

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

Encountering Hopewell in the Twenty-first
Century, Ohio and Beyond

The University of Akron Press

2020

Vol.2 Cha.10 Twenty-first Century Hopewell

Mark F. Seeman

Follow this and additional works at: https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/encountering_hopewell

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Recommended Citation

Seeman, Mark F., "Vol.2 Cha.10 Twenty-first Century Hopewell" (2020). *Encountering Hopewell in the Twenty-first Century, Ohio and Beyond*. 19.

https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/encountering_hopewell/19

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by The University of Akron Press at IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Encountering Hopewell in the Twenty-first Century, Ohio and Beyond by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact mjon@uakron.edu, uapress@uakron.edu.

Chapter 10

Twenty-first Century Hopewell

Mark F. Seeman

The Third Chillicothe Conference in May 2016 represents a milestone in Hopewell studies, a gathering of scholars to take stock of findings regarding this enduring North American focus of archaeological inquiry. The resultant two volumes follow in the tradition of syntheses resulting from the first Chillicothe Conference of 1978 (Brose and Greber 1979) and the second Chillicothe Conference of 1993 (Pacheco 1996). To this listing should be added the “Perspectives on Middle Woodland at the Millennium” conference in 2000 held in Grafton, Illinois, which is viewed by some as the true companion to the First Chillicothe Conference (Charles and Buikstra 2006:xviii-xix). I’ve been fortunate enough to participate in all four of these sessions, both on the banks of the Scioto and of the Illinois, which strikes me as a very Hopewell-like pattern of interaction and idea-exchange.

My role in this most recent 2016 Chillicothe Conference was to highlight important trends in recent research, many of which are certainly well-represented by the conference papers themselves. The organizers asked that I focus on post-2000 developments, hence my title “Twenty-First Century Hopewell.” Over these last fifteen years the amount of Hopewell archaeology, and particularly Ohio Hopewell archaeology, has been vast, so even with this constraint in mind I must be selective. There is no question that a remarkable array of new techniques—geophysical, chemical, and geographical—has contributed to new twenty-first century perspectives on our

Ohio Hopewell archaeological record, as have new ideas about what to investigate. A look backwards to the first Chillicothe Conference in 1977 shows Hopewell at that time was still regarded mainly through the lens of culture history, with dates and decorated pottery sherds in the foreground, though a few papers were testing the waters of what was at the time the still new, very avant-garde domain of Binford's "new" or processual anthropological archaeology. Such approaches today seem a bit dated and simplistic, but do, at least for me, form a basis for comparison with Twenty-First Century Hopewell and the immense distance we have traveled in our understanding of this ancient, 2,000-year old archaeological culture.

OHIO HOPEWELL AS NATIONAL PARK

The concentration of Hopewell geometric earthworks built along the modest river valleys of southern Ohio during the first three centuries of the Common Era is remarkable. They are an enduring and highly significant achievement of Native American visionaries. These earthen construction efforts were planned carefully and were truly "monumental" in scale. The associated activity and artifactual record is replete with objects and arrangements showing the development of a symbolic system of a greater complexity than at any time previously in eastern North America (Penney 1989:249). Truly exotic raw materials such as copper, mica, silver, galena, meteoric iron, grizzly bear teeth, and obsidian were moving farther and in greater quantities than at any other time in the archaeological record of the midcontinent and were crafted into refined, but often highly conventionalized forms. Our most important job as Hopewell specialists is to carry these accomplishments to our twenty-first century public in ways that evoke the wonder, curiosity, and stewardship that we feel ourselves. It is up to us to make the Ohio Hopewell story come alive.

Yet the distinctiveness of Ohio Hopewell presents us with an interpretive dilemma; is it so unique that it must only be understood in its own terms, or can we find grounds for comparison with similar societies elsewhere and in so doing construct generalizations on our human condition? The former view seems to fit Byers' (in Volume 1) call to see Hopewell burial places as culturally specific "Hopewell Collective Burial Locales" or CBLs. It sets a path toward historicism and the humanities (Whitley 1998:13, 19). Or, if we seek a stronger tie to the social sciences and a comparative methodology, what then exactly are the appropriate and useful comparisons? Caldwell (1964:139), for example, compared Hopewell to the Battle Axe Culture of Europe and the Midewin Cult of the Upper Great Lakes; Bender (1985) to the Neolithic of Brittany; DeBoer (1997) to the Chachi of

Ecuador; Braun and Plog (1982) to the Western Anasazi; Artursson et al. (2016) to the Scandinavian early Neolithic; and Spielmann (2013) to the Enga of New Guinea. As Trigger (1989:346–347, 372–373, 378) makes clear, the notion of a historically unique Ohio Hopewell versus one couched in generalizing cross-cultural comparisons to societies in other times or on other continents is simply one example of a larger debate played out in many archaeological circumstances. Hopewell archaeology is a rich archaeology, and it is not surprising, therefore, that we often disagree on what particular practices might mean and how they should integrate with other aspects of culture. Debate and disagreement, however, are not altogether negative circumstances—as long as we stick close to the actual evidence and keep personal attacks to a minimum. Regardless of which of these divergent paths we take—humanity or science—a few things seem clear.

The present state of Hopewell studies truly permits multiple views and interpretations. But they are not all of equal value, especially when we consider the need to keep our connection to an interested audience through active engagement. Hopewell archaeology needs to ring with common sense and urgency, not intellectual esoterica. That is why I consider the development of Hopewell Cultural National Historic Park as the centerpiece of Twenty-First Century Hopewell archaeology.

Hopewell Culture National Historic Park (HOCU) began as Mound City Group National Monument by proclamation of President Warren G. Harding on March 2, 1923. It's officially expanded mission and new name were established by law in 1992. HOCU has prospered in the twenty-first century, especially with regard to new construction and land acquisitions. In 2000 and 2003, 153 acres were added to existing holdings at the Hopewell site. In 2001 and 2010, 159 acres were added to the High Bank site. In 2001, 2002, 2011, and 2014 a total of 263 acres were added at Seip. In 2009, legislation authorized the expansion of the park boundary by an additional 400 acres to include the Spruce Hill Works, 224 acres of which are now owned by the Arc of Appalachia Preserve System. Between 2006 and 2009 a visitor's facility and trail were constructed at the Hopewell site. In 2011 a new curation facility was constructed to serve collections and research needs. By initiating long-term research projects on these properties, notably Mark Lynott's (2009, 2014) project at Hopeton and others at Hopewell (Bauermeister 2010; Pacheco et al. 2013; Komp and Lüth, Volume 1; Ruby, Volume 1), the National Park Service has provided a sense of institutional commitment to a scale and to a coordination of endeavors that will propel Hopewell studies well into the twenty-first century.



Figure 1. A young Ohio girl collecting with her father in an Ohio field. How will she learn to value her Hopewell archaeology? *Photo credit: Chad Waffan.*

A protected and interpretable Ohio Hopewell landscape is growing in southern Ohio. Despite the centrality of pure research in this context, the presence and preservation of these grand Hopewell constructions—and the ability of the public to have authentic experiences with them—are the key to future Ohio Hopewell studies (Cameron and Gatewood 2000; Hargrave 2003; Knudsen and Waade 2010). Today about 35,000 visitors annually come to HOCU to walk in Hopewell footsteps. An anticipated UNESCO World Heritage status will enhance visitor expectations and outreach capabilities, at the same time potentially broadening the range of stakeholders wanting to tell the Hopewell story (McNiven and Russell 2008; UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2008). The continuing development of HOCU will provide all of us with the best chance to meaningfully engage the largest number of people in what we do and to develop our own brand (Gran 2010). And again, it cannot be boring, elitist, or overly speculative. In the last twenty-five years, nothing has garnered more public or media attention than the Great Hopewell Road (Lepper 1995, 2006) and we must collectively ask ourselves why this is the case and how do we bottle it! The enhanced capability of Hopewell Culture National Historic Park is the most encouraging development in twenty-first century Hopewell archaeology (Figure 1).

