

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

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

The University of Akron Press

2020

Vol. 2 Ch. 0 Preface

Jarrold Burks

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

Burks, Jarrod, "Vol. 2 Ch. 0 Preface" (2020). *Encountering Hopewell in the Twenty-first Century, Ohio and Beyond*. 24.

https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/encountering_hopewell/24

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.

Preface

Jarrold Burks

Welcome to the second volume of contributions from “The Third Chillicothe Conference on Hopewell Archaeology,” which was held May 13–14, 2016 at the Christopher Conference Center in Chillicothe, Ohio. In the 23 years since the second Chillicothe conference, interest in Ohio Hopewell research has continued to expand—so much so that we had to divide the publication of the conference proceedings into two volumes! This second volume related to the conference includes chapters on settlement, subsistence, and interaction within and between communities.

With a few notable exceptions, the Third Chillicothe Conference was heavily weighted toward Ohio Hopewell research, much as its predecessor, which produced a volume entitled “A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology” (Pacheco 1996). While earthworks and mounds have long been a topic of active research in Ohio (e.g., Atwater 1820; Greber 1983; Shetrone 1926; Squier and Davis 1848), everyday life, as seen through the lens of the settlement, has only relatively recently become an object of study. For example, Olaf Prufer’s work at the McGraw site in the early 1960s was one of the first Hopewell settlements to be examined in Ohio (Prufer 1965). But Prufer focused his excavations on the site refuse dump, rather than in areas containing cooking pits or structure remains. So, while he came away from the project with a tremendous record of the material remains of daily life, we still did not know what a Hopewell house looked like.

Hopewell settlement research was scarce at the first Chillicothe Conference in the mid 1970s (Brose and Greber 1979). Structures had been found at the Seip Earthworks in Ross County, but at the time it was thought that these were special buildings used for crafting (Baby and Langlois 1979; cf. Greber 2009). By the second Chillicothe Conference this question of houses, or the near lack thereof, still had

yet to be answered (Griffin 1996), fueling a growing debate between those who viewed the Hopewell as mobile hunter-gatherers (e.g., Cowan 2006) versus those accumulating mounting evidence indicating a sedentary, horticultural (or even agricultural) Hopewell population (e.g., Dancey 1991; Pacheco 1996; Wymer 1996).

Not long after the second Chillicothe Conference, Dancey and Pacheco (1997) brought together all of the known Hopewell settlement data as of the early 1990s and proposed their Dispersed Sedentary Community Model of Hopewell settlement in southern Ohio, building on the work begun by Prufer in the 1960s. In their edited volume, "Ohio Hopewell Community Organization" Dancey and Pacheco (1997) compiled existing settlement data from over 90 sites and showcased new results from around the region (e.g., Carskadden and Morton 1997; Kozarek 1997). But for some, the dispersed sedentary model continued to seem "overdrawn" (Griffin 1997:405). The ongoing settlement debate continued into the early 2000s (Pacheco and Dancey 2006; Ruby et al. 2005; Yerkes 2002, 2006).

And yet, even with data from dozens of settlements, Griffin's Hopewell housing crisis still loomed large in the early 2000s. Scant few complete Hopewell houses had yet to be found in southern Ohio. For some researchers working in the region, this gap in the Hopewell archaeological record was more an issue of sampling error than an indication of how things actually were in the past. For example, in the early 2000s I encountered portions of a large structure (8+ meters across) at the Strait site in Fairfield County, and based on distributional data from thousands of artifacts, I argued for the presence of multiple households in one settlement (Burks 2004). Surely this was not the only large domestic structure at a Hopewell settlement? Not long thereafter, another large structure was found, though it was not interpreted as a domestic site (Zink 2009). But at this rate, the Hopewell housing shortage problem would never really be solved in our lifetimes. What we really needed to do was to find substantial houses, cooking pits, and refuse dumps at several different settlements all across southern Ohio, and we needed to do it in a more systematic way than the catch-as-catch-can methods of the past, which largely have relied upon encounters during cultural resource management projects. Enter the geophysical survey.

One of the big changes in Hopewell archaeology between the second and third Chillicothe conferences is a maturing of archaeological geophysics, and in particular, magnetometry. The first use of a magnetic survey to locate archaeological features in the United States occurred in 1959 at the Angel site, a Mississippian town located in southeastern Indiana (Black 1961). About a decade later, limited

geophysics was in use in Ohio (e.g., Goodman 1971; Prufer and Shane 1970). However, magnetometry was not used in the state to any large degree until the 1980s, and it wasn't until the mid-1990s, after the second Chillicothe Conference, that it had been put to use on a Hopewell settlement. Today geophysical survey is the foundation for nearly all Hopewell field research. In fact, the new results presented in at least half of the chapters in Volumes 1 and 2 of this series are somehow related to a geophysical survey. And, most importantly for Volume 2, it is revolutionizing the way we excavate Hopewell domestic sites, leading to many important new discoveries—including three complete structures at the Browns Bottom cluster of sites just south of Chillicothe (see Pacheco 2005, 2009a, and 2009b). The Hopewell housing shortage is beginning to wane.

