

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

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

The University of Akron Press

2020

Vol. 1 Ch. 7 The Collective Burial Locale Site A Critical Archaeological Feature in the Ohio Middle Woodland Period

A. Martin Byers

Vanier College, ambyers-2@outlook.com

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

Byers, A. Martin, "Vol. 1 Ch. 7 The Collective Burial Locale Site A Critical Archaeological Feature in the Ohio Middle Woodland Period" (2020). *Encountering Hopewell in the Twenty-first Century, Ohio and Beyond*. 7.

https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/encountering_hopewell/7

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 7

The Collective Burial Locale Site

A Critical Archaeological Feature in the Ohio Middle Woodland Period

A. Martin Byers

The collective burial locale, or CBL, as I have nominated it, is probably among one of the most important site types of North American prehistoric archaeology. It is usually not called a CBL but, instead is typically referred to as a cemetery. The favored term “cemetery” follows from the fact that the site displays an aggregation of socially generated mortuary depositions that are usually and unproblematically referred to as “graves” or “tombs,” thereby collectively constituting a “cemetery.” Of course, the cemetery CBL is important because the aggregated graves and tombs, both in terms of their contents and the relative positioning, are used to reconstruct the social and cultural structures of the communities responsible for these burials and these are unproblematically treated as the termination of a sequence of funerary rites. It might well be asked if there is any sense in my renaming the cemetery as a CBL site? Is this not simply jargon? In fact, there is good reason. My advocating the CBL idiom does not reject the cemetery idiom. Rather, I want to signal that the cemetery is only one possible type of CBL. As archaeologists we must be prepared to recognize this possibility since different types of prehistoric CBLs entail different types of prehistoric social systems.

In this paper I argue that the unquestioned assumption that informs the usage of the term “cemetery” results in and arises from a significant misunderstanding of mortuary practices and of the structural nature of the social system responsible for these CBLs. This is especially the case when addressing the Hopewellian earthworks of the Middle Woodland period because, as sites containing a rich array of mortuary residue, i.e., CBLs, these are spoken of as cemeteries. I claim that cemeteries, although certainly real material cultural mortuary features, presuppose certain types of social systems. Treating this mortuary record as so many cemeteries is false and, since archaeology considers the patterning of cemeteries as an index of the social and cultural structures of the responsible communities, as a result, our understanding and characterization of the responsible social system in which these mortuary aggregations were generated is also false.

Now, in the abstract, I certainly consider an actual cemetery CBL to be a major mortuary feature and, indeed, its importance in archaeology arises from our being able to treat it as the aggregated outcome of the funerary practices of the social system responsible for generating it and usually this system is spoken of as a community of one sort or another. But it does not follow that all sites embodying aggregations of human burials are cemeteries or that such aggregations were generated by the funerary practices of communities. This means that we need to be cautious here and first recognize a site as a socio-culturally generated aggregation of mortuary deposits, i.e., a CBL, and then determine through further theorization, analysis, and interpretation, what kind of CBL it is. A cemetery CBL is one possibility. There could be others and, in the case of the Hopewellian CBLs, i.e., those associated with Hopewellian earthworks sites, I claim that these were not cemetery CBLs. Instead, they were what I generically refer to as the world renewal CBLs because I claim they were generated by a complex sequence of world renewal rituals mediated by what I generally term postmortem human sacrifice.

Of course, funerary practices are likely universal rites of passage by which the living constitute the transition of the soul of the deceased to a new life, the “after life”; and this is likely why there is a strong tendency pervasive in modern prehistoric archaeology to unproblematically identify all instances of mortuary aggregations as cemeteries. I certainly see funerary ritual as a universal human cultural practice. I also believe that all funerary practices include an inbuilt part of the ritual that counts as the separation of the personal soul of the deceased from the community, and that this ritual moment counts as the rite of passage of the deceased from being a member of the living community to being a member of the

community of the dead. In Euro-American communities, terminal burial in a material feature we term a grave or tomb is the most common material expressive form of this rite of passage. But I believe that it is critical to recognize that the rites of termination of funerals can vary so that they need not generate graves. Indeed, they may not generate any material patterning that can be preserved as part of the archaeological record.