FAMILY TIES—REAL AND METAPHORICAL

The nineteenth and early twentieth century focus on mortuary contexts and mound-building gave antiquarians and early professional archaeologists a one-sided view of Ohio Hopewell societies. Where Hopewell peoples slept, ate, and conducted simple tasks in domestic contexts were really not investigated or deemed important, though as recently as the mid-twentieth century it was asserted that Hopewell houses were in fact to be found in the post mold patterns underneath many Ohio Hopewell mounds (Webb and Snow 1945). Prufer's (1965) work at the small McGraw homestead on the Scioto River floodplain challenged this perspective somewhat, as did Dancey's (1991) research at the Murphy site in the Licking Valley, both contributing to the development of a "Hopewell Dispersed Sedentary Community Model" (hereafter DSCM). Ohio Hopewell habitations were not within the earthworks and they were not typically in villages per se, but rather were small residential units composed of isolated or loosely adjacent sedentary, or semi-sedentary, households (Dancey and Pacheco 1997:21; see also Smith 1992:243).

The DSCM has had its detractors, in part because the evidence itself has been slow in coming and permits alternate interpretations (Byers 2015:219, 302–303; Cowan 2006; Griffin 1996; Lynott 2014:251–253; Yerkes 2006). Were Ohio Hopewell populations mobile foragers, sedentary food producers, or a mix of the two? One of the most important discoveries of the twenty-first century, therefore, has been the careful excavation of three complete Hopewell residential structures at the Brown's Bottom #1 and Lady's Run sites on the Scioto River floodplain near the Liberty earthworks by Paul Pacheco, Jarrod Burks and DeeAnne Wymer. These researchers are now investigating another Hopewell household farther north at the Balthaser Home site near the Circleville Works. Excavations have revealed substantial structures, interior and exterior storage facilities, thousands of pounds of fire-cracked rock, a slope midden into a buried paleochannel, front and side yard burials, substantial evidence for the use of domesticated plants, dog burials, and clear evidence for multi-season occupancy. These data help to clarify an important aspect of Ohio Hopewell life that has been debated for more than twenty years.

Several points need to be addressed with respect to the important discoveries at Browns Bottom #1 and Lady's Run. First, each investigation was greatly facilitated by geophysical technology, leading to the establishment of a protocol regarding how to prospect for such sites. The co-occurrence of strong bladelet concentrations on the surface and ground-truthed earth-oven signatures below the surface can be important predictors of Hopewell residential buildings. Second, the size, design, and

permanence of these structures suggest they were used by extended-family, multi-generational households with attendant production and property transmission capabilities. Each of these buildings were built to last a minimum of twenty years, and based on floor area, house more than ten people per structure (Kanter et al. 2015:179–180; W. Kennedy, pers. com. 2017). Cross-culturally, a permanent house carries with it a sense of belonging and a rootedness to ancestral lands (see Smith 2006:496–497). The reckoning of “generational time”—that is, the kind of long-term planning that involves the cooperation of successive generations—can be seen in these sophisticated structures, just as it can in the context of Hopewell earthworks, the renewal of ritual basins and shrine building floors, the transfer of heirlooms and repaired objects, and of course the famous once-in-a-generation lunar alignment at Newark. The passing down of responsibilities and prerogatives across time was an important dimension of Hopewell life, and cross-culturally is generally most associated with the prerogatives of lineages, gens, and/or clans and the concept of tracing descent to a common ancestor—real or mythic. The notion of Hopewell lineages and clans is not new to this discussion (e.g., Callender 1979:256; Cowan 1996:136–140; Greber 1997:215; Prufer 1964:73–74; Thomas, Carr, and Keller 2005), and indeed the existence of such organizations of kinfolk may extend well back into the Archaic period of eastern North America (Buikstra and Charles 1999:211–212).

The four-square architecture of Ohio Hopewell house walls and the complementarity in the placement of multiple hearths at Lady’s Run and Browns Bottom #1 show the emergence of new domestic arrangements when compared with earlier houses in the region.¹ Square structures provide better and different opportunities for discrete functional subareas than do earlier round structures and at the same time set up relationships of both opposition and complementarity (Brown 1979:212–213; DeBoer 2010:196–197; Hall 1997:61; Hultkrantz 1979:50; Seeman 2004:67–68). Further, the square is innovatively seen elsewhere in Ohio Hopewell construction and is presented at a variety of scales, notably in the form of corpse-processing “altar” basins, shrine buildings, and large geometric earthworks. This is a new and extended trope in the Woodland world and carries both social and symbolic importance. That we see the use of such constructs bridging through to the ancestral realm emphasizes the continuity of the living and the dead, and by extension, the “naturalness” of any prerogatives assumed by the living in terms of rights to position and place. The prepared clay basins especially are clearly places of transformation, both for the bones of kinsmen as they become ancestral relics and in the transformation of objects, “killed” and/or arranged in similar rituals (see Yerkes, Volume 1). The central basin

in Turner Mound 5 seems to have been rebuilt at least four times, each with a separate mantling floor (Willoughby 1922:75). Persons and objects can be powerfully deconstructed in such contexts. Some of these killed objects are represented only by selected pieces, with others perhaps extended to kinsmen or other groups that were there when the object was whole (Brown 2012:356; Mainfort 2013:170; Seeman and Soday 1980:79). This is not “destruction.” It is transformation into a different form; a reintegration into the conceptual world as a different kind of entity (see Hutchinson and Aragon 2002:34–35).²

We are often tempted to think of the souls of Hopewell kinfolk as passing through cremation basins on a one-way journey to a celestial realm, but this may not be exactly true if we remember that historic Algonkian clans held a stock of cycling, intrinsically powerful names referencing the eponym (Callender 1962:29–30). For example, “Wearer-of-a-Shell-Gorget,” a name referring to the white throat patch of *Ursus americanus* was one of over 200 historic Winnebago bear clan names. These were prerogatives passed down through the generations, suggesting a passage of essential characteristics or reanimation, which we also see in the renaming that accompanies adoption (Diterle 2005; Hall 1997:42, 59; Hultkrantz 1979:137; Gillespie 2002:68). Bear clan names connote specific bear behaviors or physicality, so people know your clan affiliation by your name. If Ohio Hopewell groups followed similar practices there would have been no need for each person to wear visible clan tokens such as drilled bear canines or beaver jaws for identity or identification (*sensu* Thomas et al. 2005:357–359,372–373).³ Your clan affiliation is in your name. A non-linear concept of time is all that is required to reconcile a spirit journey to the after-life and at the same time a reanimation across the generations.

The Ohio Hopewell square earthwork/shrine building/house/altar is a metaphorical composition. As a symbolic restatement, the elements all adhere to a fixed point of common orientation—a convention—but they also refer to something else, and the meaning of “that something else” is negotiable and subject to individual interpretation. It is this kind of relationship that forms the basis for creative cultural modification over time and space (Wagner 1986:3). Although we may strain to understand the “correct” interpretation of this metaphor, we can, as Wagner (1986:6) suggests, more productively focus on what it *does*. I would argue that what it does is make natural the various social scales of interaction that are likely well separated in time and space themselves. A house-raising of a large, permanent building or major rites-of-passage such as an altar cremation synchronized the experiences of Hopewell kin groups, thus coordinating social identity (Fowler

2004:81). What is needed is a focus on how this particular trope and others mesh to form a Hopewell symbol system. The meaning(s), as distinct from what it does, of any one such metaphor can only really be understood as it relates to an entire corpus of metaphors with its own syntax and lexicon—a Hopewell language, if you will, based in material symbols (Knight 2012; Wagner 1986:8). A systematic review of Hopewell material symbols has not yet happened, but needs to be a part of our twenty-first century archaeology. A good first step would be to organize the corpus of these symbols and their contexts on a site-by-site basis.

I will end this section with a return to those four new houses. They open up to us the practices of everyday life—cooking stew on the fire, smoking a pipe, or simply passing the great Liberty earthwork every day on a well-worn pathway to get water or to visit a friend. These are the things by which Hopewell life was made natural and at the same time reproduced in the Scioto Valley. Tiny fragments of cut mica in many household features, a broken platform pipe and tobacco seeds in a nearby trash midden, a lost small copper awl, or a partially finished bear canine ornament thrown away; here we gain insights into how tasks were organized outside of the charged atmosphere of rites-of-passage or other inclusive public ceremonies. We see the whole as well as the parts, and in so doing we break through the notion of the sacred and the secular as the sort of site-specific dichotomy that has characterized much of the recent discussion on Ohio Hopewell. The ordinary and the supernatural can be found everywhere.

