

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Nebraska Anthropologist

Anthropology, Department of

2004

COMPARISON OF THE TRADITIONAL AND CONTEMPORARY
EXTENDED FAMILY UNITS OF THE HOPI AND LAKOTA (SIOUX): A
STUDY OF THE DETERIORATION OF KINSHIP STRUCTURES AND
FUNCTIONS

Benjamin Grant Purzycki

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nebanthro>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Purzycki, Benjamin Grant, "COMPARISON OF THE TRADITIONAL AND CONTEMPORARY EXTENDED FAMILY UNITS OF THE HOPI AND LAKOTA (SIOUX): A STUDY OF THE DETERIORATION OF KINSHIP STRUCTURES AND FUNCTIONS" (2004). *Nebraska Anthropologist*. 68.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nebanthro/68>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Anthropology, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nebraska Anthropologist by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

COMPARISON OF THE TRADITIONAL AND CONTEMPORARY EXTENDED FAMILY UNITS OF THE HOPI AND LAKOTA (SIOUX): A STUDY OF THE DETERIORATION OF KINSHIP STRUCTURES AND FUNCTIONS

Benjamin Grant Purzycki

Drawing on a body of classical and contemporary ethnographic resources, one finds a number of conflicting conclusions and assumptions in not only the evolutionary role of the extended family and its functions, but also—in a post-colonial context—how these units as well as their roles and functions change. When comparing a number of sources, we find that extended families are explained in diametrically opposed terms (e.g. some say extended families result from hunter-gatherer societies while others attribute it to agricultural groups), creating conflicting theory obviously not considered together as often enough—hence the necessity of comparative study between traditionally agricultural Hopi and hunter-gathering Sioux.

By comparing these two drastically different groups, through kinship terminology to particular facets of the two family extensions, one concludes that the two extended families looked at drastically differ in function, while remaining quite similar in form. On the one hand, traditional Hopi extended families functioned as an economic extension, whereas the Sioux extended families functioned primarily as a military extension.

Introduction

By looking at two very different American Indian nations, both traditionally and contemporaneously, we find a number of interesting facets of extended families, how they are useful, how they have changed, and how their differences have influenced the familial structures in a colonial context. The Hopi, pastoral agriculturalists, serve as the quintessential example of matrilineal clan structure (and matrilocal residence) whereas the Sioux, traditionally hunter-gatherers, serve as an anomaly on a number of fronts regarding our anthropological knowledge and approaches to social structure and kinship organization.

When extended families are closely examined and compared, we find a disparity in their respective functions. The Hopi, employing an *economic extension* traditionally established a

vastly different (in function) family extension system from the Sioux, who developed a *military extension* family system. Certain facets of both kinship terminologies and practice inform and reinforce the nature and specific functions of the respective extensions. When we examine the processes of colonialism and the assimilation programs installed by the United States government, we find the installation of mechanisms in order to specifically and systematically alter these types of extended families.

As a note, the terms *Oceti Sakowin* (translated as Seven Council Fires), Sioux, and Lakota will be used interchangeably. *Oceti Sakowin* literally means “Seven Council Fires”, a term which the Sioux use to denote themselves, including bands, clans, *tiospaye* (extended families), and individuals. Lakota is used due to the author’s use of the Lakota language

rather than the dialects of the Dakota or Nakota.

Traditional Hopi Social Organization

The Hopi Pueblos, located in the northeast corner of Arizona, have endured a number of changes in their social structure due to a number of factors. Traditionally pastoral-agriculturalists, politically, the Hopi were a male-based, theocratic society, while domestically the women had much more power. In other words, Hopi men were responsible for farming and religious duties, more or less monopolizing the latter, whereas elder women were in charge of most household rules and affairs and were the sole owners of the house and other resources as discussed later. With an initial glimpse of the household, an apartment or "house block" consisted of the basic nuclear family. Because the Hopi are a matrilineal social organization, also included would be, according to Earnest Beaglehole, "unmarried or widowed brothers and sisters of the wife, married daughters, their husbands and children, and also widowed or divorced sons" (1937: 5). Mischa Titiev adds that "a natural thing for a Hopi woman to do in the event of a sister's death is to adopt the children of the deceased, an act that implies no change either in residence or terminology, and that scarcely affects the tenor of household life" (1971: 10). Obviously, with this concerted focus on the matriarch's kin and their residence, the nuclear family model is not applicable unless there are not any of the above to live in a family's block, but would of course if they existed. The size and scope of Hopi families, with notions of familial identity formulate the

designations of the Hopi clan system.

According to Richard Maitland Bradfield, the Hopi clan, or *nya mu* is composed of three fundamental characteristics: a) "All the members of the clan are supposedly *descended from a single ancestress*, the foundress of the clan"; b) "Traditionally, the principal kinds of property... were held *in the name of the clan*"; and c) "Each clan *has its own name*, its own sacred objects (*wuya*), and its own clan house in which the sacred objects are stored" (1995: 10. Emphasis in original.). In other words, Hopi clans claim a relationship with the same female ancestor, collectively own specific property, and are responsible for their respective religious articles and storage units.

