Few Southwestern archaeologists have escaped the temptation of incorporating aspects of Hopi culture and society into models of prehistoric Pueblo social organization. The Hopi have figured prominently in archaeological and ethnographic research since the onset of professional anthropology in North America. Aloof and unwilling to part with their ancient lifeways, the Hopi offered anthropologists the unique opportunity to examine an instance of in situ, uninterrupted development of a North American Indian society from pre-Columbian times to the present. The widely shared perception that the Hopi changed little throughout the colonial and early American periods has been instrumental for the construction of analogical arguments to explain diversity and change in Southwestern prehistory. In fact, interpretations linking ceramic manufacture to kinship, architecture to ritual performance, and land tenure to sociopolitical organization abound in modern archaeological literature and most, implicitly or explicitly, look up to the Hopi as the primary source of inspiration.

This inextricable relationship between Southwestern archaeology and extant Pueblo societies, in particular the Hopi, may be traced back to the late nineteenth century, when BAE scholars set out to record what they perceived as the last vestiges of a dying way of life, and to preserve it in writings, photographs, sketches, and artifact collections for future generations of Americans. BAE research constitutes the cornerstone of Southwestern anthropology and an invaluable source of information for students of Pueblo culture and society. However, perspectives about its relevance for addressing diversity and change in prehistory have shifted in tandem with the growth of the discipline. Faithful to the laws of scientific dialectics, issues that once preoccupied nineteenth-century BAE scholars, such as the role of migration, ethnic diversity, and ritual
in the organization of the Western Pueblos, have returned to the center stage of archaeological research in the Southwest. The time, therefore, is ripe for reflecting on the contributions of the BAE to Southwestern archaeology in the twentieth century.

In this paper we first characterize the political milieu surrounding the BAE presence at Hopi. Second, we review the intellectual framework and substantive contributions of Hopi scholars between 1870 and 1895. Subsequent use of BAE research by professional anthropologists is then discussed. Last, we reflect on the impact of this research on the development of Southwest archaeology and evaluate its validity from the perspective of current research trends.

**BECOMING AMERICANS: ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE POLITICS OF INDIAN ASSIMILATION**

Although the Hopi were known to the Spanish since Francisco de Coronado entered the Southwest in 1540, they remained, for the better part of three centuries, beyond the reach of outsiders. The remote location of the ancient province of Tusayan, coupled with the Hopi’s reluctance to surrender to European rule contributed in great measure to the survival of their traditional society throughout the Spanish colonial and Mexican periods (Adams 1989). Efforts to establish colonial posts and Catholic missions at Hopi were short-lived and failed repeatedly, culminating with the well-known destruction of Awanovi Pueblo in 1700 (Whiteley 1988: 13–22; Rushforth and Upham 1992). After the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, the Hopi leaders developed a diplomatic strategy of passive resistance that proved highly successful at maintaining peace with Spain while allowing them to avoid European intrusion in their villages (Adams 1989). Until the early 1800s the Hopis were, in the words of Thomas Donaldson, “surrounded by deserts and the fierce Navajos, and these were sufficient to stop visitors or adventurers: only armies could reach them” (Donaldson 1893: 24).

With the opening of the West in the mid-nineteenth century, the Hopi witnessed an increasing encroachment of Anglo-American explorers and settlers in their surroundings. The purchase of the Arizona Territory in 1854 marked the end of their isolation from civilization. The first visits of American government officials to the Hopi Mesas in the 1850s were aimed at evaluating the potential of the newly pur-
chased territories for colonization and economic development; gathering information on the Indians inhabiting these territories and their potential threat to Anglo-American settlers was a second goal of the surveys (Abel 1915; Ives 1861; Schoolcraft 1857; see James 1990: 77–84). Soon thereafter, Mormon settlers began to establish farming communities in the vicinity of the Pueblos (James 1990: 86; Whiteley 1988: 33). These changes were not unique to the Hopi or to other Western tribes, but were a logical extension of political trends that had been brewing east of the Mississippi River since the early decades of that century.

