

his own interpretations, and by this procedure he was able to revise superficial interpretations (without adhering exclusively to one) by consulting their commentaries as ethnographic data.

So it is not surprising when he confesses that “my readings of these myths would be different now, not only because of my advanced linguistic proficiency but also because of my greater knowledge of the cultural context” (xxv). In other words, he believes that the interpretation should be modified according to the refinement of the tools and skills available to analyze the oral tradition. We can appreciate the author’s confidence in his work as the characteristic of an artisan, and the result of more than fifty years’ residence in Colombia carrying out anthropological research. Such self-assurance is expressed in several epigrams about Tukanoan studies that are recorded in the book, especially in the Introduction; it appears as if he were leaving his last testament to the next generation.

The author compares the Tukanoan oral tradition to a “treasure house” (xix). If this is the case, the problem is how to get the treasure out of it. Reichel-Dolmatoff’s contribution may be illustrated by pursuing his analogy of the worldwide motif of the treasure house, which in most versions is protected by a man-eating monster that turns out to be killed by a clever hero after the deaths of other challengers. Using this well-known motif as an analogy, we can identify what Reichel-Dolmatoff’s great achievements were: he clarified the structure of the treasure house; he gave us a general understanding of the man-eating monster’s characteristics that can be used to destroy it; and he led us to the entrance of the house so that we can find the treasure. Reichel-Dolmatoff was not, of course, eaten by the monster; he died leaving us an unrivaled treasure like this book, the result of his long and patient devotion to Tukanoan studies. We must thank our great anthropologist and devise ways to use his rich legacy for future study.

KATO Takahiro
 Mie University
 Tsu, Mie Prefecture, Japan

TEIWES, HELGA. *Hopi Basket Weaving: Artistry in Natural Fibers*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1996. xxvi + 200 pages. Figures and color plates, glossary, bibliography, index. Cloth US\$45.00; ISBN 0-8165-1613-8. Paper US\$19.95; ISBN 0-8165-1615-4.

The author of *Hopi Basket Weaving: Artistry in Natural Fibers* is a German-born professional photographer who has worked for the Arizona State Museum since 1966. Both as part of her work and as a personal pursuit, she has been documenting the life of the southwestern Indians. She dedicated the book to Professor Emil W. Haurly, with whom she once worked at the Hohokam site in Snaketown, south of Phoenix, and whose financial support of the museum allowed the author to document Hopi basketmaking and write this book.

The book consists of excellent photographs taken by the author. Many of the photos are portraits of Hopi basketmakers that not only accurately illustrate the contents of the accompanying text about technical facts (e.g., how to split yucca leaves and coil a bundle of the gal-gal grass with them) but also convey abstract ideas such as the respect for plants and the closeness to nature that the basketmakers and the author “cherish.” Teiwes carefully records with pen and camera Hopi basket weaving to show and interpret for us what she has witnessed among the Hopi.

The pages about basketmaking on Second and Third Mesa will be of interest to readers. Besides technical matters, the author also tells us about the basketmakers’ daily lives, personal

histories, and the rituals and taboos surrounding basket weaving of both the past and present. The technical information that Teiwes recorded illustrates the exact structural and aesthetic reasons for basketmaking in general. For instance, Teiwes recorded carefully a comment made by Bessie Monongye while collecting materials for a wicker plaque: "One should cut, for the weft element, stems of sivaapi that are thinner than warp materials, so that one can weave in wefts densely enough to cover the warp perfectly, which is critical for well-made plaques." One can find many such descriptions showing Teiwes's perfect understanding of what she was told by the experienced basketmakers. As for taxonomy of basketry, I agree with Teiwes that plaiting and wickerwork differ. Though both consist of two structural elements intersecting at ninety degrees, in plaiting the two elements should be homogeneous and equal in function (i.e., interchangeable), but in wickerwork one element, called the "warp," should be stronger than the other, called the "weft" (SEKIJIMA 1986, 12–14). This is the primary difference between the two.

One note made by Teiwes that caught my attention as a contemporary basketmaker was about the name of a plant. Teiwes writes on pages 47 and 48:

Until recently one could read that scrub sumac is also used as the warp material in wicker plaques and baskets, but I know that at least today *siwi* [*Parryella filifolia*] is used instead. Perhaps there was a misunderstanding almost a hundred years ago when researchers tried to write down the Hopi word for sumac. Otis T. Mason, in his report for the U.S. National Museum at the Smithsonian in 1902 gives the Hopi name for *Rhus trilobata* (sumac) as "si'ibi". He heard the Hopi word correctly, although according to Emory Sekaquaptewa the correct spelling is "siwi." In any case the plant was misidentified: the Hopi name for scrub sumac is *suuvi*.

I checked two editions of Mason's books that were readily available. One was Peregrin Smith's 1976 edition; the other, Dover's 1988 edition of a reprint of Doubleday's 1904 edition. Both include the report mentioned by Teiwes. I found in both that Mason gave the name "si'ibi" for *Rhus trilobata* on pages that listed plant names (see page 210 of the former book and page 36 of the latter). However, MASON recorded: "Wicker baskets are made at the Hopi pueblo, Oraibi. The radiating framework [i.e., warp] is a slender shoot of *subi*, *Rhus trilobata*" (1976, 504; 1988, 453). This passage and the one by Teiwes made me think not only about how complicated it is to identify plants, but also about the possibility that new and different materials might have been used at certain times and under certain circumstances. I cannot help thinking that even in traditional crafts there may be some factors that are more subject to change than we think. I know that many basketmakers by nature are innovative and flexible.

After reading through the book one should understand well the meaning of Teiwes's preliminary comment: "Hopi basketry is closely linked to the social interactions of Hopi families and clans. One could say that the natural fibers of which basketry items are made are symbols of the fibers that bind Hopi society and culture together" (xx–xxi). The contents of this book make it easy to see how basketmaking is conducive to holding together Hopi identity. The nature of basketmaking among the Hopi has shifted from a means of producing vessels to be used for their own needs to a means for members of Hopi society to pay back debts or to fulfill an artistic impulse; in either case they still make baskets as a labor of love and with excellent traditional techniques.

REFERENCES CITED

MANSON, Otis Tufton

1976 *Aboriginal American Indian basketry*. Santa Barbara: Smith, Inc.

- 1988 *American Indian basketry*. New York: Dover Publications.
SEKIJIMA Hisako
1986 *Basketry*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

SEKIJIMA Hisako
Basketmaker
Tokyo