As the members of the clans are all related to a "single ancestress," according to Harry C. James, "the clan relationship system... is based upon unilateral descent through the mothers of the tribe" (1956: 39). According to Beaglehole, the individual, on the other hand, has "obligations and duties of both groups of kindred... [;] his bilateral kinship affiliations" (1937: 6). An interrogation of this conflict is in order if we are to understand both the individual's obligations as well as how the extended family is maintained *vis-à-vis* economic and religious participation.

Bradfield writes that "while certain limited resources (e.g. wild-seed tracts) remained the property of the community as a whole, the principal resource, namely agricultural land, was vested in (matri-) lineages; post-marital residence was firmly matrilineal; and the individual family or household" (1995: 376). Among the number of things the matriarch of the household is responsible for are household utensils (Titiev 1971: 16; Beaglehole 1937: 10), "bedding of

sheepskin and rugs, the simple furniture...basketry, as well as the corn and other produce stored in the house, but produced by her husband or male relatives...[and she] controls clan lands assigned to her household, the garden plot...orchards and the peach house" and all of the (Beaglehole 1937: 10) and all of the "produce from the land" (Clemmer 82). Interestingly enough, "if a married man builds a new house away from the house block of his wife's people, as occasionally he may to escape conflicts with his wife's parents, the house becomes the wife's property and descends to her daughters" (11). Similarly, as noted by Harry C. James, while a husband lives with his wife and her family, "even after marriage he continues to consider the house of his mother and of his sisters his real home" (1956: 40). This is only a scratching of the surface, however, of the Hopi household.

On the nature of the household itself, Fred Eggan writes that "the relation of sisters to one another-and to their mother-is the foundation of the Hopi household group. This relationship, based on the closest ties of blood, residence, and common occupation, lasts from birth to death and influences their lives each day" (1950: 36). Sisters are responsible for each other's children and share all of the labor. Eggan notes that "sororal polygyny is not practiced, nor is there any tendency toward the sororate or levirate" (36). Also, "the importance of the bond between siblings...does not find expression in...fraternal polyandry" either (112). A mother sometimes turns over the house to a favorite daughter, but usually the eldest sister inherits the control of the household" (36). Dorothy Eggan notes that "divorce among the

Hopi was extremely simple—a dissatisfied husband took his belongings elsewhere, a disgruntled wife merely set her husband's possessions outside her door" (1944: 2). It is quite clear that the matriarch of the Hopi household had an impressive amount of power both within and outside of the household. As the nucleus of the household and extended family, a mother's influence and role surfaces in the Hopi vocabulary as well.

We see the structure of the household group reflected in Hopi familial terminology. Ego's father is called *Ina'a* as well as an uncle who marries into the extended family. According to Titiev, *Ina'a* is used for "Father, father's brother, father's sister's son, mother's father's brother's son, mother's father's sister's son, all men belonging to the father's clan...[and] all husbands of an *ingu'u*" (1971: 17). *Ingu'u* translates as "mother" and is used for aunts in the matrilineage as well. Cousins, regardless of gender, are called *Itiwaiya*. These cousins are only called *Itiwaiya* if they are offspring of members of the extended family (cousins married in are called *Imu'wi*) (Titiev 1944: 8-9; Bradfield 1995: 275. The latter source uses the term *iñü'ü* for mother and mother's sisters.). It is clear that the kinship terminology employed by the Hopi reflect that of extended family kinship systems insofar that similar terms are used for those who are siblings within the same household.

In terms of participation in public affairs, ranging from decision-making to ritual life, the Hopi were clearly patriarchal in this respect. Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford M Lytle write that "the original Pueblo government was a theocracy of priests who filled offices derived from supernatural or religious sources. A council of priests represented

the Pueblo in its internal self-governing aspect, and their function was what we would today describe as judicial—the interpretation of tradition, the articulation of custom, and the application of existing beliefs in new situations” (1988: 19).

To conclude, it is necessary to classify the specific *type* of extended family the Hopi had in order to distinguish between both other variations of the extended family as well as the extended family system which “exists” presently. It would seem accurate to call it an *economic extension* due to the fact that its functions were specifically for food production, clan maintenance and perpetuation, and it ensures property for offspring. There is a tacit assumption, however, that needs to be addressed, namely that an extended family perpetuates because of marriage and child-bearing.

Contemporary Hopi Social Organization

Whiteley notes that “there is at least one obvious problem with using classical descent theory as an explanatory system for Hopi society: The Hopi have refused to remain frozen in the ethnographic present of 1932 through 1934 [when Titiev and Eggan conducted their fieldwork]” (1998: 56).

However, many aspects of traditional Hopi social structure survive today. Presently, there are roughly 30-40 clans in total on the Hopi reservation (Bradfield 1995: 10). According to Richard O. Clemmer, “Hopis continue to determine descent, inheritance of certain kinds of non-moveable property such as houses, and clan affiliation through the female line,” (1995: 13) although “a change of matrilineality to patrilineality

might be predicted” due to a number of developments in the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century:

growth in the importance of large herd animals; political influence from a larger society of more hierarchically organized neighbors, the Americans; permanent invasion of the ecological niche by communities of Navajos; and the possibility for men to acquire economic wealth independently of women through selling labor, crafts, livestock, and wool (82).