While in the mid 1800s the political climate regarding the status of Indian populations had been separatist, after the Civil War government policies were increasingly influenced by the need to incorporate them into American society (Hoxie 1984: 13). The expansion of post-war America into previously uncolonized lands, the awareness that settlers would have to live near people quite different from them, and the denied access to pristine areas set aside for Indian reservations brought about a public outcry condemning the politics of separation advocated by the Indian Office and calling for effective assimilation strategies (Hoxie 1984: 13). Underlying the assimilation philosophy was a thirst for knowing America’s past as a means for establishing rights of possession of the land; in a nation colonized by people of multiple ethnic origins and without ancestral ties to each other or their new country, nationality was to be defined almost solely in terms of territorial occupancy (Olwig 1993: 335).

It was at this juncture that government-sponsored anthropological research became a key for providing information to develop successful assimilation policies (Hoxie 1984: 16–24; Darnell 1971; Horsman 1975). Social evolutionism, as conceived by Lewis Henry Morgan and understood by his followers, offered moral and practical solutions to the problem of assimilation. Indians were in a much lower stage of social development, but they could be incorporated into mainstream America through education, religious indoctrination, and adoption of private property (Powell 1874: 7–8). Indian citizenship would be, in evolutionary terms, the inevitable consequence of progress and civilization.

Crucial for legitimizing American nationality and cultural identity was the development of letters, science, and arts. The nascent science of anthropology was seen as a potential contributor to such development. Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, for example, exhorted scholars to de-
vote themselves to the study of the natural and human history of the land, and particularly American Indians as an intrinsic component of the land. He saw the study of Indian culture and society as a debt owed to the conquered; their history was the history of America and hence of all Americans (Hinsley 1981: 20). Thus armed with a noble cause and instructed in the principles of Lewis Henry Morgan, anthropologists set about to preserve this heritage before it disappeared on the road to civilization. In a letter to Smithsonian Secretary S. F. Baird (cited in Hoxie 1984: 22), John Wesley Powell warned, “if the ethnology of our Indians is ever to receive proper scientific study and treatment the work must be done at once.” Accordingly, Powell channeled the Bureau of Ethnology’s human power and funds toward the organization of anthropological research in America.

THE ROMANCE OF TUSAYAN: 
POWELL ENCOUNTERS THE HOPI

In 1870 Major Powell obtained a $10,000 appropriation from Congress to undertake the Geographical and Geological Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region. This survey was intended as a continuation of his exploration of the Colorado River of the West, which he had conducted between 1867 and 1869 (Dellenbaugh 1965; Stegner 1982: 123). Powell began fieldwork in the Plateau province in the fall of 1870. At the fort in Pipe Spring, Utah, he met Mormon missionary Jacob Hamblin, who accompanied and guided the survey, contributing his invaluable knowledge of the country and the local tribes (Stegner 1982: 129).

South and east of the ethnological gold mine of the Utah plateaus lived the legendary Hopi. From Hamblin, Powell learned about the mysterious origins of the tribe and longed to meet these people who appeared to be more evolved than other Western tribes (Stegner 1982: 133). For their part, the Hopi, too, had learned of the one-armed explorer of the Colorado River and were curious to know whether he had visited their sacred places in the canyon country (James 1990: 94). Powell and Hamblin finally arrived at Hopi late in 1870 and remained there for almost two months. In The Ancient Province of Tusayan (1972 [1875]) Powell briefly recounted this trip and summarized observations of the daily life at the Pueblos:
Thus in this desert land we find an agricultural people; a people living in stone houses, with walls laid in mortar and plastered within, houses two, three, four, five or six stories high; a people having skill in the manufacture and ornamentation of pottery, having cotton, and weaving and dyeing their own clothing, skilled in a system of picture writings, having a vast store of mythology, and an elaborate ceremonious religion; without beast of burden, and having no knowledge of metals, all their tools being made of bone, stone, or wood. (Powell 1972: 33)

The Hopi impressed him as gentle, pious, and industrious, having reached a high stage of barbarism. He marveled at their crafts, a sample of which he carried back to Washington. Powell was intrigued by the Hopi's origins and pondered on the relationship between them and the remains of ancient towns that littered the surrounding countryside (Powell 1972: 33). Importantly, his travels through that country demonstrated to him that it was possible to transform the arid lands of the West into productive agricultural fields.

