Kaiser, Malik, and Emerman citation on page 54. The AIDS and Anthropology Research Group is referenced as an author with its full name and elsewhere with its acronym. There is no consistency in either referencing an author-organization with its full name followed by the acronym or vice versa. Even on a single same page there are different usages, such as the first and the third entry on page 316. Electronic publications are frequently not completely referenced. One online source is referenced with a four-line-long Web address (293). How helpful is that! Gilbert Herdt is having a separate entry as Gil Herdt. On page 311 and 313, "epidemiology" is spelled four times "epidermiology." Empirical research becomes "empircial" research. Also the index is poorly prepared. It is rather amusing to find the following entry in the Index: "Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome." How helpful is such an entry as AIDS is mentioned on nearly every page?! It seems that the publisher has cut corners when editing the manuscript, something frequently done by low-ranking commercial publishers but embarrassing for an academic publisher.

Nevertheless, the book is highly recommendable. Anyone interested in a comprehensive publication on HIV and AIDS and how anthropology understands and addresses the epidemic should read this publication. The book is a very informative and usable textbook for any college and university course. I will definitely adopt the book for one of my courses.

Alexander Rödlach

Whiteley, Peter M.: The Orayvi Split. A Hopi Transformation; 2 vols. Vol. 1: Structure and History; vol. 2: The Documentary Record. New York: American Museum of Natural History, 2008. 1137 pp. ISSN 0065-9452. (American Museum of Natural History, Anthropological Papers, 87) Price: $ 80.00

As is evident from the bibliographic details above, this book by Peter M. Whiteley, Curator of the Division of Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York, is big. It is also a major achievement in an anthropological area that is both overexposed and intransigently opaque. The Hopis have been studiously trying to avoid the limelight ever since avid American tourists discovered that they danced with dangerous snakes in their mouths 150 years ago. During the last three decades, the Hopis have actively prevented anthropologists and other scholars from pursuing fieldwork. Peter M. Whiteley is one of the few scholars who has achieved recognition from the Hopis for his valuable contributions to the study and analysis of Hopi history. Whiteley's major contribution was his analysis of the split that occurred in the village of Orayvi (Oraibi) on Third Mesa in 1906. The causes of the split and its consequences have been elegantly analyzed in Whiteley's book "Deliberate Acts. Changing Hopi Culture through the Oraibi Split" (Tucson 1988). A follow-up study of the foundation and history of the village of Bacavi was published with the generous help of the villagers and Hopi historians in the book "Bacavi. Journey to Reed Springs" (Flagstaff 1988). Other scholars have attempted to analyze the Orayvi split (Mischa Titiev, Jerrold E. Levy, Scott Rushforth and Steadman Upham, Richard Clemmer, and myself), but none as comprehensively as Whiteley.

With such an impressive record of achievements, what more could possibly be said about the 1906 split? That was my initial impression upon receiving the heavy package containing two volumes printed in glossy paper filled with a large number of photographs, illustrations, tables, maps, drawings, photos of archival materials, and so on. As Whiteley explains in the abstract to the book, many theories have been proposed to explain the fission of this small-scale kin-based society. Most of the theories have failed for two reasons: 1) the obvious trap of all theories, namely, that they often reduce complex events to a single cause, and 2) the more important empirical reason that significant archival records have been neglected.

What records is Whiteley referring to? Besides thorough-going fieldwork throughout Hopi country and surrounding environs during the past 25 years, Whiteley has visited the local archives at the Museum of Northern Arizona, University of Arizona Special Collections, University of Arizona Bureau of Applied Research, Northern Arizona University Library, Keam's Canyon Hopi Agency, and the Bureau of Land Management in Phoenix as well as archives throughout the U. S. such as the Mennonite Library and Archives, University of Michigan's Bentley Historical Library, the Fred Eggan Collection at the University of Chicago, the National Anthropological Archives, and the Field Museum in Chicago, and he was granted generous access to personal archives such as those of Barton and Margaret Wright, John R. Wilson, and Kenneth Hill. Furthermore, Whiteley enlisted the expert assistance of a variety of people who have helped him draw census maps, tabulate field data collected during the decades before the split and various censuses before and after the split, and much more. All of the tabulations and maps are in the main volume. Some of the valuable archive material (over 280 pages) is included in volume II of this book. The sheer industry of this book is breath-taking. Someone had to do it, and Whiteley was the best person to do the job.

