

S. Gladwin, Emil W. Haury, James A. (Al) Lancaster, Robert H. Lister, Earl H. Morris, Jesse Nusbaum, and last but not least, the much publicized mummy called “Esther.”

Zeke Flora and Esther are central figures in this drama. Zeke “excavated” Esther from “Federal Lands”, claimed her as his own and thus became involved with government officials and academicians. But, Zeke had his supporters in the local newspaper editor, many Durango area citizens and even Harold S. Gladwin, who employed Zeke for periodic work in the Durango area for Gila Pueblo.

The current discussions of the role and relationships of Cro-Magnon Homo sapiens and Neanderthals is not new to Durango archaeology. Zeke, in a series of radio talks, newspaper articles and letters advocated the existence of “Durango Man” as a Neanderthal. E. A. Hooton and Carleton Coon get cited and misquoted in this matter.

The interpretation of the early Basketmaker occupations in the Durango vicinity is, however, the main source of aggravation between the Flora and professional camps. Here Florence Lister gives a thought-provoking presentation of the philosophies of the day regarding the responsibilities of academicians to share their thoughts and findings with the interested, tax-paying public. This discussion has definite ramifications in today’s world and its even-handed documentation is important both historically and as these situations continue to plague fund raiding and research today.

I dealt with Zeke Flora briefly in the mid-1960s. He was dogmatic, single-minded and energetic. He caused aggravation and also stimulated research, if for no other reason than to attempt to produce evidence that his viewpoint was not absolutely correct. The book cover photo of Zeke Flora shows him in a typical pose—steely-eyed and exposing artifacts with his favorite excavating tool, a butcher knife.

Today, Durango, Colorado, has a city archaeological committee and a “code” involving cultural resources within city boundaries. How we got to this point is historically important and fun reading.

Nampeyo and Her Pottery, by Barbara Kramer. 1996. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, xiii+224 pages, illustrations, appendices, index. ISBN 0-8263-1718-9. Cloth, \$39.95.

Reviewed by

Jonathan E. Reyman
Anthropology Section
Illinois State Museum
Springfield, IL 62703-3535

Pueblo pottery and Pueblo potters have long been of interest to anthropologists, artists, and other scholars. Pueblo pottery has been a focal point of government, museum, and individual collecting activities for well over a century, beginning with the work of Major John Wesley Powell and later Colonel James Stevenson on behalf of the U.S. Geological Survey and the Bureau of (American) Ethnology. Anna O. Shepard pioneered technical studies of archaeological ceramics based on the pottery of Pecos Pueblo and on sites on the Pajarito Plateau of New Mexico; and Ruth Bunzel’s *The Pueblo Potter* (1929) is an early classic in the field of anthropological studies of ceramics. Alice Marriott’s biography, *Maria: The Potter of San Ildefonso* (1948) is an early study of a particular Pueblo Potter.

Biographical studies of both individual potters and pottery-making families have proliferated in recent years, e.g., the late Lucy Lewis and Marie Chino of Acoma, the late Helen Cordero of Cochiti (creator of the Storyteller figurines), and Margaret Tafoya of Santa Clara have all been subjects of such studies. Barbara

Kramer has now contributed a biography of Nampeyo, the Hopi-Tewa (or more properly, in my opinion, Tewa-Hopi) woman of Hano on First Mesa, one of the earliest known potters and certainly the most important one in terms of the revival of Hopi ceramics that began before 1900.

The dust jacket notes state that this volume “is the culmination of fifteen years of research,” and the publisher’s press release states: “The only reliable biography of the artist responsible for revitalizing Hopi pottery also presents the first stylistic analysis of her work.” The author combines research into the few original documents pertaining to Nampeyo, research into other historical materials such as correspondence and photographs, interviews with Nampeyo’s descendants, and her own analyses and interpretations to produce a useful, if flawed account of the potter and her work in their historical context.