During the 1870s ethnographers paid only brief visits to Hopi, with the purpose of obtaining artifact collections. The collecting trips were undertaken by Edward Palmer in preparation for the Centennial Exposition of the Smithsonian museum (Hinsley 1981: 74; see Jeter, this issue), and from 1879 to 1882 by James Stevenson, who brought to Washington the first extensive collection of Hopi artifacts. This collection included, according to his catalog, artifacts made of stone, clay, wood, antler, and leather; basketry and woven fabrics; and feathers, head dressings, and assorted objects for personal adornment (J. Stevenson 1884: 587 and passim). His wife, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, was intensely disliked by the Hopi, but nonetheless managed to publish a brief description of their Snake and Flute ceremonies, which she obtained from a Zuni informant (M. C. Stevenson 1892). In 1881, J. K. Hillers, the Geological Survey photographer, secured a large number of photographs of all the Hopi villages (Powell 1884: xiii) (figures 1 and 2). His photographic records were produced just before “milled lumber, glass, sashes, stovepipes, and changes in settlement patterns began modifying rapidly the pre Hispanic look of Zuni and Hopi architecture” (Nabokov 1989: xii).

In the same year, Frank Hamilton Cushing visited Oraibi Pueblo in Third Mesa on his way to Cataract Creek, where he hoped to verify
Zuni accounts of ancestral relationships with the Havasupai inhabitants of that country (Powell 1884: xviii). During this journey he noted the presence of cliff dwellings along the Verde Valley. Cushing returned to Oraibi in 1882, where he witnessed a bitter encounter between the village chief and the head priest. This event may have been a symptom of internal power struggles that eventually led to the Oraibi Split in 1906 (Whiteley 1988: 42). He made another trip to Third Mesa in 1883 (Cushing 1922), and subsequently helped open the way to Hopi for the Mindeleff brothers and Jesse W. Fewkes.

DIVERSITY AND CHANGE AT HOPI

The most salient characteristic of BAE ethnographic research at Hopi during the last two decades of the nineteenth century was an emphasis on the relationship between social structure and religion (see Walker, this issue). Overwhelmingly, accounts provided by A. M. Stephen and J. W. Fewkes, who lived at First Mesa over extended periods of time, focused on documenting the complexity of ritual and ceremonialism. Elsie Clews Parsons, for example, described Stephen’s Hopi Journal as primarily a biography of ceremonial. Parsons added, however, that Stephen’s account gave many pictures of the cultural life in general and portrayed Hopi society as being held together by “ties which make alike for permanence or continuity and for elasticity and vitality” (Parsons 1936: 1; see Hinsley, this issue, for a similar perspective on Cushing’s portrayal of Zuni society).

While many aspects of Hopi society and culture were left untouched by Stephen and Fewkes, they nonetheless captured the essence of Western Pueblo social organization, that is, the dynamic relationship among population diversity, religious complexity, and social power. Through the study of kinship structure, they uncovered important clues about the most critical source of Hopi wealth and inequality, which was the ownership and inheritance of agricultural land (Levy 1992; Titiev 1944; Whiteley 1988). Their research added a unique dimension to the Mindeleff’s records of Hopi architecture by providing a means to correlate living space with social and ritual activities and the oral history behind them.
Figure 1. Old Orangi. Photo by J. K. Hillers, ca. 1881 (Arizona State Museum Photography Collections)

Figure 2. Shipaulovi. Photo by J. K. Hillers, ca. 1881 (Arizona State Museum Photography Collections)
Alexander M. Stephen

Alexander M. Stephen was born in Scotland and graduated from the University of Edinburgh. He arrived in the United States in 1862 and came to Tusayan in 1881, where he befriended Thomas Keam, the trader (James 1990: 193). From Keam he learned Navajo, the lingua franca of the Colorado Plateau at that time. In 1882 Stephen recorded the first systematic observations of Hopi, in connection with the Mindeleff’s study of Hopi buildings (Parsons 1936: xx). Although the bulk of Stephen’s journals date between 1891 and 1894, throughout the 1880s he maintained long-term friendships with the Hopi of First Mesa as well as with their Navajo neighbors, thus providing a glimpse at Hopi-Navajo relations (Parsons 1936: xx).

Stephen’s fieldwork at Hopi, albeit cut short by his premature death at Keam’s Canyon in 1894, was a seminal contribution to the study of Hopi culture and society, comparable in depth and detail to that of the Mennonite missionary Heinrich R. Vogt (1905). Stephen “possessed the confidence of the principal priests” according to Victor Mindeleff, and thus was of great assistance to them as well and to Fewkes (James 1990: 196). After Stephen’s death, Fewkes organized and published many of Stephen’s observations and also edited and expanded his notes.

