orayvi and conducted performances up to 1918 (Whiteley, 1988a: 275), but with no Antelope sodality, these were a pale reflection of the ceremony as continued at Hotvela thereafter (Forrest, 1929: 139). Similarly, the Blue Flute sodality was primarily Hostile and continued to perform in the Hostile villages, first at Paaqavi until the death of Lomahongiwma in 1919, and then at Hotvela, initially under the leadership of his brother Lomayestiwa, and thereafter into the mid-20th century. The Gray Flutes, primarily Friendly, ceased operations ca. 1915, with the conversion of their chief-priest to Christianity (Whiteley, 1992b: 60).

(IV) KIVAS AND KIVA GROUPS

Most ceremonial activities are centered in kivas: in effect, these are independent but mutually coordinated “chapels” within the overall “church” of a Hopi village’s liturgical cycle. Each kiva group thus comprises another organizational unit, since its ordinary membership—which convenes for activities both secular and sacred, like Social or *Katsina* dances, weaving parties for wedding ceremonies, rabbit hunts, etc.—consists of other individuals beyond those whose sodal-

TABLE 2.3
Orayvi Kivas, 1906

Name	Translation
Sakwalenvi	Blue Flute place
Hawiwvi	Going Down place
Taw kiva	Singers' kiva
Naasavi	Middle place
Kwan kiva	One-Horn kiva
Hotsitsivi ¹	Zig-zag place
Tsu' kiva	Rattlesnake kiva
Maraw kiva	Maraw society kiva
Hano kiva	Tewa/Tanoan kiva
Wiklavi ²	Fold-of-fat place
Pongovi ³	Circle place
Is kiva	Coyote kiva
Katsin kiva	Kachina kiva
Kyarsurkiva	Parrot-tail kiva

¹ Hotsitsivi was also known as Honankiva (Badger kiva), Povolkiva (Butterfly kiva), and Su'at (Last One below).

² Wiklavi was also known as Siva'ptsomo (Rabbitbrush mound), and Siva'p kiva (Rabbitbrush kiva).

³ Pongovi was renamed Tawa'ovi (Sun above place), ca. 1900.

ity meets at the kiva. At Orayvi in 1906, there were 14 kivas (table 2.3). While there is an association between clan, sodality, and kiva, it is not a one-to-one correspondence. For example, the Snake *society* performs its ceremony, owned by the Snake *clan*, from out of the Snake *kiva*. But the Snake kiva also includes other ordinary members—notably for *Katsina* ceremonies and social dances—who are neither members of the Snake clan, nor initiates of the Snake society. These ordinary members do not attend the kiva while the Snake society is in session. Like clans and religious societies, each kiva is named; after it has been built, repaired, or rebuilt, a kiva will be (re-)named and (re-)consecrated during a Social Dance. If re-named, the name will reflect the clan of the sponsor in charge of refurbishing; today, there is no necessary carryover in clan ownership of the kiva, although at Orayvi this may have been more typical. Kivas organize certain economic activities, like hunting, and ritual pilgrimages to distant springs (like Kiisiwu on northern Black Mesa during the *Powamuy* and *Niman* ceremonies).

(V) ORAYVI SOCIETY: SUMMARY

In sum, Orayvi society was composed by a series of exogamous matrilineal clans, sub-

divided into smaller groups, dubbed “households” and “lineages,” and grouped into larger sets (“phratries”). Each clan is conceived as having its own separate history, ceremonies or other prerogatives, and attachments to particular parts of the landscape through which it migrated. The ceremony or other designated social function was the clan’s social charter, legitimating its position in the Orayvi community. Orayvi social structure was an interwoven web of clans and households, with primary economic functions, of ritual sodalities articulating the metaphysical relations of production and reproduction, and of kiva groups that were, in effect, men’s houses (political and social centers). Instituted leadership associated with clans and ritual sodalities provided the basis of Orayvi’s governance, especially via the roles of Kikmongwi, Qaletaqmongwi, and Wimmongwit (sodality chiefs). It is this structure that was sundered in the Orayvi split.