The book is divided into two parts: Part I provides some historical background and a chronological narrative of Nampeyo’s life illustrated with a good complement of photographs, a few of which are not widely known (e.g., Figures 7 & 8). From this, the reader obtains a good overview of the basic biographical data. Kramer corrects some misconceptions and factual errors, and we are indebted to her for setting the record straight. For example, she makes it clear that Nampeyo’s husband, Lesso, was neither a factor in the revival of Hopi-Tewa ceramics nor an assistant in the production of potters as was Julian Martinez in the development of the Santa Clara matte-painted blackware made famous by his wife, Maria; she corrects the matter of the published date of Lesso’s death (7 May 1930, not 1932); and Kramer also clarifies the position and activities of Nampeyo’s brother, Tom Polaccaca, in the history of First Mesa — Tom Pavatea, and not Tom Polaccaca, opened and operated the trading post at First Mesa through which Nampeyo sold some of her pottery to obtain household necessities. However, the historical context that forms the background for Nampeyo’s life is marred by some rather sloppy scholarship resulting from the author’s bias against J. Walter Fewkes and a few of his contemporaries and co-workers (see below).

Part II is a heavily illustrated discussion of Nampeyo’s pottery and that of her daughter, Annie Healing. The 16 color and 8 black-and-white plates (pp. 147-158) are excellent, and the inventory of vessel profiles and painted designs (pp. 179-188) favored by Nampeyo will help other scholars to identify her pottery (almost all of which was unsigned) as well as Annie’s pottery. The chapter titled, “Stylistic Analysis of Vessels” provides a descriptive, historical chronology of Nampeyo’s ceramic production divided into five periods. Although this chapter is a bit superficial and repetitive in terms of materials presented earlier in the volume, it is useful for comparative purposes with other works on Hopi and Hopi-Tewa pottery.

“Appendix A: Published Fallacies and Erroneous Photographs” is a summary (again somewhat repetitive of materials presented earlier in the book) that suffers from some important omissions. Kramer states a published fallacy: “That Nampeyo’s brother Tom Polacca operated a store around which the village of Polacca grew” and then notes, “Tom Polacca had alienated First Mesa residents, who would not have patronized a trading post operated by him” (p. 191). It would have been worth noting that Polacca was founded in 1888 at the locality of the Moqui (Hopi) Agency day school that had been established to promote the education of Hopi children. Appendix B is a genealogy of Nampeyo’s family, and Appendix C provides maps of the area. The map of the Hopi villages omits Bacavi and Moencopi (pp. 200-201). The maps of First Mesa and Hano as of 1886-1887 are not referenced in terms of who drew them, and the distance scale for First Mesa lacks the 300’ mark (pp. 202-203).

The author gives no attribution for the quotations she cites from the interviews she conducted. She does this because her purpose is “. . . not to analyze a disparity between factions of an extended family or to exacerbate them” (p. x). One can understand her motivation, but one problem that arises from this is that it is difficult to know how credible a source is on matters of fact. It is reasonable to assume that Nampeyo’s grandchildren - lineal descendants - would have better personal information about her than would more distant kin - either collateral or affinal relatives. Without attribution, the reader cannot assess how accurate

the quoted source might be. Contrary to Kramer's assertion (p. x), the stories do not "speak for themselves." For example, in the discussion of how Nampeyo learned to make pottery (pp. 13-14), knowing who said what and the individuals' relationships to Nampeyo would help the reader to evaluate credibility.