The Mindeleff Brothers

Victor and Cosmos Mindeleff had been working on Zuni architecture throughout 1881 and subsequently went to Hopi to continue their research. Aided by Stephen, the Mindeleffs proceeded to document systematically the building history, technology, variability, and associated social and ritual observances in several Hopi villages located on First, Second, and Third Mesas (V. Mindeleff 1891; C. Mindeleff 1897; see Longacre, this issue). In addition, they also recorded architectural information on nearby ruins and the cliff dwellings of the Verde Valley (C. Mindeleff 1896a), which was in turn integrated with migration traditions that tied ancestral homes to the different clans (C. Mindeleff 1900). Overall, the Mindeleffs’ “Study of Pueblo Architecture in Tusayan and Cibolá” was imbued with a dynamic view of the built environment and an almost uncanny perception of the processes of construction, use, and abandonment of Pueblo settlements. This particular characteristic of their work was further developed in Cosmos Mindeleff’s reconstruction of the occupation sequence at Casa Grande Ruins National Monument in Arizona (Mindeleff 1896b).
J. W. Fewkes (figure 3) arrived at Hopi in 1891 as the director of the Hemenway Southwestern Archaeological Expedition and enlisted Stephen's aid. From the beginning of his research at Hopi, Fewkes was fascinated with the antiquity of the pueblos and their relationship with prehistoric ruins. From Stephen and Mindeleff he learned of the migration traditions that spoke of such relationships, a knowledge that he furthered through ethnographic and archaeological investigations (e.g., Fewkes 1893, 1896a, 1896b, 1898, 1904, 1907, 1911a, 1911b, 1913, 1916). During the years he worked for the BAE he returned to Walpi almost every summer and conducted numerous archaeological excavations of the surrounding pueblo ruins, including Awatovi, Sikyatki, and Homolovi (Fewkes 1893, 1898). While the BAE ethnographers who preceded him at Hopi had contributed ethnographic collections to the Smithsonian museum, Fewkes undertook the task of obtaining archaeological specimens, and particularly pottery, to enrich the museum collections. He published extensively on his researches (see Walker, this issue), many of which were an expansion of Stephen’s earlier work.

During Powell’s tenure at the BAE, the main emphasis of ethnographic field research was to collect data; interpretation, generalization, and analogical constructs were to be left for later times, when enough information would warrant a synthetic effort (Stegner 1982: 269). Thus Fewkes’ research stands out from that of many of his contemporaries as having a very specific purpose, a theory that he wished to prove regarding the origin of Hopi clans. In a letter addressed to F. W. Hodges, he explained this theory:

I want someday to emphasize in print my “composite origin” and “theory of the Hopi” It [sic] the great discovery of all ages!! A ray of light illuminating the darkness of american ethnology!! . . . I hope to show reasons for the belief that the Hopi are composite in their acts, ceremonials, language, and life. (Fewkes ca. 1898)

In the process of developing this theory, Fewkes stepped beyond the traditional evolutionary framework that saw prehistory as the static testimony of earlier stages of evolution. Having researched carefully the migration traditions of the First Mesa clans, he interpreted the archaeological record as part of the Hopi developmental history. To reconstruct this history, he attempted to integrate environment, ritual, kinship, oral tradition, and archaeology. In his study of “The Kinship of
the Tusayan Villagers” (1894a), for example, Fewkes characterized the Hopi ancestors as semi-sedentary feudal groups that had come together on the Hopi Mesas after moving about the landscape (1894a: 397, 417). The evidence, he thought, was the ruins left behind after disastrous wars, famine, or disease forced the clans to migrate toward Hopi, as were the claims of ownership over ancestral homes, springs, springs, eggs, and other resources used by the clans’ ancestors (e.g., Fewkes 1893, 1900, 1905, 1906). This was the source of his theory of the composite character of the Hopi.