MAKING COMMUNITIES

Ohio Hopewell households must have participated in broader social networks we can term “communities” of one sort or another. Some of these larger groupings were based on residential proximity, while others were formed on different principles entirely (Nolan et al., this volume; Ruby et al. 2005). There are over 170 earthwork enclosures in Ohio, and it has long been argued that they centered a considerable number of Hopewell communities spread along the main drainages (Greber 2006; Pacheco and Dancey 2006). Unfortunately, the Hopewell affiliation of most of these earthworks is at this point more assumed than demonstrated.

Pacheco and Dancey (2006:17–18) have proposed that Hopewell residential communities were themselves organized into at least 20 larger scale peer-polities. Pacheco and Dancey show these larger peer-polity groupings as of varying sizes and they were clearly nonrandomly distributed. Together they raise the questions: (1) were they all the same, and (2) what exactly were in places where communities weren't? With regard to the former, we see a very selective use of Hopewell con-

structs in northern Ohio (Redmond, this volume; Redmond and Scanlan 2013; Seeman 1996), and I still remember Jimmy Griffin's offhand comment that there was no true Ohio Hopewell north of Interstate 70. More fundamentally, any talk of community distributions and their differences raises the ugly specter of defining what exactly Ohio Hopewell is, and like a bad high school reunion, I don't want to go there. I would add, however, that across large areas of western and central Ohio there are many Hopewell projectile points identical to those found on sites of the Scioto and Licking valleys and made of the same Flint Ridge flint, but precious few bladelets or other indications of long-term settlement. The notion that certain prime lands in Ohio, or even in adjacent Kentucky, did not support resident Hopewell populations may offend our current sensibilities, but "vacant quarters" have been documented at other times in the Midcontinental region, and such situations often correlate with changes in social organization or technological efficiency (Fortier 2006:337–338; Meeks and Anderson 2013; Theler and Boszhardt 2006).

If we stay in southern Ohio, it is fair to say that there are two main models of Ohio Hopewell community organization in play at the beginning of the twenty-first century. One, based on the work of Prufer, Dancey and Pacheco (Dancey and Pacheco 1997; Pacheco and Dancey 2006), has been termed a *Proximity Model* (Nolan et al., this volume). The other, based on the work of Chris Carr (2005a), is more of a *Synaptic Model*. The *Proximity Model* is essentially a peer-polity construct based on local relationships among habitations and earthworks; supporting households and an earthwork are part of a common habitus as people work through their daily lives. With the *Proximity Model*, Ohio Hopewell communities appear like tar bubbles in the La Brea pits, with the size of individual bubbles at any particular time in the hands of especially charismatic leaders. Despite basic continuities, the fortunes of individual centers rise and fall, and perhaps rise again, depending on idiosyncratic histories.

Carr's *Synaptic Model* is more hierarchical and complex, and like interwoven dendrites it carries with it the notion of the multiple obligations an individual takes on as she/he is enmeshed in a variety of social networks. In this view, leaders from all of these various residential areas are jointly buried at the apical Hopewell-type site, but other individuals from a given household or a given residential community may be buried at virtually any earthwork, regardless of proximity. The synaptic model assumes that most of the Ohio earthwork centers are too close together and population densities too low to have supported multiple, proximity-based communities. Rather, a variety of social ties prompted households to provide labor and allegiance to a number of earthworks over its history (Bernardini 2004). Much of

the Hopewell archaeology of the next ten years or so will be involved in evaluating the merits of these two early twenty-first century models. Recent substantive research on this matter is equivocal. Ruhl's (2005; see also Nolan et al., this volume; Ruhl and Seaman 1998) analysis of Hopewell ear spool style comes the closest to providing a test case and it carries tar-bubbly overtones.

Over a 15-year period, Kathy Ruhl has analyzed the stylistic details on hundreds of Hopewell copper ear spools from across the Midcontinent. It is an unparalleled study in terms of its comprehensiveness with regard to Hopewell-style objects. In addition to establishing a seriation with relevance for chronological placement, Ruhl found that minute, difficult-to-see details in the crafting of these ornaments differ from site to site; in other words, despite an overall appearance of conformity from a distance, these spools differed from site to site in construction detail. This suggests the crafting of these objects at particular sites rather than their extensive exchange and long-term circulation as finished products in a complex, multi-centered social network.

Copper ear spools are some of the most frequently encountered Hopewell objects. They were worn by a minority of men and women across inferred kin groups and across substantial geographic areas. It is possible, as Carr (2005a:283–286; see also Carr et al. 2005:529–530) has concluded that they were sodality markers for Ohio Hopewell groups, although their pan-Hopewellian distribution, sometimes carried in the hands of dead adults, suggests a resonance broader than that typically connoted by sodality designation in middle-range societies.

Finally, in considering the social networks that forge communities (and other kinds of relations) we must be cognizant of the differences in scale and longevity between a McGraw or a Browns Bottom #1 site and the major earthwork sites their residents supported such as Hopewell or Liberty. The former type of site may have been occupied for fifteen years, the latter for several hundred. The intersite distances are such that in the Scioto Paint Creek “core” area occupants of virtually any of the known habitations could be at a minimum of nine major geometric earthworks in a half day's travel time. The implication is that households could have shifted their support among earthworks at relatively low cost and that what appears as multiple ties to earthworks may actually be a palimpsest of shifting, singular ties. Or alternatively, that multiple ties can become more singular over time. Hopewell social networks, and even the kinds of networks, can be expected to have shape-shifted across a more than three-hundred-year span, as Spielmann (2013) clearly foregrounds. In short, we need to see how the real data pertaining

to style and production variables, appropriately placed in time, play out and extend our available, first-generation community models across the Hopewell episode.

MONUMENTALISM AND CREATING HOPEWELL PLACES

Having discussed some of the recent work on households and communities, it is time to turn our attention to the great geometric earthworks themselves. At the first Chillicothe Conference in 1977 these were still seen as places of the dead even though most of them like Hopeton, Baum, or Portsmouth had never produced any evidence of mortuary activity at all. Today these are much livelier places, animated no longer by just a focus on burial practice, but by discussions of astronomy, crafting, feasting, visitation, agency, gender, and landscape. Regarding the latter, the twenty-first century has brought us to a much clearer recognition that many Hopewell earthworks were situated near particular and distinctive features of a constructed cultural landscape—a named land that no doubt had importance in myth and identity construction, and that gave a living face to the experienced world (see Basso 1996). This case has been made especially for Seip and Copperas Mountain, Mound City and Mount Logan, and Newark and the surrounding hills of the Raccoon Creek Valley (Hively and Horn 2010; Seeman and Branch 2006). Astronomical alignments to the moon and sun as well as certain measurement correspondences also have been convincingly demonstrated, especially in recent research by Romain (2015), Hively and Horn (this volume), and Ruby (this volume). It is important to remember that in a totemic reality these places also would be seen as sacred to societies of animals as well; thus, for example, Devil's Tower was sacred to the Lakota, but also to the mythic heroine White Buffalo Calf. The Cheyenne revered a cave on the side of Bear Mountain where animals came forth in mythic time under the control of twin-boy animal masters (Hall 1997:78,138). The annual Cheyenne Massaum lodge ceremony was to trap animal spirits and assure the continuance of the bounty of Mother Earth. In sum, place-making within the larger context of landscape provides deep connections with the land; it centers and brings power to ritual gatherings and the cult dramas performed there. These are the places where spiritual powers were snared and different layers of reality intersected. Over the long haul, such timed ceremonies—both their repetition and their creative modification—ensure that as an aggregation of communal acts over time they begin to carry the weight of history, providing clearer justification for validating lines of descent and other sociopolitical arrangements (Seeman and Branch 2006:121).