Problems also exist with the historical data and facts of both Tewa and Hopi culture that are presented. Kramer states that katchinas appear at Hopi between the winter and summer solstice (p. 3). However, Niman, the ceremony when the katchinas return to their homes in the San Francisco Peaks, occurs after the summer solstice, not before it. The author states without reference (p. 15) that in the early 1860s, hundreds of people died of starvation due to drought. There is no question that post-Contact times were difficult for the Hopi. Historic records (summarized in Rushforth and Upham 1992:107-122) indicate that the population was reduced by 60% or more during the 1851-1853 smallpox epidemic; other epidemics occurred before and after this one, and thousands died. The records do not indicate, however, that drought during the 1860s resulted in hundreds of deaths from starvation, though migrations of Hopi people to Zuni Pueblo in the 1820s, 1850s, and 1860s, some caused by drought, did significantly reduce the population of the Hopi mesas. It is also worth noting that these Hopi-Zuni contacts resulted in the exchange of cultural traits, among them the introduction of the Zuni rain-bird motif into Hopi pottery decoration (Wade and McChesney 1981:17, *passim*).

Kramer states that, in the 1880s, the Hopi were "living in a present unchanged from the past" (p. 18). One need only note that her own statements about the Hopi herds (sheep), other animals (e.g., horses), and foodstuffs (e.g., peaches), all introduced by the Spanish, disprove her contention that the Hopi were "unchanged" from their past.

There are other problems with historical data and their interpretation. For example, the author states that following the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, "One hundred and fifty years of relative isolation allowed the people [Hopi] to celebrate life without intrusion" (pp. 63-64). This is simply not true: the Spanish made numerous attempts to reconquer and missionize Hopi, of which the attempt by Governor Don Juan Bautista de Anza (1780) was only the latest (see Montgomery, et al. 1949:18-40) for a comprehensive discussion of this). Kramer identifies George Wharton James as "... a writer of colorful but shallow travelogues" (p. 62) apparently unaware that his book, *Indian Basketry* (1902) is considered a classic study and has gone through four editions and several reprintings. Tension and jealousy among the Hopi-Tewa (p. 15) was no doubt real, but it probably reflected the endemic factionalism among the Tewa, seen also among the Rio Grande villages, as much as it resulted from problems within the two Corn Clan groups and between the Corn Clan and the rest of the village. Finally, a typographic error puts the founding of the Franciscan mission at Awatovi in 1692 (p. 63) rather than in the correct year of 1629.

Among the more valuable contributions to the history of American anthropology in this volume are Kramer's documentation of: (1) the compulsive and massive collecting practices of museums and individuals (pp. 28-33), (2) the deliberate attempts to destroy Hopi culture through forced federal school programs and government sponsored missionization (pp. 35-42, 61-67, 113-114, *passim*); (3) vandalism and site destruction as a serious problem in the southwest as early as 1900 (p. 95); and (4) the government assisted exploitation of the Hopi by private firms such as the Fred Harvey Company and the Santa Fe Railway (pp. 87-94, 101-108, *passim*). The Hopi profited financially from their relationships with commercial firms, but the vast majority of the profits went to the companies. The economic principle of supply and demand was ignored by American businesses in the case of the Hopi when they, and the traders such as Lorenzo Hubbell who maintained the reservation posts, tried to increase their profits from the great demand for Hopi pottery.

A central concern throughout the book is the role of Nampeyo in the revival of Hopi ceramics, specifically the revival of Sikyatki-like decorative motifs. Scholars argue about the degree to which Nampeyo is responsible for the revival (cf., e.g., Fewkes 1919, Wade 1980, Wade and McChesney 1981), but none denies that

she played an important role. Kramer's position in the debate is clear: throughout the book she argues, quite convincingly, that Nampeyo - not Thomas Kean and certainly not J. Walter Fewkes was the impetus for the revival as well as the creator of the pottery. In arguing her position, however, Kramer badly distorts the data of the published record.

There is no question, for example, that Fewkes was not well liked by many of his contemporaries. This is clear from the historic documentation that survives (see, e.g., Hinsley 1981:201, 281). Kramer's dislike of Fewkes is so personal and intense, however, that it leads her to make unwarranted statements about him vis-à-vis Nampeyo. Kramer states, "His [Fewkes] frequent self-contradictions, a propensity for disparaging the work of others, and a compulsion to prove his own preconceived theories compromised many of his findings" (pp. 44-45). This might be true, but Kramer has done the same thing.