Fewkes’ convictions challenged Powell’s linguistic reconstruction of culture regions (Powell 1891; see Shaul, this issue). In “The Kinship of a Tanoan-speaking Community in Tusayan” (1894b), he used the history, kinship, and linguistic data from the Tewa of First Mesa to argue against the fallacy of assuming that linguistically homogeneous groups would share the same cultural stock or vice versa. He concluded:

The persistence of the language of their forefathers, notwithstanding the changes in their blood kinship, illustrates in a striking manner a liability to error in supposing in all cases that two peoples speaking the same tongue are necessarily more closely related racially than those which are linguistically different. It is believed that in some cases, as a result of the rigid adherence to the matriarchal law, language may survive after racial kinship has changed. These possibilities are of profound importance in speculations as to the kinship of the Hopi themselves, as we shall try to show in subsequent articles. (Fewkes 1894b: 167)

And so Fewkes undertook large-scale excavations and surveys, while continuing with ethnographic work. Even though his perseverance and outspoken criticism of the prevailing research framework at the BAE did not earn him favor in Washington, Fewkes continued to research and publish his findings well into the twentieth century.

In sum, through a combination of polemic, persistence, and passion, the BAE compiled and documented in objects, film, recordings, and reports the incredible diversity of Hopi culture and society. How well were the Hopi of the time portrayed in these documents? It is fair to assert that, despite the theoretical bias, methodological shortfall, and cultural stereotype BAE scholars brought into the study of American Indians, at Hopi they accomplished the institution’s research goal. In their papers there is evidence of the complexity of this culture, its infusion of
ritual into the individual, social, and political roles of the everyday life, and rich oral traditions that connected the Hopi to their land, their past, and their gods. From these papers a sense develops of Hopi as a product of place and of the intricate cultural connections that defined this place and created a context for Hopi—a sense that has dazzled subsequent generations of anthropologists.

Although cast in a quaint evolutionary framework and accomplished through salvage ethnography, the BAE's documentary record provides the basis for placing these people in a historical context at once preserved through their efforts and lost to the myriad other forces of change of the day. The BAE documenters kept alive aspects of the history of a people in things and ideas that serve all Americans, especially the Hopi of today. Use of this documentary record by contemporary archaeologists is a tribute to its value, which is the subject of the following section.
SUBSEQUENT USES OF BAE DOCUMENTATION
OF DIVERSITY AND CHANGE

By the 1910s, Americanist archaeology had taken a direction opposite to and partly in reaction to much of the BAE work. Morgan’s evolutionary approach to culture was being rejected in favor of the historical particularism of Franz Boas. In the American Southwest, archaeologists such as Nels Nelson and A.V. Kidder began to develop the time-and-space framework that would soon become the central tenet of culture history (see O’Brien and Lyman, this issue).

Although from the foregoing discussion of the BAE and its political milieu it is clear that the intent was to document Hopi culture prior to its extinction, most information was judged—and still is judged in some cases—as having been collected indiscriminately. Thus, most prominently, Fewkes was criticized for his acceptance of clan oral history as fact and his uncritical application of Hopi oral history to the archaeological record at Mesa Verde, in northeastern Arizona, and elsewhere. In fact there was a strong opposition to the eclectic methodology of the BAE from Kroeber (1917) and Kidder (1968 [1924]). In reaction to the BAE scholarship, both archaeologically and ethnographically, Kidder (1968: 266-67) wrote:

The ruins of the Little Colorado drainage are for the most part reduced to low, inconspicuous mounds... The result of it... is that a classification based on architectural features is impossible without house excavation, very little of which has ever been done, almost all investigators having contented themselves with digging in the easily found and extremely prolific burial grounds. ... The trouble is that most work in the Little Colorado... has been carried on by explorers who have placed more reliance upon the clan-migration legends of the Hopi and Zuni, than upon the empirical evidence offered by the ruins and their contents. Hence the stricter archaeological aspects of the problem have been to a large extent disregarded.