The main part of the book, volume I, (which is well over 800 pp.) contains detailed information on the structure and history of the Hopis and the Orayvi split. After an introduction to the people and the subject, Whiteley reanalyzes the study of Hopi social structure and the split. This is followed by chapters on families, clans, and houses at Orayvi, the material and demographic context, genealogies, censuses, allotment surveys, and conclusions about the population and social aspects of Orayvi in 1906.

For those who are not familiar with the split of Orayvi, here is a resumé: during the four day aftermath of the Snake Ceremony on September 7, 1906, the troubles of more than two decades came to a head. Under the leadership of the new Village Chief, Bear Clan leader Tawakwaptiwa and his men, who were known to be friendly to American influence (called the "Friendlies" in the litera-

ture), attempted to force the "Hostiles," under the leadership of Yukiwma of the Kookop Clan (translated as "Fire Clan"). Persuaded by acting school principal Elizabeth Stanley, the gathering numbers of supporters on each side agreed to lay down their arms. What ensued is one of the most curious resolutions of social conflict in the anthropological literature. Enclosed within two lines drawn in the sand, the leaders of the opposing groups (Whiteley says that Humihongiwma may have stepped in on behalf of Tawakwaptiwa), physically backed by their supporters began a pushing contest. The result was that Yukiwma and his group lost and had to leave the village. They headed six miles to the north to a place called Hotvela (cedar slope) where they camped. A supervisor sent by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Reuben Perry, arrived with troops and persuaded some of the Hostiles to return to Orayvi, the rest were either imprisoned or moved to Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania. Tawakwaptiwa, his family, and some friends were sent off to Sherman Institute (an Indian Boarding School) at Riverside, California, for three years. This move made Tawakwaptiwa a bitter man and no friend of the Whites when he got back. The children of the Hostiles were hauled off to Keam's Canyon Boarding School for four years.

In the meantime, Hotvela became an established village under the leadership of Yukiwma upon his return from prison in 1907. A second split occurred at Orayvi when Tawakwaptiwa got back in 1909. This led to the founding of Paaqavi (Bacavi) right across the road from Hotvela. Many of Tawakwaptiwa's former supporters (some disillusioned with him) moved into the valley below Orayvi and founded the village of Kiqötsmovi (New Oraibi). Other Friendlies moved to Mùnqapi (Moencopi) which also split during the 1930s when a group wished to become autonomous from Tawakwaptiwa's rule. Thus, the Orayvi split led to the founding of three new villages and the enlargement of Mùnqapi. As Whiteley concluded: "The largest and most important Hopi town, settled and apparently integral for more than a millennium, thus rapidly disintegrated into five, and in the 1930's, six, fragment communities, with the original site almost a ghost town, inhabited by less than 10 percent of its former populace" (5 f.).

Hopi culture has been remarkably resilient to outside influences for several centuries. Even today, a significant dimension of traditional culture is still alive. That is one of the reasons why anthropologists have been so interested in the Hopis. The split offered a unique opportunity to study social fission in a group not affected by state domination or market capitalism. The split, however, followed more or less along matrilineal kin lines, which allows scholars to study how the social structure of a small-scale society holds together and splits apart in dynamic interplay between tradition and change. The latter is, according to Whiteley, the great challenge of social anthropology (8).

The book under review here attempts to empirically test four major hypotheses about the split: sociological (with its focus on structure), materialist (with its focus on infrastructure), ideological (with its focus on superstructure), and agential (with its focus on the deliberate actions of social agents) (8 f.). All four are "a microcosm of anthropological theory" (11). The problem evidently is that all studies have been based on faulty data, data which has become, according to Whiteley, "received data" and which also has been influenced by "explanatory narratives" mostly based on descent theory (11). This book tries to correct the situation so that proper analyses can be carried out. Thus, Whiteley writes: "The present work thus has four principal aims: (1) to produce a more comprehensive record of the Orayvi split's demography and history; (2) with a comprehensive record completed, to permit more rigorous evaluation of explanatory hypotheses; (3) to re-evaluate Orayvi's social and material forms vis-à-vis the received framing by descent theory; and (4) to provide an accessible set of resources for Third Mesa Hopi history and social structure that will, it is hoped, assist the development of further analyses and interpretations" (13).