THE RECORD OF STUDY

Hopi social structure, as representative of one Pueblo Indian form, has been a subject of anthropological inquiry since the 1870’s (L.H. Morgan, 1870), and there are brief descriptions earlier (Ten Broeck, 1856). But Victor Mindeleff’s (1891) study of Pueblo house forms in the 1880’s, assisted by his brother Cosmos and, especially for the kinship data, by Scottish ethnologist Alexander M. Stephen, truly inaugurates systematic study. Stephen recorded social organization by “gentes” (or “clans”), and “families,” a perspective developed by Jesse Walter Fewkes in the 1890’s (Fewkes, 1894) and thereafter. Further research on Hopi social structure in the 1910’s and 1920’s—by Robert Lowie (1929a, 1929b), Elsie Clews Parsons (e.g., 1932), and C. Daryll Forde (1931)—concentrated upon First and Second Mesas. Parsons (1922) wrote briefly on Orayvi following a visit in 1920, and in the same work reprinted the 1882 and 1890 accounts of Orayvi by Frank Cushing and Fewkes respectively, both of which indicated the presence of factionalism. The ethnological researches at Third Mesa of missionary H.R. Voth in the 1890’s and early 1900’s focused on ritual

and myth, with significant allusions to, but no concentration on, social forms themselves. Voth discussed the factional division at several junctures in his texts, attributing it to the government policy of enforced schooling (e.g., Voth, 1903b). In the late 1920’s and early 1930’s, the study of Hopi social structure was stimulated by argument between Lowie (1929a) and Parsons (1933), as well as by the impetus toward structural studies by A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, upon his arrival at the University of Chicago in 1931 (Whiteley, 2003a).

This was the state of anthropological play in 1932, when Leslie White led the Laboratory of Anthropology’s summer field school in ethnology to Third Mesa. The Orayvi split had been described, but, with the partial exception of Parsons (1922), its social dynamics had not been investigated, and no structural studies had focused on Third Mesa, the largest Hopi population center. Over two months, White orchestrated a survey of Orayvi kinship, social organization, and the split, with a party of graduate students—including Mischa Titiev, Fred Eggan, and Edward Kennard. They compiled genealogies, charted kinship and affinal relationships, and investigated the social operation of kin groups. Following on from this, in 1933–1934, Titiev returned to Orayvi (accompanied for a short but influential period by Eggan), where he deepened the study of social forces behind the split. Titiev focused on Orayvi’s social structure, including the rearrangement of clans and religious sodalities among Orayvi, Hotvela, and Paaqavi effected by the split. Titiev combined his own research results with those of White’s field school to produce *Old Oraibi* (1944). Eggan’s fieldwork of January–March 1934 was primarily at Supawlavi, with brief visits to Titiev at Orayvi (Eggan, personal commun., 1980). By this point, Eggan had already completed his doctoral dissertation (Eggan, 1933) on Western Pueblo social organization, based on a literature survey and his work in the 1932 field school. Supplemented by the 1934 fieldwork, Eggan’s dissertation was eventually published as *Social Organization of the Western Pueblos* (1950).

Titiev and Eggan largely agreed on the units of Hopi social structure as a nested se-

ries of matrilineal units—households, lineages, clans, and phratries—integrated by intermarriage and cross-cutting ritual sodality memberships: their explanation was fundamentally structural-functionalist, under the influence of Eggan’s mentor, Radcliffe-Brown, and Titiev’s in this regard, Lloyd Warner (Whiteley, 2003a). As noted in chapter 1, Titiev concluded the split’s cause lay in Orayvi’s ineffectively integrated system of descent groups: while “Lololoma’s receptiveness to American influence provided a *casus belli*, . . . the primary division of the village resulted from the splitting of the weak phratry tie that had held two strong clans together” (1944: 75). Titiev’s analysis was thus structuralist, in the Radcliffe-Brownian sense: the cause lay in the very form of society itself, whose functional integration of elemental matrilineal units was structurally inadequate and fell apart under pressure from outside forces.