Regarding the quickening of Hopewell earthworks, it must be again acknowledged that much of this has been made possible by advances in geophysical prospecting and motivated investigators (thank you, Jarrod Burks). Perhaps the most spectacular of these discoveries has been the three huge woodhenge post-circle constructions at Stubbs (Cowan 2005), Fort Ancient (Miller 2010; Riordan 2015 and this volume), and Hopewell, the latter with a clear summer solstice alignment (Ruby, pers. com., 2016). The Moorehead Circle at Fort Ancient, over 60 meters in diameter and composed of 240 huge posts, is the perimeter for a complex enclosure with many interior features. It is well preserved and well excavated, and will serve as the archetype for interpreting similar constructions. All three of these are ritual facilities appropriate for large gatherings and timed, recurrent ceremonies, some probably involving pilgrimages from well outside the region (Lepper 2004, 2006; see also Mainfort 2013:232). The draw for these ceremonials was great; for example, we now can state with confidence as a result of Stoltman's (2015) recent petrographic work that people from as far away as Florida were preparing food or medicines in Ohio Hopewell places and bringing their ceramics with them. I am particularly interested in the intensified blade-making documented at many Ohio earthworks and the conclusion that small-scale craft production was imbedded in the ritual process (Cowan 2006:30–31; Nolan et al. 2007; Spielmann 1998, 2009, 2013). Importantly, as the archaeological record accrues, we see more clearly that each of these complex earthwork sites is distinctive and carries its own particular history; this connotes contingency and perhaps the episodic renegotiation of ideology and social practice. Craftwork in these places contributed to making things special.

Carr's synaptic model of Ohio Hopewell communities is premised in part on labor constraints that would have resulted in a Scioto-Paint Creek cultural landscape crowded with monuments; he argues there are too many earthworks here and too few people to support a proximity model (see also Artursson et al. 2016:15; Berardini 2004). It is of interest that early twenty-first century research has compounded this problem by demonstrating that even more work was needed to build at least some Hopewell earthworks than thought previously. At Hopeton, the late Mark Lynott and his colleagues have shown that a massive area was stripped away before even beginning to build the geometric earthworks there. More specifically, a detailed study of soil development has shown that all of the topsoil or A horizon and some of the underlying B horizon had been systematically removed from a 15 ha (37 acre) area of the site before earthwork construction began, all a basket load at a time (Lynott 2014:105–116). More limited work at High Bank and Mound City

suggests that they too were the targets of similar surface preparation efforts (Greber 2006:89; Lynott 2014:172–173). Only future work will determine how extensive this practice actually was; it may have been broadspread, or it may have been limited to those specific areas where previous and potentially polluting prior Adena ritual activities took place. But lest synaptic community model supporters get too comfortable with the evidence for this increase in work effort, it should also be noted that both stratigraphic and radiometric determinations suggest that each earthwork may represent efforts accomplished over a longer time frame than previously thought. This eases, to some degree, the labor shortage.

At the time of the first Chillicothe Conference, we operated under the assumption that the main Ohio Hopewell earthworks unfolded in sequence; Tremper was first and Turner was last. This line of thinking goes back to Prufer and before him, Shetrone and Greenman. Recent work at Hopeton, the site with the best internal chronology, goes against this model. Specifically, certain segments of the Hopeton embankment appear to have been built at different times covering a minimum of one hundred years (Lynott 2014:111–112). Further, the three other sites with comparable radiometric records—Hopewell, Pollock, and Fort Ancient—also suggest longer-term constructional or use-histories (Greber 2006:91; Lynott 2014:135). Brown's (2004:155, 157; 2012:353–357) work at Mound City additionally supports this view; he notes that the orientation and arrangement of the mounds here change over time, that individual mounds were the aggregates of complex and sometimes repetitive ritual episodes, and that the encircling embankment actually may have been fairly late in the total construction effort. Greber (1997:209–211) suggests three or four hundred years for the constructions at Seip. Thus, the twenty-first century data for longer-term site use takes us away from the notion of constructing some sort of perfect mechanism designed to be built, used, and then avoided as “sacred ground,” and towards a more active model that couples the completion of a conceptual design over a longer period of time (the earthwork itself) with the accumulation of an interior built environment requiring less labor and serving a range of ritual purposes. In thinking about such a shift I am reminded of two things. First, participation in construction can itself be considered a ritual commitment, mustering congregants to do their part. To some degree, this view is supported by the discovery of offerings and ritual remains within the earthwork walls, especially well-documented at Hopeton, Hopewell, and Turner. Second, when it comes to large-scale construction projects, we need to be self-aware of our Western notions of deadlines, production schedules, and material handling, and consider other alternatives and a more “build-

as-you-go” architectural mentality. It is quite possible, for example in considering large-scale projects, to follow a master plan slowly and as time, labor, and weather permit. In such situations things may look “in process” at any given time, and they are, but the process is additive and unfolds over the long haul. Bernardini’s (2004) estimate of up to ten years to construct the walls of a large Hopewell earthwork need not have been consecutive years, and is quite possible to occupy part of a ritual precinct while other parts are unfinished or unplanned. This should be kept in mind when we look at the archaeological evidence at places like Hopeton.

Who organized the construction and rites conducted at Hopewell earthworks? James Brown (2006) has argued that these were under the control of shamans with spiritual powers that put them in the forefront of local and regional networks. This view contrasts somewhat with that of Carr (2005a:317; Carr and Case 2005b:231; Carr et al. 2005:514), Byers (2004:269–278; 2006:63–66), and myself (Seaman 2004:71) who have argued that such leadership was more likely shared, or at least in part under the control of lineage leaders and medicine societies. Regarding the latter, it should be noted that in middle-range contexts, such sodalities of “lay visionaries” often develop, possibly because spiritual qualities in such situations are seen as fairly fixed in the body and there is less need for individual shamanic negotiation, and also, because vision-producing hallucinogenic shortcuts are available, such as highly addictive strong tobacco or communally consumed purgatives. Nicotine gives liveliness to the tobacco plant; it demands to be smoked. Ethnographically, tobacco is associated with men (Hall 2006:466; Hultkrantz 1979:75, 116–128), but the Hopewell evidence is more ambiguous (see below, Table 1).

Generally and cross-culturally, the shaman is an “archvisionary” and ecstatic; his spirit may leave his body and an animal spirit possess it (Hultkrantz 1979:85). He acquires his powers on his own, and “his” is the appropriate pronoun here since ethnographically true shamans are predominantly men. Given their individual spiritual experiences, shamans may assemble medicines and work kits that are themselves highly personal and particular. Lay visionary societies, on the other hand, are a fellowship, they are more likely to hold calendric rites where all members participate, and they are more reliant on the animistic powers of body paint, masks, and other objects, often highly conventionalized, of which they are caretakers. In the end, most current studies point to several sorts of Hopewell leaders at work in local social networks, and these connections may sometimes have been extended via peer-polity and/or cultic connections to a broader interregional stage. Unfortunately, as Brown (2006:479–480) notes, the artifact classes we have come to iden-

tify most with Hopewell relationships do not consistently pattern with one another at the level of the individual grave lot, thus creating challenges for a sociology-of-burial approach. This fluidity is to be expected in societies where individual histories and experiences accumulate without established hierarchies, but it complicates our efforts at unraveling specific leader/follower distinctions, just as it does for sodality/lineage distinctions. DeBoer (2006:154), however, has recently and convincingly made a case that there is patterning in Hopewell artifactual associations at the level of age and sex, and this portal may serve as a useful starting point for building more complex schemes in the future (Table 1). DeBoer uses large samples drawn from a broad geographic area and includes subadults, in contrast to Case and Carr’s (2008) Ohio drainage-by-drainage approach for adults only. Regarding DeBoer’s tally, it is interesting that tobacco pipes were the third-most frequently encountered class, and they were prerogatives of both men and women. Although this may mean that there were many female Hopewell shamans, it seems more likely to me that, as with metallic ear spools, they had ties to sodality networks or their cultic extensions. Regardless, the pattern goes against our ethnographic expectations. Finally, we must face the fact that for clearly sex- or age-associated objects there also are consistent minority occurrences with the opposite sex, or age group, a point I will return to in a subsequent section of this chapter. In sum, it is clear that the twenty-first century has seen the meaning of Hopewell earthworks shift towards greater complexity, dynamism, and longevity, and as places where varying constituencies contended for social prominence and spiritual power.

Table 1. Hopewell Objects in Mortuary Association by Age and Sex (sources DeBoer 2006; Farnsworth and Atwell 2015; Turff 1997).