Thus, Whiteley develops a revisionary model of Hopi social structure based on a "house" model, examines in great detail Orayvi's economy, ecology, production, field system, climatic and soil conditions, population size, and social and environmental conditions of the late 19th century, and questions the conclusions and inferences of Titiev, Bradfield, and Levy on the social and material conditions at Orayvi. Through the careful analysis of different census data from 1888 to 1934, Whiteley presents data on individual persons, "their social positions, and their ties of kinship, affinity, and association" (13) in Orayvi prior to the split and in the fragmented groupings afterwards.

The bulk of the book (chapters 6 – 15: 241 – 824) is an intimidating, barely narrative, presentation of data without the advantage of Whiteley's otherwise eloquently pleasurable prose. Where there is prose, one could hardly imagine that descriptions of allotment surveys could be very stimulating reading. But I was riveted by the excitement of discovery so skillfully weighed and described by this masterful author. In a way, it reads like a detective novel (if you skip all the tables and lists and whatnot), as one theory after another and one hypothesis after another get shot down by the careful empirical sifting of hitherto overlooked evidence.

An important logistic step in understanding the new evidence, that Whiteley pursues, is his revisionary analysis of social structure theory in the Hopi context. The ordered scale of descent groups favored by the nestors of Hopi anthropology, Mischa Titiev and Fred Eggan, and every social anthropologist in Hopi studies since, except for Whiteley (and a small number of pioneer Pueblo scholars before him), is the following: households, lineages, clans, and phratries. But, as Whiteley notes, "The orderliness of the scalar descent-group model is subverted, however, by its lack of fit with Hopi social discourse and action" (33). I can confirm from my own work that the standard structural model strikes critical observers as only being "almost right." There is a puzzling disorder in what appears to be a hierarchically developed system of clans, ritual sodalities, and phratries. This "dis-

order" can, however, be a result of a wrong (or at least, faulty) analytical model. A good example of this "misfit" of model-to-social-reality, mentioned by Whiteley (34), is how the Hopis use the term *ngyam*, "clan" (in a collective sense) or *wungwa* (in an individual sense). The term is used by the Hopis about groups with "different ranges of inclusion" than those implied by formalist approaches. Understanding the logic behind Hopi usage has fundamental implications for anthropological interpretations of this particular sociocultural system. The same goes for Hopi kinship and marriage. Whiteley concludes that Hopi social structure appears to be transitional in three ways: "between kin and class societies, between 'elementary' and 'complex' structures of kinship and marriage, and between egalitarian and stratified political economies" (43), which is why the lineage model is inadequate.

Whiteley's alternative is drawn from the work of French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss who argued that "house societies" constitute just such hybrid forms as described above. The concept of clan houses (*wungwkiki*) play a central role here (42–44). Based on actual usage in Hopi discourse, Whiteley argues persuasively that Hopi dwelling concepts fit closely with the term *wungwa*. The Hopis don't use terms that correspond with anthropological descent groups like household, lineage, and phratry. Whiteley asks what terms do they then use for various social entities (46)? Fred Eggan was aware of the meaning of houses in Hopi thought, but did not consider them to be analytically significant. Both he and Titiev also privileged the household which they considered to be matrilineal. But their lineal descent-group interpretation has been disputed by Kroeber, Parsons, and Brainard. Parsons, for instance, argued that the household or maternal house allowed for "all kinds of collaterals" (49).

What seems to be the empirical case in Hopi usage is that group identity is contextual and "shaped especially by sociopolitical contingencies, and identified with specific houses" (51). Furthermore – this may come as a shock to most – Whiteley argues that the Hopis are not as matrilineal as we thought they were, mainly because cognatic and patrilateral relations are important in the house and household and actual marriage unions contain a significant number of examples that depart from matrilineal exogamic logic, primarily in FBC-MZC marriages (father's brothers' children and mother's sisters' children) (51 f.). In fact, household identification has clear patrilateral ties. And thus the Hopi system seems to coincide much better with the so-called "house-clan" complex in early Pueblo ethnology, dovetailing nicely with Lévi-Strauss' cognatic *maisons* and the Crow social systems (57).