While condemning their lack of concern or understanding of temporal variation, Kidder nonetheless unwittingly borrowed the concept of the social and cultural homogeneity of Pueblo culture which the Mindeleffs and many others derived from Lewis Henry Morgan’s evolutionary theory. His concern was in building the space-time contin-
uum for the ancient Pueblo Southwest, but yet Kidder (1968: 343-44) could not part ways with the idea that the Pueblos had changed little, managing to preserve some pristine aspects of their ancient lifeways:

Few races have gone as far toward civilization as did the Pueblos while still retaining the essential democracy of primitive life. Most other peoples, as they advanced from savagery, have first set up for themselves, and later fallen under the domination of, rulers temporal or religious; aristocracies or theocracies have sprung up, and the gap between the masses and the classes has become wider and wider. But among the Pueblos no such tendency ever made headway; there were neither very rich nor very poor, every family lived in the same sort of quarters, and ate the same sort of food, as every other family. Pre-eminence in social or religious life was to be gained solely by individual ability and was the reward of services rendered to the community.

From the 1930s to the mid-1950s, ethnography became dominated by structural/functionalist models which wanted to know how cultures worked. Archaeology was viewed as a partner to ethnography in the work of Eggan (1973) and even Titiev (1944), who were influenced by the evolutionary focus of White (1932) and Steward (1937). Archaeology enabled these ethnographers to apply a time depth to their evolutionary schemes on social organization. Adoption of a structural/functionalist philosophy stimulated archaeologists to investigate settlement patterns and to develop the school of cultural ecology. Such functionalism also created the stimuli for further ethnographic analogy beginning in the 1950s, as for example, Haury (1956), Martin and Rinaldo (1950) and, later, Longacre (1970).

*Ethnographic Analogy and the Question of Change*

Ethnographic analogy was frequently simply the application of the direct historical approach, often using Hopi. In Kidder's early work (1968: 150, 343-44), quoted previously, and in various applications of evolutionary schemes by Steward (1937) and structural/functional studies of Eggan (1973: 11-12) and Titiev (1944: 96-102), the pueblos became an aggregate, based largely on interpretations of Hopi social organization. This interpretation was further emphasized in these ethnographers' applications of their models to the existent archaeolog-
ical record and achieved scientific legitimacy in the early days of the New Archaeology. James Hill (1970: 19), for example, stated that “there is little doubt that ethnographic evidence can be of great value in archaeological interpretation—although the idea is still more often utilized by ethnologists than archaeologists.” Because Hill (1970: 19) was working at Broken K Pueblo in the upper reaches of the Little Colorado River, he relied on western Pueblo ethnography and assumed “that western Pueblo social organization and culture have changed slowly since A.D. 1200 or 1300, or there have been no changes drastic enough in that time to invalidate ethnographic inference.”

Although Hill (1970: 19) acknowledged Spanish contact, he stated that “most of the changes, at least until quite recently, have been relatively unimportant.” Nevertheless, the ultimate critique of Hill, Longacre (1970), and other “new” archaeologists’ work was based more on their assumptions about formation processes than their naive use of ethnographic analogy (Schiffer 1987: 323–38). Archaeologists’ ability to interpret the ethnographic record was further complicated by Parsons’ (1933: 76–77) early assertion that political complexity, which had long been acknowledged by Pueblo scholars, was due to Spanish influence. This long-enduring assertion became a core of complexity debates between Grasshopper and Chavez Pass archaeologists (Cordell, Upham, and Broek 1987; Reid et al. 1989). Upham (1989) has characterized this uncritical use of ethnographic analogy and the direct historical approach as the “composite Pueblo model” (not to be confused with Fewkes’ “composite theory of Hopi”), which portrays these societies as politically acephalous and socially egalitarian. Although Upham attributes this model to Bunzel (1938) and Dozier (1970), as noted previously, this uniformitarian perspective goes all the way back to Kidder (1968 [1924]).

Archaeologists continue to make the same mistake. They have taken revolutionary works, such as Kidder’s and Eggar’s, and reified them. They trusted rather than critiqued—they viewed models as ideas set in stone (Cordell 1989). Thus beginning in 1917 with Kroeber, canonized in 1924 with Kidder and later with Eggar (1973), continuing into the 1980s with Upham (1989) and Cordell (1989), and living in the 1990s with McGuire and Saitta (1996; McGuire 1997), the BAE and contemporaneous research of the 1870–1900 period has been mined for information and reinterpreted according to intellectual trends favored at one time or another, but also denounced as biased, unproductive, and politically incorrect.
TOWARD A REASSESSMENT OF BAE RESEARCH

Recently, critical reading of Titeiv (1944) and Eggn (1973), who utilized Dorsey and Voth (1904), Fewkes, Stephen (Parsons 1936), and the Mindeleffs (1891; 1900), has created a new generation of discovery in the interpretation of social organization, ritual, and complexity. Much relevance is being recognized in early Hopi scholarship. For example, Whiteley (1985, 1986, 1988) and Upham (1989) have critiqued Eggan and Titeiv in their reconstruction of Hopi social organization. They note the inequality of power in Hopi society as manifest in ownership of land and control of ritual knowledge. Jerrold Levy (1992) has further confirmed a strong link between control of land, ceremonial position, and social (clan) ranking of individuals having high status in Hopi society; however, Levy emphasizes that social stratification was recognized by Eggan and Titeiv.