In other words, as larger herds become more necessary for better living, outside influence, and simply better methods of acquiring income would likely drive males to seek income elsewhere (land not owned by wives). Considering males were traditionally solely responsible for the harvesting and shepherding, and traditional rates of growth do not facilitate comfortable living now, women will have an increased dependence on men as they are bringing the income in from other sources.

While this may be the case, Scott Rushforth and Steadman Upham note that beginning around 1910, there has been “a decline in the significance of lineages, clans, and phratries. This decline is accompanied by an increase in the importance of nuclear families as residential and economic units,” indicating the infiltration of the national, or arguably *global*, economic system (1992: 159, 168). This is supported by the (then) emerging neolocality of Hopi newlyweds. Titiev notes that “under present conditions there is an increasing tendency for young couples to build houses for themselves...Nevertheless, all houses belong to women and are transmitted only to female heirs” (1971: 16). So there are surviving qualities of

the *nya mu*, but as economic independence, rather than codependence, emerges, the function of the extended family dissolves. In sum, it is quite clear that the breakdown of the traditional Hopi extended family and the developing nuclear family model was for economic reasons, rather than i.e. an extended family could not support itself on a cash-economy basis, as detailed above.

Emily Benedek writes that the “[traditional] Hopis have historically resisted the concept of a Tribal Council. Each village considers itself an independent entity. Its residents are members of different clans, each has slightly different clan stories, and even the language differs across the mesas” (1992: 30). Benedek notes, concerning political influence: “Because each of the fourteen Hopi villages considers itself an autonomous unit and because clans within the villages compete for authority on certain matters, it is often difficult to come to a consensus” (44). In other words, traditional Hopi communities (clusters of *nya mu*) act independently of one another, thereby rendering an overarching governing body invalid in both practicality and principle. The traditional division of labor and responsibilities maintained a more or less balanced public and private politics with little to no reason for creating a congress, as economic self-sufficiency was maintained. We see this process of change in the extended family structures of the Lakota Sioux as well. However, there are many differences as the primary functions and various aspects of the extended families of the Sioux are quite different from those of the Hopi Pueblos.

Traditional Sioux Social Organization

Not much is really known about the Sioux prior to European invasion, although there has been some speculation that they once inhabited what is now known as South Carolina, farming, getting pushed out by the Iroquois circa 1500 (Mails 1990: 13). What *is* known is Sioux residence in Wisconsin and Minnesota (*mni water + s + óta* many; Buechel and Manhart 2002: 201, 479) but, as Thomas Mails writes, for “all intents and purposes the Sioux are a people who came into being in the late 1600’s, when first they moved as a nation into the Midwest and buffalo country” (1990: 13) considering what is seen as “traditional” Sioux culture and spiritual belief and practice is based on the surrounding area and its non-human inhabitants of the Plains region including the Black Hills (Looking Horse 1987: 67; Brown 1989; Neihardt 2000; Lewis 1990).

Pasternak, Ember, and Ember note that “In bilocal societies people may trace descent through either parent, or may provide some other basis for supra-family organization apart from common descent” (1997: 214). This is the case in what we know of Lakota social organization. In addition to our lack of understanding of the Oceti Sakowin during their woodland residence, there is a general lack of understanding of the structure of Lakota households or localities. In all of the literature reviewed for this essay, not one offers a kinship chart regarding post-marital residence. This is a result, which is demonstrated below, of the flexibility of locality due to what is likely the status of the respective fathers of the married couple.

Like the Hopi, foundations of the

social structure and organization of the Sioux (*Oceti Sakowin*) reside in the extended family, (*tiospaye*) although they serve quite different purposes. Royal B. Hassrick writes that “bands were extended family units headed by a Band Leader chosen for his war record and his generosity. Such a leader was often the patrilineal head of his family, responsible to them and to his division for its proper functioning” (1944: 339). Here Hassrick, not alone, uses “clan” and “*tyospe*” (sic) interchangeably, while elsewhere, he calls the “*tiyospe*” (sic) “clannish” (1964: 12; Powers 1986). The important factor to note here concerning the crystallization of *tiospaye* is what is valued in a leader, namely a prestigious history of battle.

While “polygamy was commonly practiced by the wealthy... monogamy was considered highly virtuous” (Hassrick 1944: 339). What Hassrick neglects to note, however, is how “wealth” was determined among the Lakota. Wealth, in terms of the Lakota, should be equated with status, rather than an amount of material possessions. As noted by John G. Neihardt, “you had to be a great warrior and a good man to attain the chieftainship” (1985: 320). In other words, good warriorship was the measurement of who qualified for a prestigious position in Lakota polity.