Following Robert Hall (1997) in this matter, I have long argued that the Middle Woodland period communities of the Central Ohio Valley performed the terminal rite of passage by exercising a spirit release rite, possibly by the senior mourner tapping the sacred bundle containing the deceased with his/her pipe, thereby enabling and likely entailing that the personal soul of the deceased leave its body. I have also argued that this simple rite also counted as formally transferring custodianship of the body, now bereft of its personal soul, to the group of life-long companions of the deceased (Byers 2004, 2011, 2015). This group shortly thereafter removed the sacred bundle of their deceased companion from the clan-based mortuary locale, probably the lodge of the deceased or a scaffold that was placed beside the lodge, to an equivalent locale where the companions were able to proceed with further mortuary spirit release rites through a sequence of rites that progressively released what have been recorded in North American anthropology as the living souls of the deceased. I have contended that it is this sequence of living-souls release rites—not the initial rite of releasing the personal soul—that has been mapped in the Hopewellian-related mortuary practices and the most outstanding material outcome of these practices is not cemetery CBLs but Hopewellian world renewal CBLs.

How might all this work? Fairly simply in terms of individual steps, but the sequence of steps could and would generate a very complex mortuary record! The family and its clan would be responsible for the performance of the funerary ritual of one of its deceased members. I have already alluded to the latter ritual as likely being initiated by placing the deceased in a simple space on the floor of his/her lodge. This feature would serve to constitute this initial mourning as a laying-in phase. Here a sequence of mourning rites could be performed by kin and companions, including the presentation of mourning gifts. Following a day or so, the deceased might be wrapped in a mourning shroud and placed on a scaffold erected beside the lodge. After several scaffold laying-in days of mourning and visitation from distant kin and companions, traditionally four days, the act of spirit release could be performed by a senior kin member, as noted above. This ritual not only terminated the funerary rites but also transferred the mortuary responsibility for

the deceased, now bereft of its personal soul, to his/her companions. This group would then bear the shroud-wrapped body to its own and spatially separate locale, possibly installing it on another scaffold or in a small crypt-like feature for temporary curation. During this second laying-in phase further mourning rites could be performed by the group of companions and related groups—usually referred to in the anthropological literature as an age-set sodality, i.e., a small group of members of the same community who were united as companions or friends by sharing the same-age/same-gender attributes. This age-set sodality and associated age-set sodalities from neighboring communities would then bear the shroud-wrapped body to another larger locale built and sustained by all these local age-set groups of the communities of this region. I have referred to the association of the several age-sets of a given community as an ecclesiastic-communal cult sodality and the association of the cult sodalities of the communities of a region as a first-order cult sodality heterarchy.

Here, in the first-order cult sodality heterarchy site, further laying-in release rituals would be performed. But it is important to note that these would not be rites of personal soul release but rites of releasing the living spirits of the deceased, and, progressively, the many deceased brought to this locale would become aggregated. This first-order cult sodality heterarchy in turn allies with other first-order heterarchies to generate second-order heterarchies which, in turn associate to form what I have termed *dispersed third-order cult sodality heterarchies*. It is these heterarchies that generated the world renewal CBLs. In sum, the progressive sequence of living soul release rites generated the progressive levels of Hopewellian CBLs—first-, second-, and dispersed third-order, these could be quite properly termed *world renewal CBLs* since, as I have long argued, the release rites served to return the living souls of the deceased. This is a metaphorical way of saying that the living souls, originally derived from the spiritual powers immanent in the animals and plant species that the human community exploits and consumes are returned to these species occupants to enable their being reborn.