	Adult Male*	Adult Female	Subadult
Copper Plate	22	2	3
Cut Jaw	26	4	3
Copper Celt	20	1	6
Bear Canine Ornament	21	2	6
Panpipe	14	3	9
Smoking Pipe	24	10	2
Ear Spool	24	14	1

	Adult Male*	Adult Female	Subadult
Bladelet	18	11	10
Conch Shell	13	11	10
Ceramic Vessel	6	13	15

*pertains only to categories with sample sizes greater than twenty for age and sex (from DeBoer 2006:154; Turff 1997:5; Farnsworth and Atwell 2015; see also Carr 2008:245).

MUTABLE OBJECTS, MUTABLE PEOPLE

At the time of the First Chillicothe Conference, mass artifact deposits generally were regarded as displays of conspicuous consumption supporting individual leader's claims to title and position. In contrast, Carr et al. (2005:485,498,518; see also Cowan 1996:143; Hall 1997:156) have been clear in their recent statement that Hopewell objects, particularly if they occur in mass deposits or as multiples with a given burial, should be seen as group contributions or gifts to the body, not the result of individual aggrandizement. This is an important distinction and brings with it a sense of community action over personal accumulation. Contributed community gifts assure that the soul will not be departing for the spirit world alone. Gifting mediates and extends relationships, and gifting back to the Creator as part of a mortuary ritual thus fulfills one side of a gift transaction and comes with the expectation of a return gift or blessing in the future. Thus, what we see is one side of a reciprocal relationship that renews and perpetuates the world as community responsibility. An example of this type of practice comes from the floor of the Edwin Harness mound where a rectangular basin contained a redeposited cremation with two shell disc beads outlined by 28 unburned bear canine ornaments (Mills 1907:142).

Although some Hopewell object classes may have been more highly charged than others, it must be remembered that in burial context we are not seeing them in their active state, and further and especially for kin- or sodality-related objects, that their own animacy provided them with specific histories of successes or failures, of being born in a particular generation or of having been inherited from a previous one; they may have not simply marked social roles but behaved as "persons" themselves and independent of particular caretakers. Thus, these objects, to the extent that they have their own volition may have been "alive" in much the same sense as animals or humans. Some may have had to be cared for

more like family members than inanimate objects. This helps us to understand how certain Hopewell objects can be generative elements in the creation of relationships—they have their own agency—a point I have made previously (Seeman 1995). As a visual metaphor with form as well as content they can be at once proposition and resolution; they stand for themselves (Wagner 1986:11). Many Hopewell objects were precious, but not sufficiently sacred or transcendent that they could not be given away or extended to others in the right circumstances. Powerful objects in short had to be treated in particular ways, and may have carried the expectation of a spiritual potency that can, and probably must, be returned to the Creator. Copper celts are notable examples in this regard in the sense that they are rarely encountered outside of ritual contexts, they have been disassembled from their hafts, and they were often bundled with textile, hide, or fur wrappings. Similar wrapping practices extended into Mississippian times, for example, copper celts at the Spiro site were similarly honored with textile boxes or wrappings (Brown 1996:480; see also Twigg 2009). Finally, it must be remembered that copper celts, if they are to maintain their reflective qualities, must be cared for and polished in a process of continuing engagement.⁴

In considering the group rather than individualistic connotations of these gifts to the body, we in the twenty-first century also need to revisit the meaning of the buried individuals themselves and the “personhood” around which these objects were placed. Since the 1960s and the work of Binford, Saxe, and others, some of us have become too comfortable with the assumption that status in life is reflected in death; that is, a “representationalist” view of death. This may be true up to a point, but we also must recognize that if contributed artifacts can connote community, so in equivalent fashion the body itself that centers these gifts likewise can be seen as a dimension of community. This is relatively easy to see when we are talking about redeposited cremations (e.g. Beck and Brown 2012:82; Carr 2005b:468–473; Hall 1997:74), but this same principal logically also can be extended to other forms of burial. Thus, in some cases, any particular role(s) an individual had in life may not matter very much; it is the communal aspect of burial and the gifting process that should be foregrounded. Here we have the bringing together of members of a lineage or sodality that suppress individual differences to achieve one collective, perhaps in the commemoration of a mythic being or event. In recognizing such relationships, we need to examine not only the sometimes-incongruous minority burial associations we find in Ohio Hopewell, but also the high frequency of

“double burials” and other distinctive patterns, and we might begin with the double burial at the very center of Hopewell Mound 25, Burials 260–261. This is the famous “husband and wife burial” where Moorehead (1922:110) noted that “the mass of material deposited with them exceeds that associated with any other burial so far discovered in the United States.” Case and Carr (2008) have likewise commented on the distinctiveness of this burial and its possible role in a ritual drama.

HOPEWELLIAN INTERREGIONALISM

Ohio Hopewell fits within a larger set of relationships, and indeed it is these interregional similarities across the Midcontinent and Southeast that perhaps capture our attention more than any other sort of patterning. At the first Chilli-cothe Conference, many practitioners had come to view Hopewellian interregional connections as the result of an extensive trade network, an interpretation best expressed by Struever and Houart (1972) and followed by David Braun’s (1986) publication. This interpretive focus is understandable when we reflect on the prominence at the time of cultural ecology, economic anthropology, and other functionally grounded theoretical perspectives. In the twenty-first century we see things differently, and in some respects, have rekindled Caldwell’s (1964) original notion that Hopewellian interaction at this level was based on an exchange of ideas and religious prerogatives more than actual trade, although there was clearly some of that as well. The grounding for this new perspective can be found mainly in the development of quantitative raw materials analysis and the physiochemical techniques that underlie them. Together, they point to the importance of direct procurement by motivated social actors and of the more limited movement of the finished objects that resulted.

One of the first studies to emphasize local or regional procurement patterns over that of a single global network was John Walthall’s (1981) atomic absorption study of galena ore. He showed that it arrived in southern Ohio from southern Wisconsin rather than through intermediary links that relied on other sources. At the same time, it pointed the way northwest for many materials coming into Ohio along this same route, a point recently explored by DeBoer (2004; see also Brown 2012:356–357). The absence of any comparable material flow in the opposite direction supports direct procurement over reciprocity. What followed were analyses of silver (Spence and Fryer 2005), Sterling pipestone and Catlinite (Emerson et al. 2013), and obsidian (Hughes 2006) which essentially supported this same model. With respect to northwestern Illinois Sterling pipestone and also Catlinite,

it is of interest that these materials were only important in the earliest Ohio Hopewell contexts and were not significantly heirloomed or utilized at later sites.

We now recognize that these exotic materials were also links to exotic places, and that long-distance treks to sources can be likened to going back to mythic times and the seeking of personal power (Seeman 1995; Spielmann 2009). Such journeys for preciosities also would have provided a context for the active negotiation of prestige. In that sense, they carry potential for accentuating both competition and cooperation. In the Ohio case, such links to the far west were fundamental in constructing and maintaining a regional identity.

In contrast to new information derived on connections to the west, those to the southeast along what Jim Brown has termed the “mica path” through the Appalachian Summit area of North Carolina and south seem somehow more familial and reciprocal. There was a range of Southeastern materials at most Ohio Hopewell sites. Mica, chlorite schist, steatite, Knox flint, greenstone, quartz, marine shell, ceramics, and most recently documented, copper, were coming north (Nolan et al., this volume). Mica and marine shell were quantitatively especially important. Stoltman’s (2015) petrographic work with pottery shows that there was a consistent two-way movement of ceramic pots and motifs between Ohio and the Southeast sufficiently strong to suggest regular interaction between these areas (Figures 2 and 3; see also Keith, this volume). It is of interest that Ohio-style square or squircle constructions also have been documented recently in western North Carolina (Wright 2014). Here it seems appropriate to remember that blessing-seekers, traders, and intrepid voyagers often travel on paths laid down by marriage ties. In sum, multiple raw material analyses point toward several types of interregional connections, but they do not require the majority of Hopewell objects or raw materials to circulate continuously across long distances and a multitude of hands. The shorter the transaction history, the more likely that the original meaning of a Hopewell object was preserved and the social context of production known to many. This brings us closer to Caldwell’s original notion of Hopewell Interaction as premised—but not exclusively reliant on—a limited range of material symbols that concretized key concepts and that were broadly understood. Within this corpus there very well may have been shifting cultic relationships expressed within the Hopewell episode that can be teased apart by examining particular kinds of objects more carefully, for example, effigy platform pipes versus modeled human figurines versus panpipes, but any such elucidation requires tighter chronological control.