Marla N. Powers writes, without providing any references, that “there is some speculation, based on kinship terminology, that the Dakotas were originally matrilineal” (1986: 25). While, like the Hopi, the same term (*Ina*) is used for both mother and mother’s sister, we find that the Lakota term for father (*Ate*) is also used for father’s brother, unlike the Hopi. There are also similar terms for aunts/uncles-by-marriage (*Tunwinla/Leksila*

respectively) used for women married into the mother’s and/or father’s family (Saskatchewan Indian Cultural Centre). However, a much better indication of this is the fact that, also like the Hopi, “men owned nothing but their clothing, a horse for hunting, weapons and spiritual items; homes, furnishings, and the like were the property of their wives” (Jaimes and Halsey 1992: 318). This suggests that the Lakota were matrilineal at one point but there were not different terms for mother’s relatives and father’s relatives (as seen among the Hopi). For all intents and purposes, the Sioux practiced bilocality or neolocality, for *all* uncles and *all* aunts are the same term (when a male is speaking, he uses *Leksi/Tunwin* respectively) (White Hat 1999: 16). Hassrick comments on post-marital residence, although not explaining how it is determined specifically:

Young married couples might live briefly with one or the other’s parents, but this was inconvenient and for any length of time unworkable, because of the avoidance taboo among parents-and [sic] children-in-law... As a result, a young couple was usually given a tipi to be pitched in front of one or the other parents-in-law’s lodges, where they might enjoy the proximity of their family without the embarrassingly difficult situations occasioned by the taboo (1964: 98).

Considering the nature of how prestige is measured among the Lakota, upon marriage, one would gravitate to the *tiospaye* with the most respected leader as its head. In effect, post-marital residence among the Sioux fell somewhere between bi- and neolocality.

According to Thomas Biolsi, “in the third quarter of the 19th century, [the Sioux] were an equestrian, bison-hunting, warring, ‘stateless,’ social form

in which the primary sociopolitical units were kinship-based, leader-centered bands (*tiospaye*) and larger intermittent, ecologically and militarily strategic political clusters" (1995: 29). Hassrick notes the fundamental reason for Sioux organization in this respect:

Such a family tended to ensure the large force of man power necessary for communal hunting and concerted war activity. A solitary man, his wife, and small children would be at an extreme disadvantage in acquiring sufficient meat and in gathering an adequate supply of wild fruits and vegetables to sustain themselves for long periods. In addition, they would be easy prey to marauders" (1964: 12).

In sum, the combat-prestige of a male dubbed him leader of the *tiospaye*, which is formed on the basis of safety and food collection. Biolsi's notion of a "militarily strategic political cluster", however, is incorrectly attributed to the "larger" formation of Lakota groups (the *Oceti*, or Council Fire; see section I.), as the *tiospaye* is the foundation of all ecological and military strategy. Coupled with the fact that "Lakota women traditionally maintained at least four warrior societies of their own," it is clear that the organization of the *Oceti Sakowin* was designed for military purposes (Jaimes and Halsey 1992: 316; Powers 1986: 87). We see this in traditional marriage practice as well as another interesting aspect of Lakota alliances.

This aspect was the *kola*, or "particular" friend (Buechel & Manhart 2002: 182). The bond between two *kolapi* was extremely important and interesting facet of Sioux kinship. Albert White Hat Sr. writes that "to acknowledge another man as a [*kola*] is to commit to that individual for the rest

of your life. They say if a [*kola*] gets shot down in battle then his [*kola*] has to go in and rescue him" (1999: 18). The bond between two *kolapi* (pl.) extended much further as well in traditional Lakota social life. Hassrick writes that a *kola* was "literally obligated to marry the wife of his deceased *kola*... There is an indication that two men in the relationship of *kola* might have sexual access to the same woman, and that exchange of wives between *kola* was an expression of that relationship" (1944: 340). In other words, the camaraderie between two *kolapi* was extremely strong, with potential wife-sharing (no other source mentions this quality of this relationship, however). Nothing in the available literature questions the nature of the living *kola*'s new relationship with the extended family of his deceased comrade, let alone the state of the extended family he leaves. One could conjecture that the wife and children of the deceased would join the living *kola*'s *tiospaye* and his kinship duties would become twofold.

According to Ward Churchill, "[a]nother aspect of traditional Lakota community organization has always been the direct interaction of the various Tiospayes in comprising a multifaceted, multilevel national governing structure... [i.e.] 'participatory democracy'" (2002: 414). The *tiospaye* as a political organization is further supported by the fact that "Ultimately... Lakota marriage was an exogamous union that cemented an alliance between two *tiyospayes*" (Steltenkamp 1993: 11-12). As the conditions of both economic, residential, and military life of the Sioux have changed over the years, the concomitant altering of the *tiospaye* occurs as well. Contrary to the Hopi, who maintained

traditional structure far longer, the Sioux *tiospaye* has undergone a number of changes.

Contemporary Sioux Social Organization

Hassrick writes that "as a result of the generalized disintegration of the Plains Indian culture, there is a loosening of the lineal and collateral bonds within the society" (1944: 347). The reason, he claims, for this "generalized disintegration" is that "band organization has become submerged in the struggle for individual security brought about by the extinction of the buffalo, and the horse and war economy" (347). Marla N. Powers, in response to one Lakota woman's criticism, writes that "the *tiošpaye* has changed, and if it has become 'dysfunctional,' it is because its few political functions have been supplanted by the U.S. government" (1990: 495). In the target source, she states that "The presence of different [religious] denominations provided a framework to keep the old *tiošpaye* alive even though it was now politically and economically defunct" (1986: 193). As described below, this is not the case. Along both lines, and more recently, Thomas Biolsi argues that the creation of a Foucauldian "matrix of individualization" and "subjection" caused the breakup of the *tiospaye* (1995).