Whiteley warned the scholarly community about this already in his two-part article from 1985–86 "Unpacking Hopi 'clans'" (*Journal of Anthropological Research* 41.1985: 359–374; 42.1986: 69–79). This book presents unequivocal evidence not only that he is right but also that Hopi ethnographic nestors downplayed their own evidence which was contrary to the unilaterial descent model they were committed to.

What may be of interest to scholars of religion is that there is a logically cohesive relation between ritual authority, the so-called "clan lands," and "clan" houses. What the evidence shows is that only one third of Orayvi's clans had clearly identified clan fields or lands. The only lands that were clearly identified by leaders and commoners alike as "clan lands" were all owned by the Village Chief and leading ritual sodality chiefs, which were farmed by the commoners on behalf of the chiefs. The commoners also had their own plots, but their locations were evidently changeable. Whiteley's conclusion is: "In keeping, however, with Hopi social thought on this issue, as *wimvaavasa* [ritual fields], these fields are conceptually governed by the ritual practices they index, rather than by any sense that they are inalienable descent-group estates per se. Without continued practice of the associated ritual functions, the legitimacy of field ownership or usufruct is ceded: the original exchange at acceptance into the village required performative renewal within the calendrical cycle. … The fields and an area to build houses in the village were granted on condition that the clan introduce its ritual and engage in prescriptive marriage exchanges with the other clans in the community. It is thus the *-wungwkiki*, 'clanhouses' that 'house' the Wimmomngwit [ritual chiefs] and control the *wiiwimi*, sodality rituals, which are the true owners of the *wimvaavasa*. Since much of the group labor within fields is performed by conjugal members of houses, rather than by clansmen alone, the house model is more apt in this sphere also, including fields not owned by prominent houses" (85).

In other words, the Hopis had "a hierarchical system of land tenure, principally dividing chiefly fields associated with prominent clanhouses, and their ritual entitlements, from those of commoners, many of whom held land by individual tenure in a very large free area" (86). This is exciting news that has actually always been there (as mentioned, even Titiev had snippets of this kind of information in his dissertation which were either deleted or downplayed in the published version of his monograph), but has been distorted through the smoke lenses of the lineal descent model.

There is no room for detailed descriptions of all the surprising discoveries in the book. Suffice it to say that quite a number of the favorite "causes" of the split have been definitively falsified: it was not because of overpopulation (there was none) or drought (not in the immediate time frame of the split and the Hopis used flood irrigation anyway) or wash backup (which happened after the split), or Navajo and Mormon encroachment (certainly a factor but not the only one). After an exhaustive, magisterial analysis of the evidence, Whiteley concludes: "[T]he Orayvi split was a total social fact that resonated throughout the several planes of Orayvi life. Numerous variables – demographic, material, structural, and historical – interacted to produce the conditions in which this dramatic transformation of a middle-range, semicomplex social system occurred. No unicausal explanation is sufficient to the transformation, which is reducible neither to material praxis, societal form, ideological difference, or

agential vectors alone. Sound explanation must take into account the interaction of all these forces, both structural and historical" (830).

Scholars of Hopi culture constitute their own small tribe (as I suppose most anthropologists have). Some will probably still jockey into place and defend their favorite unicausal theories about the split, based on received knowledge and explanations from venerated ancestors and teachers. But I think that future generations can no longer continue this tradition. They cannot ignore this vast body of data uncovered by Whiteley. He was very wise in publishing many of the documents. Not only is this a great service to scholars of Hopi culture and history, it also makes it very difficult for competitors to ignore his results. Armin W. Geertz

Winkler, Hans Alexander: Ghost Riders of Upper Egypt. A Study of Spirit Possession. Transl. and Introd. by Nicholas S. Hopkins. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2009. 163 pp. ISBN 978-977-416-250-3. Price: $ 24.95