Figure 2. Mapped summary of Stoltman's (2015) findings regarding the occurrence of Connestee ceramics in other regions, and Ohio ceramics found in Connestee contexts only. Stoltman's sampling was not designed to yield representative results but does show that Connestee ceramics occur in a wide variety of Ohio Valley site contexts (arrow width indicates strength of connection).

Twenty-first century materials analysis has allowed us a much richer look at the diversity, creativity, and changing nature of Hopewell connections across a pan-regional metasystem. Sacred propositions were in motion, and they carry implications for all other aspects of how people saw themselves, and how they discharged their responsibilities to one another and to their Creator. As has been



Figure 3. Mapped summary of Stoltman's (2015) findings regarding occurrence of all non-Connestee ceramics in other regions (arrow indicates strength of connection).

suggested previously, Hopewell across broad areas cannot be seen simply as an epiphenomenon of local politics (Chapman 2006:511; Hall 1997:156).

SUMMARY

Hopewell, and specifically Ohio Hopewell, has been a singular focus in the archaeology of eastern North America for more than a century. Hopewell rose to consciousness in the 1920s in essentially a pre-scientific, chronologically weak, and museum-based archaeology with the recognition that certain sites—Mound

City, Seip, Hopewell, Turner, Fort Ancient, Tremper, Circleville—showed connections to others by way of shared cultural practices. There has been nearly a hundred years of innovation in archaeological method and theory since the words “Ohio Hopewell” were first spoken, and one might legitimately anticipate that such developments would have prompted the replacement of an aged and tired taxon in favor of some new schema. But this has not happened, at least not yet. Rather, new generations of archaeologists continue to find comfort and utility in “Hopewell” and the notion of an Ohio Hopewell culture. What has changed, however, is the interpretation and meaning of what Ohio Hopewell is and how it should be studied. Today, and as the diversity of new articles and books on Hopewell will testify, we enjoy a wide range of interpretations to the point that the debate is as interesting as it is challenging. As a community, Ohio Hopewell scholars seem to recognize that though we may labor mightily to put exactly the right frame around it, we likewise understand that the “Ohio Hopewell” concept centers something that truly merits our continuing study and reinterpretation. Perhaps we also can take comfort in the fact that amid the chaos of conflicting views, some bear up much better than others under a collective critical eye. This third Chillicothe Conference is very much in this tradition. Here we find a diversity of analytical tactics used to examine and expose Ohio Hopewell relationships in the twenty-first century, sometimes with surprising results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank James Brown and Paul Pacheco for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this chapter. Bret Ruby helped me assemble statistics on HOCU recent land acquisitions and improvements. I also thank the Ohio Archaeological Council for inviting me to present much of this material as the keynote address at the third Chillicothe Conference in May, 2016. I appreciate the help of the editors of this volume in editing and improving my draft.

NOTES

1. Another portion of one of these large square Hopewell structures was reported from the Madeira Brown site in Pike Co., Ohio (Ruby et al. 2005:150).
2. Most of the sidewall posts at both Browns Bottom #1 and Lady's Run were pulled, thus further signaling an acknowledgement of transformation—here in the use of place and of the household itself. Interestingly, the big interior supports were apparently left standing in place (Kanter et al. 2015; P. Pacheco, pers. com., 2017).
3. The bear “power parts”—grizzly bear claw necklaces—recently argued as providing a good ethnographic analogy for Hopewell clan insignia actually do not. Bear claw necklaces from the historic Plains and Prairies do not identify bear clan affiliations, contrary to the assumptions of Carr and Case (2005a:27), nor does Callender indicate that specific animal “power parts” are associated with specific central Algonquian clan affiliations (Thomas et al. 2005:353 citing Callender 1962:26). In historic times the wearers of bear claw necklaces were senior men who had shown good judgment, were measured, generous, strong in battle, and/or good negotiators.
4. Krakker (2011:12) has recently pointed out that the distinction between axes and adzes based on bit shape may be a false one, and in fact the plano-convex cross-section of Hopewell copper celts may have more to do with display properties than woodworking (Seeman 1995:130).

REFERENCES CITED

- Artursson, Magnus, Timothy Earle, and James A. Brown. 2016. The Construction of Monumental Landscapes in Low-Density Societies: New Evidence from the Early Neolithic of Southern Scandinavia (4000–3300 BC) in Comparative Perspective. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 41:1–18.
- Basso, Keith H. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Bauermeister, Ann C. 2010. Feature finds from the Riverbank Site, 33RO1059. *Hopewell Archaeology: The Newsletter of Hopewell Archaeology in the Ohio River Valley* 7(2). <http://nps.gov/mwac/hopewell/v7n2/five.html>.
- Beck, Robin A., Jr. and James A. Brown. 2012. Political Economy and the Routinization of Religious Movements: A View from the Eastern Woodlands. *American Anthropological Association, Archeological Papers* 21(1):72–88.
- Bender, Barbara. 1985. Prehistoric Developments in the American Midcontinent and in Brittany, Northwest France. In *Prehistoric Hunter-Gatherers: The Emergence of Cultural Complexity*, edited by T. Douglas Price and James A. Brown, pp. 21–57. Academic Press, Orlando.
- Bernardini, Wesley. 2004. Hopewell Geometric Earthworks: A Case Study in the Referential and Experiential Meanings of Monuments. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 23:331–356.
- Braun, David P. 1986. Midwestern Hopewellian Exchange and Supralocal Interaction. In *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*, edited by Colin Renfrew and John F. Cherry, pp. 117–126. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Braun, David P., and Stephen Plog. 1982. Evolution of "Tribal" Networks: Theory and Prehistoric North American Evidence. *American Antiquity* 47:504–525.
- Brose, David S., and N'omi B. Greber, eds. 1979. *Hopewell Archaeology: The Chillicothe Conference*. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- Brown, James A. 1979. Charnel Houses and Mortuary Crypts: Disposal of the Dead in the Middle Woodland Period. In *Hopewell Archaeology: The Chillicothe Conference*, edited by David S. Brose and N'omi Greber, pp. 211–219. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- . 1996. *The Spiro Ceremonial Center: The Archaeology of Arkansas Valley Caddoan Culture in Eastern Oklahoma*. Museum of Anthropology Memoir 29. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- . 2004. Mound City and Issues in the Developmental History of Hopewell Culture in the Ross County Area of Southern Ohio. In *Aboriginal Ritual and Economy in the Eastern Woodlands: Essays in Memory of Howard Dalton Winters*, edited by Anne-Marie Cantwell, Lawrence A. Conrad, and Jonathan E. Reyman, pp. 147–167. Scientific Papers 30. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- . 2006. The Shamanic Element in Hopewellian Period Ritual. In *Recreating Hopewell: New Perspectives on Middle Woodland in Eastern North America*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 475–488. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- . 2012. *Mound City: The Archaeology of a Renown Ohio Hopewell Mound Center*. Special Report 6. National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Buikstra, Jane E., and Douglas K. Charles. 1999. Centering the Ancestors: Cemeteries, Mounds, and Sacred Landscapes of the Ancient North American Midcontinent. In *Archaeologies of Landscape*, edited by Wendy Ashmore and A. Bernard Knapp, pp. 201–228. Blackwell, Malden, Massachusetts.
- Byers, A. Martin. 2004. *The Hopewell Episode: Paradigm Lost, Paradigm Gained*. University of Akron Press, Akron, Ohio.
- . 2006. The Earthwork/Habitation Dichotomy. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 62–73. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- . 2015. *Reclaiming the Hopewellian Ceremonial Sphere: 200 BC to AD 500*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- Caldwell, Joseph R. 1964. Interaction Spheres in Prehistory. In *Hopewellian Studies*, edited by Joseph R. Caldwell and Robert L. Hall, pp. 133–143. Scientific Papers 12(2). Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- Callender, Charles. 1962. *Social Organization of the Central Algonkian Indians*. Publications in Anthropology No. 7. Milwaukee Public Museum, Milwaukee.
- . 1979. Hopewell Archaeology and American Ethnology. In *Hopewell Archaeology: The Chillicothe Conference*, edited by David S. Brose and N'omi Greber, pp. 254–257. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- Cameron, Catherine M., and John B. Gatewood. 2000. Excursions into the Un-Remembered Past: What People Want From Visits to Historic Sites. *The Public Historian* 22 (3):107–127.
- Carr, Christopher. 2005a. The Tripartite Ceremonial Alliance among Scioto Hopewellian Communities and the Question of Social Ranking. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society,*

- Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Chase, pp. 258–338. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- . 2005b. Hopewell Ritual Gatherings: A Review and Discussion of Previous Interpretations and Data. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Chase, pp. 463–479. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- Carr, Christopher, and D. Troy Case. 2005a. The Gathering of Hopewell. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, pp. 19–50. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- . 2005b. The Nature of Leadership in Ohio Hopewellian Societies: Role Segregation and the Transformation from Shamanism. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Chase, pp. 177–237. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- Carr, Christopher, Beau J. Goldstein, and Jaimin Weets. 2005. Estimating the Sizes and Social Compositions of Mortuary-Related Gatherings at Scioto Hopewell Earthwork-Mound Sites. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, pp. 480–532. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- Case, D. Troy, and Christopher Carr. 2008. *The Scioto Hopewell and Their Neighbors: Bioarchaeological Documentation and Cultural Understanding*. Springer, New York.
- Chapman, Robert. 2006. Middle Woodland/Hopewell: A View from beyond the Periphery. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 510–528. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Charles, Douglas K., and Jane E. Buikstra. 2006. Preface. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. xviii–xix. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Cowan, C. Wesley. 1996. Social Implications of Ohio Hopewell Art. In *A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*, edited by Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 128–148. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.
- Cowan, Frank L. 2005. Stubs Earthworks: An Ohio Hopewell “Woodhenge.” In *Ohio Archaeology: An Illustrated Chronicle of Ohio’s Ancient American Indian Cultures*, by Bradley T. Lepper, pp. 148–151. Orange Frazer Press, Wilmington, Ohio.
- . 2006. A Mobile Hopewell? Questioning Assumptions of Ohio Hopewell Sedentism. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 26–49. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Dancey, William S. 1991. A Middle Woodland Settlement in Central Ohio: A Preliminary Report on the Murphy Site (33Li212). *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 61(2):37–72.
- Dancey, William S., and Paul J. Pacheco. 1997. A Community Model of Ohio Hopewell Settlement. In *Ohio Hopewell Community Organization*, edited by William S. Dancey and Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 3–40. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- DeBoer, Warren E. 1997. Ceremonial Centres from the Cayapas (Esmeraldas, Ecuador) to Chillicothe (Ohio). *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 7:225–253.
- . 2004. Little Bighorn on the Scioto: The Rocky Mountain Connection to Ohio Hopewell. *American Antiquity* 69:85–107.

- . 2006. Salient Representations of the American Past. In *A Pre-Columbian World*, edited by Jeffrey Quilter and Mary Miller, pp. 137–187. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- . 2010. Strange Sightings on the Scioto. In *Hopewell Settlement Patterns, Subsistence, and Symbolic Landscapes*, edited by A. Martin Byers and DeeAnne Wymer, pp. 165–198. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Dieterle, Richard L. 2005. The Encyclopedia of Hočąk (Winnebago) Mythology. <http://hotcakencyclopedia.com/ho.BearClanOriginMyth.html>
- Emerson, Thomas E., Kenneth B. Farnsworth, Sarah U. Wisseman, and Randle E. Hughes. 2013. The Allure of the Exotic: Reexamining the Use of Local and Distant Pipestone Quarries in Ohio Pipe Caches. *American Antiquity* 78:48–67.
- Farnsworth, Kenneth B., and Karen A. Atwell. 2015. *Excavations at the Blue Island and Naples-Russell Mounds and Related Hopewellian Sites in the Lower Illinois Valley*. Research Report 34. Illinois State Archaeological Survey, Urbana-Champaign.
- Fortier, Andrew C. 2006. The Land between Two Traditions: Middle Woodland Societies of the American Bottom. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 328–338. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Fowler, Chris. 2004. *The Archaeology of Personhood: An Anthropological Perspective*. Routledge, London.
- Gillespie, Susan D. 2002. Body and Soul among the Maya: Keeping the Spirits in Place. In *The Space and Place of Death*, edited by Helaine Silverman and David B. Small, pp. 67–78. Archeological Papers No. 11. American Anthropological Association.
- Gran, Anne-Britt. 2010. Staging Places as Brands: Visiting Illusions, Images and Imaginations. In *Re-Investing Authenticity: Tourism, Place and Emotions*, edited by Britta Timm Knudsen and Anne Marit Waade, 22–37. Channel View Press, Bristol.
- Greber, N'omi B. 1997. Two Geometric Enclosures in the Paint Creek Valley: An Estimate of Possible Changes in Community Patterns through Time. In *Ohio Hopewell Community Organization*, edited by William S. Dancy and Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 207–229. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- . 2006. Enclosures and Communities in Ohio Hopewell. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 74–105. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Griffin, James B. 1996. The Hopewell Housing Shortage in Ohio, A.D. 1–350. In *A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*, edited by Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 4–15. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.
- Hall, Robert L. 1997. *An Archaeology of the Soul: North American Indian Belief and Ritual*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- . 2006. The Enigmatic Copper Cutout from Bedford Mound 8. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 464–474. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Hargrave, Cheryl. 2003. Authenticity in Cultural Heritage Tourism. *Forum Journal* 18(1):45–52.
- Hively, Ray, and Robert Horn. 2010. Hopewell Cosmography at Newark and Chillicothe, Ohio. In *Hopewell Settlement Patterns, Subsistence, and Symbolic Landscapes*, edited by A. Martin Byers and DeeAnne Wymer, pp. 128–164. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

- Hughes, Richard E. 2006. The Sources of Hopewell Obsidian: Forty Years after Griffin. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 361–375. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Hutchinson, Dale L., and Lorraine V. Aragon. 2002. Collective Burials and Community Memories: Interpreting the Placement of the Dead in the Southeastern and Mid-Atlantic United States with Reference to Ethnographic Cases in Indonesia. In *The Space and Place of Death*, edited by Helaine Silverman and David B. Small, pp. 27–54. Archeological Papers No. 11. American Anthropological Association.
- Hultkrantz, Åke. 1979. *The Religions of the American Indians*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Kanter, Noah, Paul J. Pacheco, Renato Perucchio, and Jarrod Burks. 2015. Living Large on the Bottom: A Structural Engineering Analysis of Three Ohio Hopewell Structures from Brown's Bottom, Ross County, Ohio. In *Building the Past: Prehistoric Wooden Post Architecture in the Ohio Valley—Great Lakes*, edited by Brian G. Redmond and Robert A. Genheimer, pp. 146–187. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Knight, Vernon James, Jr. 2012. *Iconographic Method in New World Prehistory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Knudsen, Britta T., and Anne M. Waade, eds. 2010. *Re-Investigating Authenticity: Tourism, Place and Emotions*. Channel View Publications, Bristol.
- Kraker, James J. 2011. A Hafted Stone Celt from Genesee County, Michigan and Implications for Ground Stone Tool Use in the Eastern Woodlands. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 36:5–28.
- Lepper, Bradley T. 1995. Tracking Ohio's Great Hopewell Road: Aerial Reconnaissance and Infrared Photography Help Scholars Map a Sacred Roadway Nearly 60 Miles Long. *Archaeology* 45(6):52–56.
- . 2004. The Newark Earthworks: Monumental Geometry and Astronomy at a Hopewellian Pilgrimage Center, edited by Richard F. Townsend and Robert V. Sharp, pp. 73–81. *Hero, Hawk, and Open Hand: American Indian Art of the Ancient Midwest and South*. The Art Institute of Chicago and Yale University Press, New Haven.
- . 2006. The Great Hopewell Road and the Role of the Pilgrimage in the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 122–133. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Lynott, Mark J., ed. 2009. *Footprints: In the Footprints of Squier and Davis: Archeological Fieldwork in Ross County, Ohio*. Special Report No. 5. National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Lynott, Mark J. 2014. *Hopewell Ceremonial Landscapes of Ohio: More than Mounds and Geometric Earthworks*. Oxbow Books, Oxford.
- Mainfort, Robert C. 2013. *Pinson Mounds: Middle Woodland Ceremonialism in the Midsouth*. University of Arkansas Press, Fayetteville.
- McNiven, Ian J., and Lynette Russell. 2008. Toward a Postcolonial Archaeology of Indigenous Australia. In *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, edited by R. Alexander Bentley, Herbert D. G. Maschner, and Christopher Chippindale, pp. 423–443. Altamira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Meeks, Scott C., and David G. Anderson. 2013. Drought, Subsistence Stress, and Population Dynamics: Assessing Mississippian Abandonment of the Vacant Quarter. In *Soils*,