Biolsi breaks the process of "subjection" into four modes, namely "emproptiment, competence, degree of Indian blood, and registration of genealogy" (1995: 30).

"Emproptiment" reflects the Allotment legislation of the U.S. government. The passing of the General Allotment or Dawes Act of 1887, which divided land

according to individual and nuclear-family based ownership, was based on and carried out with a nuclear-family structure in mind. Deloria and Lytle write that this legislation was based on the following formula:

1. To each head of a family, one-quarter section (of land).
2. To each single person over eighteen years of age, one-eighth section.
3. To each orphan child under eighteen years of age, one-eighth section.
4. To each other single person under eighteen years of age living, or who may be born prior to the date of the order to the president directing allotment of the lands, one-sixteenth section (1983: 9).

Needless to say, it is clear that Allotment was based on individual and individual "family" ownership, which would dismantle the localities of the *tiyospayes*.

Biolsi's notion of "competence" refers to the weight and prestige given (by the U.S. bureaucratic agents assessing the Lakota) to various individuals in terms of how well they are assimilating (thus stimulating the desire to assimilate more in order to receive the benefits of doing so) (1995: 35-39). "Degree of Indian blood" refers to the method of measuring "blood quantum" in order for the U.S. government to both define *who* is an Indian as well and in doing so, undermining how the Indians define what being Sioux is (sovereignty) and taking the land which "mixed-bloods" of less than the quota of "Indianness" were allotted (40-42). In response, Yankton Sioux have "issued certifications of Indian identity to craftspeople who, although not biologically native, had been adopted and raised by enrolled tribal members from an early age" (Churchill 2003a: 41).

Biolsi notes that "closely

connected to the status of the blood quantum... was the administrative establishment and recording of an individual's genealogy. Family relationships—which quickly became *nuclear* family relationships listed under a male head and patronymic family name, whether or not the actual domestic unit looked like this” (1995: 42). In other words, lineages were recorded by the Office of Indian affairs as nuclear family units rather than who was actually living together. These records were the determining factor in establishing who were the “proper heirs” of land which a father was allotted (43). Biolsi does not claim military pacification (circa 1885) had little or nothing to do with the breakup of the *tiospaye*, he attributes these “modes of subjection” to internal pacification or “bureaucratic control” rather than military pacification (i.e. external) via the *very external* (to the Sioux) Office of Indian Affairs run by Euro-American bureaucrats (29).

During the insurgency period of the mid 1970s through the early 80s, (American Indian Movement and others), we see the use of the *tiospaye* reemerging as both its traditional military function, but also as a method of cultural renewal (Means 1995: 411). An example of this is the Yellow Thunder Tiospaye, which occupied a portion of the Black Hills of Wyoming (which by law, the Sioux should still rightfully own and have usufruct rights to the area. Matthiessen 1991; Churchill 2002: 113-134). While Yellow Thunder's occupation was eventually legally legitimated (Churchill 2002: 127), it fell apart and eventually became, in the words of Russell Means, “little more than a safer alternative to living on the streets or mooching from relatives... We

had lost our school, most of our children, and our spiritual commitment,” (1995: 436) not to mention defense from federal marshals (Ibid.; Churchill 2003b; Matthiessen 1991).

However, sometimes it is difficult to discern between the contemporary uses of *tiospaye* with that of “family”, with an implied nuclear structure, however. Alex White Plume, whose land is annually raided by the DEA to cut down the persistently recurring hemp crop there, has been noted as the “head of his Tiospaye (extended family)”, (Melmer 2003) whereas elsewhere these raids occur on “the White Plume Tiosape [sic] land”, (LaDuke 2002: 242) indicating a persistence of the *tiospaye*, although the literature available indicates it has become much more of an *economical extension*, rather than the traditional *military extension*.

There are a number of inconsistencies within anthropological literature, and quite a number of uncovered grounds both in terms of extended family formation, as well as function. The next section surveys a number of the more prominent problems found within socio-anthropological theory concerning family extension, their functions, and how the Hopi and Lakota can provide a few answers to questions, as well as serve as excellent examples of how present scholarship is limited.

Theoretical Considerations and Unanswered Questions

Whiteley states that while “structural-functionalism has long been debunked... there is a curious theoretical half-life for the understanding of particular cultures [which perpetuates its

use]" (1998: 49). He argues that "Hopi 'structure'...is not effectively addressed by structural-functionalist descent-theory models. Hopi social structures, especially clans, are not corporate entities formed around joint estates in property...and to transform them into such entities---especially via 'the lineage principle'---is to misconceive Hopi doxa and praxis" (49). In other words, Whiteley argues that Hopi matrilineages, among their social structure, are not group bodies, which revolve around the home because that belief misunderstands Hopi religion, which generally takes place outside of the home. Whiteley's "general" statement is clearly incorrect on account of his specific addressing of "the lineage principle." Whiteley sees "'structure' as an order of cultural value and protocol received from the past and engaging action via events" (30). In effect, the functions and forms of families (which the examples provided here should have illustrated well enough by now), let alone socially constructed institutions at large, are composed of the meaning and practice by the participants, rather than the actions and/or roles of and the participants themselves.