Nicholas Hopkins has provided an invaluable service to anthropology by translating and contextualizing this little known but fascinating work of Egyptian ethnography originally published in German in 1936. Its author, Hans Winkler, was a German anthropologist who died in WWII at the age of 45. During the 1930s Winkler lived for several months in the vicinity of Qift, north of Luxor, where he carried out participatory observation in a community of settled Bedouin. Whereas Winkler's other works follow the formerly prevalent trait-list approach to ethnography, "Ghost Riders" is exceptional. It focuses on the spirit possession experiences of one man, ʿAbd al-Radi, and aims to understand "the intimate religious life of the fellahin" (16) in a world where possession by ghosts of the dead is thinkable and fairly mundane. Such concerns place it squarely in line with recent directions in the field. Winkler spent considerable time with ʿAbd al-Radi, befriending him; his self-reflexive engagement with the latter's possession episodes was precocious, as was his speculation about the effects of their encounters on ʿAbd al-Radi and ʿAbd al-Radi's principal spirit, Bakhit. So too was Winkler's attempt to let readers see with eyes of the fellahin. These emphases, likely considered "unscientific" in the 1930s, may well have contributed to the book's obscurity.

In a short introduction, Hopkins discusses the themes of spirit possession and spirit mediumship in Egypt, the novelty of Winkler's approach, the shape of Winkler's life as he became ensnared by conditions in Nazi Germany and died in combat at the end of the war. Hopkins also provides background on the region of Qift, especially its ethnic and occupational mix, not fully addressed in the original text. He notes some of the changes in the region since Winkler's research, and tells us of ʿAbd al-Radi's fate – he lived a relatively long life during which he married twice again and had several more children, not what Winkler had foreseen. The lives of ʿAbd al-Radi's descendants in the 21st century are more prosperous than their forebear's, thanks, in part, to his vocation; ʿAbd al-Radi himself is memorialized in a shrine.

Winkler begins the book by noting his long-standing interest in shamanism and spirit possession, acknowledging the influence of T. K. Oesterreich on his thought. The text then divides into two parts. Part 1, "The Environment of ʿAbd al-Radi," portrays the physical, social, and spiritual worlds of his subject in progressively fine-grained detail. Winkler's prose has cinematic and sensual appeal: opening panoramic scenes close in on the village of Naj' al-Hijayri where ʿAbd al-Radi lives, and as they do the reader can feel the heat and languor of the place, the comfort and monotony of days spent close to the land, herding goats, driving a waterwheel, selling sugar cones and sundries from a rural shop. One senses, too, Winkler's wistful regard for villagers' innocence of the wider world.

A lengthy section describes ʿAbd al-Radi's religious environment, setting out the differences between local beliefs and those of Muslim scholars, while clarifying how their ostensibly unorthodox convictions and practices actually enhance villagers' deep and abiding commitment to Islam. "Many old religious thoughts and customs, fears, and superstitions remain alive among the people," he writes, "indeed they are illuminated by the eternal God reigning in benevolent majesty until the end of the world" (25). Winkler describes villagers' images of the human body as relatively unbounded, permeable to influences from without and able to exude influences from within, that resonate with later ethnographic research along the Upper Nile, including my own. He describes the common meanings of dream images, the way bad smells can enter the body and cause infirmity, the logic of the evil eye, the hazards that surround the mouth, "the door of food, breath, and speech" (28). Ethnographic statements about entities, remedies, illnesses, and the like are presented as bare unqualified facts. Page by page their weight slowly builds, pulling the reader deeper into villagers' world where *ʿafrit* (spirits) abound: *jinn* or "demons" who reside under the earth, *zar* spirits (a type of *jinn*) who originated in Sudan and are especially troubling to women, ghosts of the pious or ingenuous dead known as shaykhs, for some of whom *zikr*s are held and shrines maintained. Spirits of all types can seize or "ride" living persons and speak through their bodies during trance. It is thus that ʿAbd al-Radi becomes a medium or "mount" for the ghost of his paternal uncle, Shaykh Bakhit, enabling Bakhit to answer petitioners' questions about how to treat illnesses, handle worrying situations in the everyday world, or connect with their unquiet dead.

Part 2 and the longest section is devoted to ʿAbd al-Radi himself, his family origins and travails in work and marriage, the illness that leads him to realize his call to service by God and "by the shaykh" (73), the gradual normalization of his relations with the spirit, and the developing rapport between Winkler and ʿAbd el-Radi/Bakhit. Here the book recalls "Tuhami," Vincent Crapanzano's classic ethno-psychoanalytic biography of a Moroccan man possessed by *jinn* (Chicago 1980). Here too Winkler's outline of the Naj' al-Hijayri world pays off,