Titiev’s explanation of the split and Eggan’s complementary analysis of Hopi social organization were highly influential in Pueblo ethnology, and Eggan’s approach, combining structural-functionalism with Boasian historical-particularism, had broad impact in American anthropological theory. Following these two primary interpretations of the split and Hopi social structure (in some instances before they had reached publication), other scholars entered the fray. In 1930–1932, Margaret Brainard conducted a study of Hopi familial organization, notably at Third Mesa, based on fieldwork and on an analysis of census data, especially the 1930 (15th) national census (Brainard, 1935). Although her dissertation was never published, Brainard’s systematic house-by-house study concluded that the nuclear, conjugal family—rather than Titiev’s matrilineal household or Eggan’s lineage—was the principal unit of Third Mesa social organization (cf. Nagata, 1970: 247; and see chap. 3).

In the early 1940’s Laura Thompson’s study of Hopi culture and personality concluded that the split’s causes were various, but owed significantly to the subversion of cultural values by Mennonite missionaries (1950: 140), notably Voth, who had arrived in 1893. Thompson (1950: 34) also drew at-

tention in passing to the impact on Hopi resources of the recent arrival of Navajos, with their extensive livestock, in the Third Mesa area—a still underemphasized aspect (see chap. 4). Shuichi Nagata’s important study of Mùnqapi in the early 1960’s (Nagata, 1970) introduced the idea that movements from Orayvi to Mùnqapi involved a gradual sloughing off of excess population to an alternative resource-base, an idea that stated in this gradualist form, and applied to that case, I find persuasive (in contrast to its extension, by Levy, to the split itself). Bradfield’s study of Orayvi’s field system in the 1960’s, as noted in chapter 1, developed an ecological hypothesis to explain the split (Bradfield 1971, 1995). And again as noted in the first chapter, Clemmer’s study of the Hopi Traditionalist movement in the early 1970’s (e.g., Clemmer, 1978, 1995) emphasized its origins in the split interpreted as an ideological conflict.

In my own study, beginning in 1980 (based on fieldwork [initially 14 months, now three years in total] and archival research), a primary interest lay in the composition of Paaqavi’s founding populace, and the reproduction and/or transformation of social and cultural forms from the mother village. Like Titiev (though less onerously, since the population was much lower than Orayvi’s in 1906), I compiled a diachronic census of the village—including clan memberships, marriages, and membership of kivas and ritual sodalities—from oral and documentary records. My explanation of the split, to repeat, foregrounded sociopolitical agency in response to a complex of historical conditions. I described a social system more hierarchical, and based in the system of ritual sodalities, than that of the canonical accounts by Titiev and Eggan. Subsequent analyses have been described in chapter 1, with the principal one, by Levy (1992), based on an analysis of three census records, reinstating Eggan’s and Titiev’s focus on unilineal descent groups, and promoting a materialist hypothesis of lineage ranking associated with differential control of arable land; thus, with population pressure, the lesser lineages were forced in 1906 to migrate in search of new land. More recent interpretations of Orayvi social structure by Bernardini (1996, 2005) and Cameron (1999) depend in part on

Levy's census data, and on his system of lineage ranking, as well as on their own respective field and archival research. Of structural significance, Bernardini introduces a novel usage of *sub-clans* to refer to matrilineal descent groups within a particular village (a "clan" being all the representatives of a named group from multiple villages across

all three Mesas). Inter alia, Cameron foregrounds nuclear-family households as the principal building blocks of social structure.

The questions raised by this record of study and its competing interpretations and explanations are multiplex. Of primary concern are the principles underlying Orayvi's social structure, to which I turn next.