A. R. Radcliffe-Brown notes that "the concept of function...involves the notion of a *structure* consisting of a *set of relations* amongst *unit* entities, the *continuity* of the structure being maintained by a *life-process* made up of the *activities* of the constituent units" (1952: 298). In other words, offered by Jerry D. Moore, "social structure includes all interpersonal relations, the differentiation of individuals and groups by their social roles, and the relationships between a particular group of humans and a larger network of connections" (1997: 145). In effect, if one were to subscribe to this definition,

compartmentalization of the different social institutions within a social body will effectively and in much more detailed fashion provide a better understanding of those structures and their respective functions. If there is a contradiction where two structures meet or overlap, more investigation would be expected.

Returning to Whiteley, he "finds" a contradiction in structural-functionalism with what he (or more poignantly, *how*) observed. As opposed to "The vertical structure [of] matrilineal descent groups," Whiteley argues that it is "the horizontal structure that *intersects* the descent groups [which] comprises religious sodalities and kiva groups" (1998: 57). Kiva groups do, in fact overlap members, yet do not "reside" anywhere (as a matrilineage does), nor can it rely on itself for reproduction (as a household does). In sum,

Descent is an important concept for the understanding of Hopi society. However, its importance lies in the cultural use of descent as an idiom to delineate individual and group statuses and in the practical effect these statuses have upon social action, not in its supposed conformance to a rigid set of theoretical precepts about unilineal descent groups [that structural-functionalists do]" (79).

In other words, the "descent" should not have to mirror what *we* may think about unilineal descent, but rather how it is used as an expression, essentially, about defining the status of people and organizations and their impact on society. Whiteley, however is confusing the substance for shadow, or at least attempting to merge the two.

Clemmer attributes "this confusion [as stemming] from a failure to understand a fundamental point about Hopi social organization...: that clan

and lineage are *not isomorphic* with regard to one another. Neither was ever the primary unit, nor is there any reason either should have been" (1995: 311). In other words, not only do they not have a similar structure or appearance, but the ties are of a different origin and nature altogether as well. They differ in function and participants; a lineage comprises a household and the males which have left, while a religious clan has only men from various lineages. The lineage is a female gerontocracy while the religious clan is a male-only endeavor whose leadership is based on knowledge. Especially in the case of the Hopi sexual division of labor, (see below) structural-functionalism would clearly be a more prudent method to apply in order to obtain better accuracy as well as ease of interpretation.

On the nature of the extended family's function, M. F. Nimkoff and Russell Middleton note that the "paramount advantages of the extended family are economic" (1960: 217). Further, the "stability of residence [is] an additional circumstance making possible extended family organization, since a highly nomadic life militates against the development of large families" (224). It is quite clear this is not the case for the Lakota, considering extended families, adoption, and the making of *kolapi* clearly indicates that while "nomadic life" may "militate against" developing large families, carrying out successful war parties and strategies *warrants* extended families-and was quite central to the *tiospaye*. In other words, the "paramount advantage" of the extended family for the *Oceti Sakowin* was military prowess.

When considering Nimkoff and Middleton's explanation of extended families, it is important to look at

historical examples of the Lakota *tiospaye* as a form of military extension. While Francis Paul Prucha notes that the bison slaughters of the mid-late 1800s "destroyed the Indians' independence and ability to wage war," we find that this lack of resources actually *increased* the military operations of the Lakota (1986: 179). In effect, the Lakota *tiospaye* and the military raids they carried out were about *control* of resources, rather than *collection* of resources. A prime example is the devastating conflicts between Lakota and Pawnee over bison, where the former were by then equipped with guns and the latter not equipped with the military protection (from the Sioux) as promised by the U.S. for bison hunts (Wishart 1994: 181).

James H. Howard, quoting from a definition borrowed (from a lecture) by Leslie A. White, defines a clan as "a corporate kinship group the members of which consider themselves to be related and who trace their descent to a common ancestor. This ancestor, however, unlike that in a lineage, may be mythical...rather than a known person" (1979: 135). So, according to this definition, the Sioux were/are clearly not organized into clans, (as stated in Howard 1984: 87) as bloodline, marriage, or adoption determines who is in the *tiospaye* (White Hat Sr. 1999: 28). Returning to the concept of *kola*, an unanswered question is whether or not the making of two *kolapi* was ever (frequency would be likely difficult or impossible to calculate) performed on the wishes of members (likely the leaders) of two different *tiospayes* as a conscious effort to attain political alliance.