Another pivotal issue in the reconstruction of ancient Pueblo social organization is the role that ethnic diversity played in the development of religious integrative strategies and social power. Originally, Stephen, the Mindeleff brothers, and especially Fewkes, acknowledged, through their research of origin myths, that the Hopi villages were the result of multiple ethnic groups or “clans” coming together to form single sociopolitical entities. This view, advanced by BAE ethnographers, was later lost in the midst of functionalist arguments that portrayed the Pueblos as homogeneous, unchangeable, democratic societies. Yet, recent research on community formation in the late prehistoric period (Adams 1991, Cameron 1995, Zedeno 1997) indicates that the Pueblos, and particularly the Hopi, were indeed an ethnic “composite” as Fewkes had once imagined.

This reassessment has led archaeologists to once again search the incredible wealth of data compiled by A. M. Stephen, J. W. Fewkes, V. Mindeleff, C. Mindeleff, and their progeny. From a perspective of the study of human behavior, BAE research has gained new relevance for modern scholars of ancient Pueblo culture. Analogues are no longer specific elements of Hopi culture. The cross-cultural pattern that stresses the centrality of ritual behavior in defining power in middle-range societies (Adams 1996; Adler 1989), for example, has rendered irrelevant the earlier focus on the impact of contact and resultant change from Spanish and Anglo influences (cf. Parsons 1933, 1939; Upham 1989). What BAE scholars documented was the rich and patterned detail of the Hopi ritual record as the integrative fabric holding Pueblo society
together, defining power, and maintaining organizational complexity. Details of ritual behavior, associated ritual objects and ritual space, and access to ritual knowledge are the exemplary byproducts of BAE research.

Of paramount importance to archaeologists is the fact that BAE scholars were object-oriented; issues such as basic formation processes—abandonment behavior, discard—and the continuity of object life history from the ethnographic (or systemic, sensu Schiffer 1976, 1987) to the archaeological domains were discussed and debated by BAE scholars (Fowkes 1894a, 1894b; C. Mindeleff 1897, 1900; V. Mindeleff 1891; see Walker, this issue). Maps, photographs, and sketches of objects in situ and in cultural context have enabled archaeologists to predict patterns in the archaeological record. BAE ethnographers witnessed and documented instances of disposal of objects and abandonment of structures and even villages, thereby plowing fertile ground for current archaeological theory and method.

Nineteenth-century records are offering new opportunities to students of ancient Pueblo society and archaeologists in general for examining the material manifestations of power and ideology. For example, the rich potential of ritual behavior in the archaeological record has recently been explored by Adams (1991), Walker (1995a, 1995b, 1996), and others (Karunaratne 1997; LaMotta 1996; and Walker, LaMotta, and Adams 1996). Through knowledge of the byproducts of ritual acts in terms of artifacts, artifact disposal, and ritual space gained from BAE documenters, it is possible to assess the differential distribution of ritual in the archaeological record. This allows one to quantify differences in power within aggregated villages in terms of the control of ritual objects. Archaeologists are now able to identify ritual in the archaeological record, trace its differential distribution in time and space, and begin to reconstruct social organization and complexity on the basis of behavior and not on the objects themselves. Thus, it is the behavior and resultant traces that are modeled from ethnographies and that provide insights into ancient Pueblo behavior, not culture-based acts affected by contact and other processes. These behaviors have vast cross-cultural correlates.

The new approaches have encouraged appreciation for the detailed research and data recovery methods of nineteenth-century BAE scholars at Hopi. Without their foundational research and recording, none of our present understanding of ancient Pueblo culture would be possible, nor would there have been a source and stimulus for debate and intellectual growth during the twentieth century.
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