THE DUAL PERSONAL AND LIVING SOUL CULTURAL BELIEF

It is well known that a central belief component of the Native North American cultural tradition is the belief that humans embody two categories of souls or spirits, personal souls and living souls (Carr, this volume; Hall 1997; Lankford 2007a, 2007b; Von Gernet 1993). I have contended that this dual soul belief—personal and living souls—grounds the dual mortuary sphere I outlined above and

each sphere consists of rituals specialized to release the souls particular to each category. The funerary rites outlined above release the personal soul, and the world renewal rites release the living souls. Above I postulated that these two sets of rites are mutually exclusive and normally involve first the funerary release of the personal soul and then the world renewal release of the living souls. Therefore, in virtue of this dual personal soul/living soul belief, I have postulated that there are two main categories of CBLs in the prehistory of the Eastern Woodlands of North America: the cemetery CBL and the world renewal CBL.

In his long career, Robert Hall (1997) strongly argued that traditional Eastern Woodland Native American communities not only recognized a close relation between human death and human rebirth but also between human death and world rebirth or, as I prefer treating it, world renewal. This latter relation is quite foreign to Western cultural thought and practice and I think it is safe to say that as a consequence mortuary-mediated world renewal ritual is not generally recognized as a part of the mortuary traditions of Euro-American cultures. This may account for a systematic erasure or occluding from our view of the world renewal mortuary ritual from the interpretive treatment that archaeology makes of the prehistoric mortuary data of the Eastern Woodlands. While the Euro-American belief in the individual soul is akin to the traditional Native North American belief in the personal soul, there is no Euro-American soul belief category equivalent to the living soul. In European cultural understanding, when Native informants spoke of the “living souls” of the deceased, early European interveners, particularly the missionaries, made sense of these references by subsuming these “living souls” to being sub-categories or sub-faculties of the Euro-American soul and, therefore, the dual set of mortuary rites that early Europeans witnessed were interpretively conflated into being “funerals,” and they were very strange types of funerals to the European view and, indeed, perverted by “Satanic” views. But essentially these mortuary practices were treated by these early interveners as funerary rites of personal soul release.

Of course, the view that these mortuary rituals were the expression of a perverted mentality is no longer recognized in North American anthropology. But what is still pervasive in the anthropological and archaeological literature is the conflation of what I speak of as the dual sphere of funerary mortuary and world renewal mortuary ritual into its being understood to be a singular mortuary sphere and the central mortuary ritual of this sphere is commonly recognized to be the funeral. This is what I have termed the *Funerary or Cemetery model* (Byers 2004,

2010, 2011, 2015) and I treat its unproblematic application to the archaeological record of the prehistoric Eastern Woodlands as the funerary or cemetery fallacy. Seen in these fallacious terms, all the mortuary-mediated rites are funerary rites, and, those social components of the community that are responsible are kinship-based, i.e., family and clan, and therefore all CBLs are the aggregation of the deceased of the kinship groups that constitute the community. This funerary model, therefore, leads to characterizing the CBLs associated with Hopewellian earthworks as community CBLs and, since these are CBLs generated by the aggregated termination of funerary rites in graves and tombs, these CBLs nicely translate to being community cemeteries, thereby promoting the *reasoned* conclusion that the Hopewellian monumental sites were the civic-ceremonial centers of Hopewellian kinship-based communities. Even though as archaeologists we recognize that these communities would have had sodalities, i.e., the above noted complex set of ranked age-set sodalities, the possible relevance of companionship in constituting the social formations that I claim actually were responsible for these earthworks is not recognized. These are subsumed to the clans as the *operating arms* of the latter and the community that the clans constitute and are not considered to be autonomous groups in their own right, quite capable of being fully responsible for the mortuary practices that are indexed in CBLs. A complex cemetery CBL then is interpreted as indexing a complex kinship-based community that is responsible for and is embodied in the collective center of the community or of an alliance of such communities (Carr 2005b).