As mentioned above, some scholars (e.g. Hassrick, Powers) have

used “clan” and *tiospaye* interchangeably. The inherent problem with confusing these two forms is most apparent when Powers writes that “the *tiyošpaye*, sometimes numbering several hundred, came into existence as migrating groups of extended families fused with others” (1986: 26). While a tacit assumption of this statement, namely the political activity of the *tiospaye*, is mostly correct, she simply neglects the translation of the word, which when taken literally, accurately describes the word’s usage. *Ti* means “to live, dwell, abide” or “lives together”, while *ospaye* means “group,” let alone the translation of *Oceti Sakowin* (Seven Council Fires. Buechel & Manhart 2003: 304, 247; White Hat Sr. 1999: 28). It would be more accurate to call the *tiospaye* the *group which lives together* joined by, as Albert White Hat Sr. notes, “blood, marriage, or adoption” (28). If anything, a clan would be the people spoken for by the *itancan*, or “chief” at council meetings (Price 1994). The point here is not so much a push toward clarity and consistency in anthropological terminology, but the importance of political structure in Lakota social organization; confusing terms with extant Lakota terminology obscures both lexicons (anthropological and Lakota) and the structures they describe.

The Hopi provide one of the best examples which fall under Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo’s domestic and public dichotomy, with one major exception. She writes that “domestic...refers to those minimal institutions and modes of activity that are organized immediately around one or more mothers and their children; ‘public’ refers to activities, institutions and forms of association that link, rank, organize, or subsume

particular mother-child groups” (1974: 23). The Hopi clearly maintain their gendered roles this way, as women control the domestic sphere, whereas men control the public. The Hopi matriarchs are clearly in control over much more of the public domain than Rosaldo would predict, however. As an example, Beaglehole notes that “If a man wishes to present some of [his family’s] harvest to his sister or mother, he may do so freely only before it is received in his wife’s house. Thereafter he must ask his wife’s permission before disposing of field crops” (1937: 10).

On the other hand, regarding the Lakota division of labor, we find another interesting conundrum to Rosaldo’s definition of the public/private dichotomy. In terms of traditional Sioux labor, according to Powers, “women accompanied their husbands and brothers on the buffalo hunt and helped them butcher the buffalo,” indicating that women directly participated in the main source of food collection (bison) and preparation (1986: 83). That, in addition to the above-mentioned female warrior societies, further renders Rosaldo’s thesis invalid in this case. All in all, the question arises as to whether or not hunter/gatherer extended families around the world primarily function as military extensions, considering not only their rarity among extended family-based groups, but also their rarity among traditional peoples as a whole.

Pasternak et al. note that “matrilocality will occur only when the timing of purely external warfare requires women to do at least as much as men in primary subsistence” (1997: 225). This is clearly not the case for the Lakota who were bilocal/neolocal, although once again, we do not know if matrilocality was practiced originally

and carried into their movement west. Their use of warfare is historically proven to be exclusively external, both defensively and offensively (Wishart 1994; Prucha 1986; Hassrick 1964). The literature on the Hopi, on the other hand, does not provide any insight into whether or not purely external warfare was as evident, although it may be safe to assume that it was, given the rigidity of matrilocality. There is an interesting example, however, of internal historical conflict between two *tiospayes* that has lasted for four generations. When Jerome Crow Dog killed another *itancan* Spotted Tail over the latter's accepting money from the U.S. government (and a woman). According to Lakota tradition, when one kills another, this "bad blood" is carried through four generations. Chief Leonard Crow Dog writes that "The blood guilt is still there. Spotted Tail's blood is still dripping on me. It lasts four generations. My son will be free from it" (1995: 39). The Spotted Tails have since forgiven the Crow Dogs, although the Crow Dogs cannot go near the Spotted Tails without invitation (38).

Conclusion

As extended families have developed over the ages, we find their functions to be quite different when compared. The Hopi Pueblos, an example of economic extension—through a strict division of labor and ownership—are quite different from the military extension of the Sioux. The Hopi extended family could clearly be considered an archetypal example of agricultural matrilineal/focal extended families, as defined by Nimkoff and Middleton, while the Sioux clearly do not fall under many of the

generalizations of their work. By contrasting these two peoples, we logically find the different functions and can come up with the reasons why these distinctions are evident.

By looking at the changes of these family extensions over time, due to colonization and U.S. imperialism, we find a number of surviving qualities of the traditional family structures, how they have adapted, and how they have changed—all of which reemphasize traditional forms of household groups.

The theoretical work, which attempts to understand and explain these groups, has been successful in some areas, while weak in others. This diachronic comparative study hopefully strengthens socio-anthropological endeavors as well as raises questions which are not answered.

References Cited

- Beaglehole, Ernest.
1937 *Notes on Hopi Economic Life*.
New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Benedek, Emily.
1992 *The Wind Won't Know Me: A History of the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Biolsi, Thomas.
1985 "The IRA and the Politics of Acculturation: The Sioux Case". *American Anthropologist* 87.
1995 "The Birth of the Reservation: Making the Modern Individual among the Lakota." *American Ethnologist* 22(1):28-53.
- Bradfield, Richard Maitland.
1995 *An Interpretation of Hopi Culture*. Duffield: Richard Maitland Bradfield.