It is an exciting time to be a Hopewell archaeologist, whether in Ohio or beyond. World heritage status for several Hopewell earthwork sites is just around the corner, and new earthworks and settlements are being found and/or excavated every year. The chapters in this volume pull together some of the latest data on subsistence and settlement from the Middle Woodland period, setting the stage for the next generation of Hopewell research. While finding new enclosures, mounds, and other kinds of wooden architecture at earthwork sites is exciting and dramatic, the dogged pursuit of additional settlement data is what should be driving Hopewell research into the next Chillicothe Conference.

REFERENCES CITED

- Atwater, Caleb. 1820. Description of the Antiquities Found in the State of Ohio and Other Western States. *Archaeologia Americana* 1:105–267.
- Baby, Raymond S., and Suzanne M. Langlois. 1979. Seip Mound State Memorial: Nonmortuary Aspects of Hopewell. In *Hopewell Archaeology: The Chillicothe Conference*, edited by Davis S. Brose and N'omi B. Greber, pp. 16–18. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- Black, Glenn A. 1961. *Magnetometry as an Archaeological Tool: An Experiment by the Indiana Historical Society 1959–1960*. Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis.
- Brose, David S., and N'omi B. Greber (editors). 1979. *Hopewell Archaeology: The Chillicothe Conference*. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- Burks, Jarrod. 2004. Identifying Household Cluster and Refuse Disposal Patterns at the Strait Site: A Third Century AD Nucleated Settlement in the Middle Ohio River Valley. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Department of Anthropology, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Carskadden, Jeff, and James Morton. 1996. The Middle Woodland-Late Woodland Transition in the Central Muskingum Valley of Eastern Ohio: A View from the Philo Archaeological District. In *A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*, edited by Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 316–352. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.

- Cowan, Frank L. 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 (editors). 1997. *Ohio Hopewell Community Organization*. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- 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.
- Goodman, Kenneth C. 1971. The McGraw Garden Site: An Earth Resistivity Survey Experiment. *Ohio Archaeologist* 21(4):8–13.
- Greber, N’omi B. 1983. *Recent Excavations at the Edwin Harness Mound, Liberty Works, Ross County, Ohio*. MCJA Special Paper 5. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- . 2009. Final Data and Summary Comments. In *Re-Interpretation of a Group of Hopewell Mounds and Structures, Seip Earthworks, Ross County, Ohio*, edited by N’omi B. Greber. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 34:171–186.
- Griffin, James B. 1996. The Hopewell Housing Shortage in Ohio, AD 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.
- . 1997. Interpretations of Ohio Hopewell 1845–1984 and the Recent Emphasis on the Study of Dispersed Hamlets. In *Ohio Hopewell Community Organization*, edited by William S. Dancey and Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 405–426. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- Kozarek, Sue Ellen. 1997. Determining Sedentism in the Archaeological Record. In *Ohio Hopewell Community Organization*, edited by William S. Dancey and Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 131–152. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- Pacheco, Paul J. (editor). 1996. *A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.
- Pacheco, Paul J. 1996. Ohio Hopewell Regional Settlement Patterns. In *A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*, edited by Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 16–35. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.
- Pacheco, Paul J., Jarrod Burks, and DeeAnne Wymer. 2005. Investigating Ohio Hopewell Settlement Patterns in Central Ohio: A Preliminary Report of Archaeology at Brown’s Bottom # 1 (33Ro21). *Current Research in Ohio Archaeology 1999*, <https://www.ohioarchaeology.org>, accessed March 25, 2008.
- . 2009a. The 2007–2008 Archaeological Investigations at Lady’s Run (33Ro1105). *Current Research in Ohio 2009*. <https://www.ohioarchaeology.org>, accessed October 27, 2010.
- . 2009b. The 2006 Archaeological Investigations at Brown’s Bottom #1 (33Ro1104). *Current Research in Ohio 2009*. <https://www.ohioarchaeology.org>, accessed May 1, 2009.

- 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. 1–25. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Prufer, Olaf H. 1965. *The McGraw Site: A Study in Hopewellian Dynamics*. Scientific Publications n.s. 4(1). Cleveland Museum of Natural History, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Prufer, Olaf H. and Orrin C. Shane III. 1970. *Blain Village and the Fort Ancient Tradition in Ohio*. Kent State University Press, Kent, 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 Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, pp. 119–176. Kluwer Academic, New York.
- Shetrone, Henry C. 1926. Exploration of the Hopewell Group of Prehistoric Earthworks. *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* 35:1–227.
- Squier, Ephraim G., Edwin H. Davis. 1848. *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley*. Contributions to Knowledge No. 1, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- Wymer, DeeAnne. 1996. The Ohio Hopewell Ecniche: Human-Land Interaction in the Core Area. In *A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*, edited by Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 36–52. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.
- Yerkes, Richard W. 2002. Hopewell Tribes: A Study of Middle Woodland Social Organization in the Ohio Valley. In *The Archaeology of Tribal Societies*, edited by William A. Parkinson, pp. 227–245. International Monographs in Prehistory, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- . 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.
- Zink, Justin P. 2009. Form and Function: Interpreting the Woodland Architecture at the McCammon Circle in Central Ohio. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, Ohio State University, Columbus.