Kramer writes, "He [Fewkes] criticized Nampeyo by name for cleverly copying those vessels that he unearthed, implying that they were being sold as the ancient ware itself" (p. 44). Kramer gives no source to support her assertion, but a check of Fewkes (1919) reveals the following quotation:

"In that year [1895] Nampeyo visited the excavations at Sikyatki and made pencil copies of the designs on mortuary bowls. From that time all pottery manufactured by her was decorated with modified Sikyatki symbols ... This modified Sikyatki ware, often sold by unscrupulous traders as ancient, is the fourth or present epoch of Hopi ceramics. These clever imitations, however, are not as fine as the productions of the second epoch . . . There is a danger that in a few years some of Nampeyo's imitations will be regarded as ancient Hopi ware of the second epoch ..." (Fewkes 1919:218; emphasis mine).

Clearly, it is "unscrupulous traders" who are guilty of deception, and not Nampeyo. Furthermore, this statement by Fewkes is not a criticism of Nampeyo. Kramer later (p. 118) cites much of the above quotation but continues to argue that Fewkes criticized Nampeyo and made disparaging comments. As far as I can tell, these comments consist of his statement that Nampeyo's pots were "clever imitations" of Sikyatki ceramics. This statement does not seem disparaging to me but rather complimentary, especially in light of Fewkes's prediction that in years to come, it will be difficult to distinguish between the original Sikyatki pottery and Nampeyo's pottery. Clearly, Fewkes considered her pottery exemplary.

Kramer's dislike of Fewkes colors her narrative with regard to others. For example, in discussing the materials collected by Alexander M. Stephen and Fewkes relationship to Stephen, Kramer writes (p. 52) that after Stephen's death (18 April 1894):

"While Kean eulogized his friend in the solitude of the barren hills, Fewkes . . . began to discredit Stephen's pioneering role in anthropology. Fewkes had valued Stephen's objectivity, meticulous attention to detail, and integrity, and he had incorporated his observations of Hopi life and culture into his own reports while Stephen was alive. After Stephen's death, however, Fewkes denigrated his source as 'that enthusiastic student, the late A.M. Stephen.'"

The source of the Fewkes' quotation is *Tusayan Migration Traditions*, published in 1900. The full sentence from which Kramer excerpted the above quotation reads as follows: "Some of these legends have never been collected, although considerable work of great value which was done in this field by that enthusiastic student, the late A. M. Stephen, was published in Mindeleff's account of the architecture of Tusayan" (Fewkes 1900:578579). Again, this is complimentary, not denigrating.

Elsewhere Kramer writes (p. 44) with regard to Stephen: "Because his empirical studies were made without a sponsor, however, he was overshadowed by those working for established institutions, who were ensured of publication and recognition by the scientific community. Stephen's journals were not published until

1936, and then in edited form." It is unfortunate that it took more than four decades for Stephen's journal to find its way into print. Kramer is apparently unaware, however, that the original journal was not in publishable form and remained so until Elsie Clews Parsons undertook to edit it, at her expense. Her editing did not omit any significant material; indeed, she improved the readability and usefulness of the raw journal through her organization of the materials and the addition of her notes and comments and the creation of appendices and an index. Stephen collected and recorded the primary data, but Parsons' editing make the Hopi Journal of Alexander M. Stephen a classic Pueblo ethnography.

Kramer has produced a useful book. Unfortunately, personal bias toward Fewkes, some poor scholarship, and the lack of careful editing diminish its quality. It is worth reading, but it must be read carefully and critically.

References Cited

Bunzel, Ruth M.

1929 *The Pueblo Potter: A Study of Creative Imagination in Primitive Art*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Fewkes, Jesse Walter

1900 *Tusayan Migration Traditions*, 19th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Part 2, pp. 573-633, Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.