- Brown, Joseph Epes
1989 *The Sacred Pipe: Black Elk's Account of the Seven Rites of the Oglala Sioux*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Buechel, Eugene and Manhart, Paul.
2002 *Lakota-English Dictionary*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Churchill, Ward
2002 *Struggle for the Land: Native North American Resistance to Genocide, Ecocide and Colonization*. San Francisco: City Lights.
2003a) *Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader*. New York: Routledge.
2003b) *Pacifism and Pathology in the American Left*. Oakland: AK Press. CD.
- Clemmer, Richard O.
1995 *Roads in the Sky: The Hopi Indians in a Century of Change*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Crow Dog, Leonard and Erdoes, Richard.
1995 *Crow Dog: Four Generations of Sioux Medicine Men*. New York: Harper-Perennial.
- Deloria Jr., Vine and Lytle, Clifford M.
1983 *American Indians, American Justice*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
1988 *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- DeMallie, Raymond J.
2002 "Procrustes and the Sioux: David M. Schneider and the Study of Sioux Kinship." in Feinberg, Richard and Ottenheimer, Martin (eds.). *The Cultural Analysis of Kinship: The Legacy of David M. Schneider*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Eggan, Dorothy.
1944 "Hopi Marriage and Family Relations." *Marriage and Family*
- 1950 *Social Organization of the Western Pueblos*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hassrick, Royal B.
1944 "Teton Dakota Kinship System." *American Anthropologist*. 46(3).
1964 *Sioux: Life and Customs of a Warrior Society*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1964.
- Howard, James H.
1979 "Some Further Thoughts on Eastern Dakota 'Clans'." *Ethnohistory* 26:2.
1984 *The Canadian Sioux*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- James, Harry C.
1956 *The Hopi Indians: Their History and Their Culture*. Caldwell: The Caxton Printers, LTD.
- Jaimes, M. Annette and Halsey, Theresa.
1994 "American Indian Women: At the Center of Indigenous Resistance in Contemporary North America". in Jaimes, M. Annette. Editor. *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance*. Boston: South End Press.
- LaDuke, Winona.
2002 *The Winona LaDuke Reader: A Collection of Essential Writings*. Stillwater: Voyageur Press.
- Lewis, Thomas H.
1990 *The Medicine Men: Oglala Sioux Ceremony and Healing*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Looking Horse, Arval.
1987 *Sioux Indian Religion: Tradition and Innovation*. Edited by DeMallie, Raymond J. and Parks, Douglas R. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Mails, Thomas E.
1990 *Fools Crow*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Matthiessen, Peter.
1991 *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse*. New York: Viking.
- Means, Russell.
1995 *Where White Men Fear to Tread: The Autobiography of Russell Means*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Melmer, David.
2002 "Hemp could be crop of the future." *Indian Country Today*. September 17. pp. D1-2.
- Moore, Jerry D.
1997 *Visions of Culture: An Introduction to Anthropological Theories and Theorists*. New York: Alta Mira Press.
- Neihardt, John G.
1985 *The Sixth Grandfather: Black Elk's Teachings Given to John G. Neihardt*. Edited by Raymond J. DeMallie. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
2000 *Black Elk Speaks: Being the Life and Story of a Holy Man of the Oglala Sioux*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Nimkoff, M. F. and Middleton, Russell.
1960 "Types of Family and Types of Economy". *The American Journal of Sociology* 66.
- Pasternak, Burton, Ember, Carol R., and Ember, Melvin.
1997 *Sex, Gender, and Kinship: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Powers, Marla N.
1986 *Oglala Women: Myth, Ritual, and Reality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
1990 "A Comment on 'Revisionist Limitations'". *American Anthropologist* (92: 495- 496).
- Price, Catherine.
1994 Lakotas and Euroamericans: Contrasted Concepts of 'Chieftanship' and Decision-Making Authority." *Ethnohistory* 41(3).
- Prucha, Francis Paul.
1986 *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R.
1952 *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Rosaldo, Michelle Zimbalist.
1974 "Woman, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview." in Rosaldo, M. and Lamphere, Louise (eds.). *Woman, Culture and Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rushforth, Scott and Upham, Steadman.
1992 *A Hopi Social History: Anthropological Perspectives on Sociocultural Persistence and Change*. Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Saskatchewan Indian Cultural Centre.
http://sicc.sk.ca/heritage/ethnography/dnl/family/boyslakota_kinship.html. Website.
- Steltenkamp, Michael F.
1993 *Black Elk, Holy Man of the Oglala*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Thompson, Laura and Joseph, Alice.
1947 *The Hopi Way*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Titiev, Mischa.
1971 *Old Oraibi: A Study of the Hopi Indians of Third Mesa*. New York: Kraus Reprint Co.
- White Hat Sr., Albert.
1999 *Reading and Writing the Lakota Language*. Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press.

Whiteley, Peter M.

1998 *Rethinking Hopi Ethnography*.

Washington: Smithsonian Institution
Press.

Wishart, David J.

1994 *An Unspeakable Sadness: The*

Dispossession of the Nebraska

Indians. Lincoln:

University of Nebraska Press.