- Climate, and Society: Archaeological Investigations in Ancient America*, edited by John D. Wingard and Sue Eileen Hayes, pp. 61–83. University Press of Colorado, Boulder.
- Miller, Gregory L. 2010. Ohio Hopewell Ceremonial Bladelet Use at the Moorehead Circle, Fort Ancient. Unpublished MA thesis, Department of Anthropology, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Mills, William C. 1907. The Explorations of the Edwin Harness Mound. *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Publications* 16:113–193.
- Moorehead, Warren C. 1922. *The Hopewell Mound Group of Ohio*. Publication 211, Anthropological Series 6(5). Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.
- Nolan, Kevin C., Mark F. Seeman, and James L. Theler. 2007. A Quantitative Analysis of Skill and Efficiency: Hopewell Blade Production at the Turner Workshop, Hamilton Co., Ohio. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 32:297–329.
- Pacheco, Paul J., ed. 1996. *A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.
- Pacheco, Paul J., and William S. Dancey. 2006. Integrating Mortuary and Settlement Data on Ohio Hopewell Society. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 3–25. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Pacheco, Paul J., Erin Steinwachs, and Jenna Anderson. 2013. Archaeological Investigations at Datum H: Exploring Ohio Hopewell Activities at the Edge of Hopewell Mound Group. Paper presented at the 57th Midwest Archaeological Conference. Columbus.
- Penney, David W. 1989. *Hopewell Art*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Art History and Archaeology, Columbia University, New York.
- Prufer, Olaf H. 1964. The Hopewell Complex of Ohio. In *Hopewellian Studies*, edited by Joseph R. Caldwell and Robert L. Hall, pp. 35–83. Scientific Papers 12(2). Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- . 1965 *The McGraw Site: A Study in Hopewellian Dynamics*. Cleveland Museum of Natural History, Scientific Publications, n.s. 4(1), Cleveland, Ohio.
- Redmond, Brian G., and Brian L. Scanlan. 2013. *A Report of Archaeological Investigations at the Heckelman Site (33Er14): 2012 Season*, Archaeological Research Reports No. 162. Cleveland Museum of Natural History, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Riordan, Robert V. 2015. The End. In *Building the Past: Prehistoric Wooden Post Architecture in the Ohio Valley—Great Lakes*, edited by Brian G. Redmond and Robert A. Genheimer, pp. 126–145. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Romain, William F. 2015. *An Archaeology of the Sacred: Adena—Hopewell Astronomy and Landscape Archaeology*. The Ancient Earthworks Project, Olmsted Township, Ohio.
- Ruby, Bret J., Christopher Carr, and Douglas K. Charles. 2005. Community Organizations in the Scioto, Mann, and Havana Hopewellian Regions: A Comparative Perspective. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Integration*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, pp. 119–176. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- Ruhl, Katharine C. 2005. Hopewellian Copper Earspools from Eastern North America: The Social, Ritual, and Symbolic Significance of Their Contexts and Distribution. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Integration*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, pp. 696–713. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- Ruhl, Katharine C., and Mark F. Seeman. 1998. The Temporal and Social Implications of Ohio Hopewell Copper Earspool Design. *American Antiquity* 63:651–662.

- Seeman, Mark F. 1995. When Words Are Not Enough: Hopewell Interregionalism and the Use of Material Symbols at the GE Mound. In *Native American Interactions: Multiscalar Analyses and Interpretations in the Eastern Woodlands*, edited by Michael S. Nassaney and Kenneth E. Sassaman, pp. 122–143. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.
- . 1996. The Ohio Hopewell Core and Its Many Margins: Deconstructing Upland and Hinterland Relations. In *A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*, edited by Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 304–315. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.
- . 2004. Hopewell Art in Hopewell Places. In *Hero, Hawk, and Open Hand: American Indian Art of the Ancient Midwest and South*, edited by Richard F. Townsend and Robert V. Sharp, pp. 57–71. The Art Institute of Chicago/Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Seeman, Mark F., and James L. Branch. 2006. The Mounded Landscapes of Ohio: Hopewell Patterns and Placements. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 106–121. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Seeman, Mark F., and Frank Soday. 1980. The Russell Brown Mounds: Three Hopewell Mounds in Ross County, Ohio. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 5:73–116.
- Smith, Bruce D. 1992. *Rivers of Change: Essays on Early Agriculture in Eastern North America*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.
- . 2006. Household, Community, and Subsistence in Hopewell Research. In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 491–509. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Spence, Michael W., and Brian J. Fryer. 2005. Hopewell Silver and Silver Artifacts from Eastern North America: Their Sources, Procurement, Distribution, and Meanings. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Chase, pp. 714–733. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- Spielmann, Katherine A. 1998. Ritual Craft Specialists in Middle Range Societies. In *Craft and Social Identity*, edited by Cathy L. Costin and Rita P. Wright, pp. 153–159. Archaeological Papers No. 8. American Anthropological Association, Arlington, Virginia.
- . 2009. Ohio Hopewell Ritual Craft Production. In *Footprints: In the Footprints of Squier and Davis: Archeological Fieldwork in Ross County, Ohio*, edited by Mark J. Lynott, pp. 179–188. Special Report No. 5. National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- . 2013. The Materiality of Spiritual Engagement: Art and the End of Hopewell. *World Art* 3:141–162.
- Stoltman, James B. 2015. *Ceramic Petrography and Hopewell Interaction*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Struever, Stuart, and Gail L. Houart. 1972. An Analysis of the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. In *Social Exchange and Interaction*, edited by Edwin N. Wilmsen, pp. 47–79. Anthropological Papers No. 46. Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Theler, James L., and Robert F. Boszhardt. 2006. Collapse of Critical Resources and Culture Change: A Model for the Woodland to Oneota Transformation in the Upper Midwest. *American Antiquity* 71:433–472.
- Thomas, Chad R., Christopher Carr, and Cynthia Keller. 2005. Animal-Totemic Clans of Ohio Hopewellian Peoples. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Chase, pp. 339–385. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.

- Trigger, Bruce G. 1989. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Turff, Gina A. 1997. A Synthesis of Middle Woodland Panpipes in Eastern North America. Unpublished MA thesis, Trent University. Peterborough, Ontario.
- Twigg, Deb. 2009. Cahokia Axe Stolen! <http://sracenter.blogspot.com/2009/03/cahokia-axe-stolen.html>
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre. 2008. Hopewell Ceremonial Earthworks. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5243>.
- Wagner, Roy. 1986. *Symbols that Stand for Themselves*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Walthall, John A. 1981. *Galena and Aboriginal Trade in Eastern North America*. Scientific Papers Vol. 17. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- Webb, William S., and Charles E. Snow. 1945. *The Adena People*. Reports in Anthropology and Archaeology Vol. 6. University of Kentucky, Lexington.
- Whitley, David S. 1998. New Approaches to Old Problems: Archaeology in Search of an Ever Elusive Past. In *Reader in Archaeological Theory: Post-Processual and Cognitive Approaches*, edited by David S. Whitley, pp. 1–28. Routledge, London.
- Willoughby, Charles C. 1922. *The Turner Group of Earthworks, Hamilton County, Ohio*. Harvard University, Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 8(3). Cambridge.
- Wright, Alice P. 2014. History, Monumentality, and Interaction in the Appalachian Summit Middle Woodland. *American Antiquity* 79:277–294.
- Yerkes, Richard W. 2006. Middle Woodland Settlements and Social Organization in the Central Ohio Valley: Were the Hopewell Really Farmers? In *Recreating Hopewell*, edited by Douglas K. Charles and Jane E. Buikstra, pp. 50–61. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.