1919 *Designs on Prehistoric Hopi Pottery*, 23rd Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, pp. 207-284. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.

Hinsley, Curtis M., Jr.

1981 *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846-1910*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.

James, George Wharton

1901 *Indian Basketry*, privately printed, Pasadena, California.

Marriott, Alice

1948 *Maria: The Potter of San Ildefonso*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Montgomery, Ross Gordon, Watson Smith, and John Otis Brew

1949 *Franciscan Awatovi: The Excavation and Conjectural Reconstruction of a 17th Century Spanish Mission Establishment at a Hopi Indian Town in Northeastern Arizona*, Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Vol. 36, Cambridge.

Parsons, Elsie Clews (editor)

1936 *Hopi Journal of Alexander M. Stephen* (2 vols.), Columbia University Press, New York.

Rushforth, Scott and Steadman Upham

1992 *A Hopi Social History: Anthropological Perspectives on Sociocultural Persistence and Change*, University of Texas Press, Austin.

Wade, Edwin L.

1980 "The Thomas Keam Collection of Hopi Pottery: A New Perspective," *American Indian Art Magazine*, 5(3):54-61.

Wade, Edwin L. and Lea S. McChesney

1981 *Historic Hopi Ceramics: The Thomas V. Keam Collection of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology*, Harvard University Peabody Museum Press, Cambridge.

Images of the Recent Past: Readings in Historical Archaeology, edited by Charles E. Orser, Jr., Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, 1996. 477pp. 47 figures, 47 tables, references

Reviewed by

Susan Malin-Boyce

Department of Anthropology

New York University

When searching for a reader in historical archaeology this volume is the place to start. Charles Orser has collected some fine examples of historical archaeology for this publication that spans over a decade of research. They introduce method, theory, the underlying philosophical issues behind theory, and the application of all of these to archaeological data sets of the historic period.

The volume is organized thematically into six sections each with its own introduction. In all there are twenty chapters and Orser's introduction to the volume. The first and final sections offer perspectives on the state of historical archaeology as an endeavor, both in the United States and abroad. The remainder of the volume presents case studies in several categories. Though these categories seem somewhat arbitrary given the breadth of the material covered, they do serve to juxtapose articles facilitating an appreciation for the complementarity of varied approaches.

Part I (Recent Perspectives) includes two papers that provide both retrospective and contemporary views that situate historical archaeology as a discipline. Kathleen Deagan's (1982) paper reviews historical archaeology past and present, examining the sometimes competing definitions for the practice, as well as its orientation that has variously drawn more or less heavily upon the fields of history, archaeology, or anthropology. Barbara Little (1994) literally picks up where Deagan leaves off, identifying the change in focus that has emerged in the intervening decade. She discusses the role of historical archaeology as the archaeology of capitalism, and advocates the field's responsibility to correct histories drawn exclusively from documents. Combined, these two papers provide an excellent overview for the theoretical perspectives presented in subsequent chapters.

People and Places (Part II), presents a number of case studies, projects of varied scope and duration, that graphically demonstrate the development of the discipline itself. David Hurst Thomas's fifteen year study of the settlement at the Mission Santa Catalina de Guale parallels the expansion of historical archaeology in general as the project is transformed to incorporate the regional landscape to explore interactions between European settlers and the indigenous population. In a completely different methodological approach, Michael Parrington, Helen Schenck, and Jacqueline Thibaut compile excavation data collected by a half dozen different investigators for four encampments at Valley Forge. The diversity of encampment structures and arrangements presents a striking contrast to Washington's orders for the standardized construction of these bases. The two chapters that follow examine aspects of disenfranchised people, poorly represented to documentary sources. Plantation slave archaeology is the subject of Theresa Singleton's chapter in which she provides a sweeping review of current studies in the archaeology of slavery, while Edward Staski distin-