SOUL BELIEFS AND THE DUAL COMMUNITY/HETERARCHY SOCIAL SYSTEM

I have long argued that these dual mortuary practices also influenced and were influenced by the social structural formation of the community. Under the Mourning/World Renewal Mortuary model, I have argued that during the Middle Woodland period in Ohio the funerary and world renewal trajectories were particularly specialized with the funerary sphere being the prevailing responsibility of the kinship groups of the Ohio communities, likely best characterized as clans, while the prevailing responsibility for the living soul release rites—constituting the world renewal sphere—was under the exclusive responsibility of the companionship groups that constituted the above noted structure of cult sodality heterarchies. The latter heterarchies are the focus of the Hopewellian ceremonial assemblage and the distribution of these heterarchies also maps the distribution of this unique assemblage.

As I briefly noted above, the cult sodality heterarchies were organized in progressively more inclusive levels: first-order, second-order, and likely the maximal dispersed third-order levels. A typical first-order heterarchy consisted of a consensually affiliated network of cult sodalities of the several autonomous and dispersed communities of a local region. These cult sodalities allied to constitute this first-order heterarchy. The second-order cult sodality heterarchy level consisted of an affiliation of the several contiguous but regionally dispersed autonomous first-order heterarchies, thereby collectively embracing an even larger region, and so on, to the dispersed third-order level.

Hence, the social system of regions where the Hopewellian ceremonial assemblage prevailed (during the Middle Woodland period) consisted of a dual complex of mutually autonomous social formations, the community consisting of the clans occupying their hamlets and the cult sodality heterarchies, occupying the lesser and greater Hopewellian earthworks. I suggest that the cemetery CBL was rather rare and largely archaeologically invisible. This is because few funerals were terminated in burial but instead were terminated by the transfer of the body to the custodianship of the cult sodalities who, in turn, incorporated these deceased, now bereft of personal souls, into the sequence of world renewal rituals performed in the context of these cult sodality heterarchies. This means that the Ohio Hopewellian earthworks as world renewal CBLs were dominant in the landscape serving to mediate sequences of world renewal rituals that systematically released the different categories of living souls in a complex mortuary process—the post-mortem human sacrificial ritual *chaîne opératoire* mortuary trajectory.

LETHAL AND POSTMORTEM HUMAN SACRIFICE

This raises another inadequacy in anthropological theory largely arising from the Euro-American singular soul belief. This is that the only form of human sacrifice is lethal sacrifice. Lethal human sacrifice entails destroying the life of the human victim. This destructive moment, the lethal moment, of human sacrifice is treated as a form of releasing the personal soul as a sacrificial gift to the intended deity or deities. I certainly do not deny that lethal human sacrifice is well known and that it was a widely performed type of sacrifice. The problem is that in anthropology and archaeology it is taken to be the only form of human sacrifice. The critical definition of human sacrifice is that it releases the human soul as a gift to the deities. But if the prevailing belief is that there are two categories of human souls, then it is quite possible and indeed, it is very likely for communities based

on this dual soul belief to be able to perform two types of human sacrifice, one type that is lethal and one type that is non-lethal. I have called the latter *postmortem human sacrifice* since it entails the releasing of the living souls of the human after his/her natural death. At death, the personal soul release rites are performed, i.e., funerary rites. These are not sacrificial rites. But then the sequence of living soul release rites are performed—and these are human sacrificial rites.

Hence, because of the belief that different bodily components of the human being were enlivened by specific sacred living souls—the flesh and blood, the limbs, the thorax, the skull, and each of these could be subclassed into discrete body parts—releasing these sacred living souls was carried out by and constituted as a complex *chaîne opératoire* that could vary between regions. I term it a postmortem human sacrificial *chaîne opératoire* mortuary trajectory because I have postulated it as consisting of a sequence of linked mortuary processing stages, each stage entailing some (literal) deconstructive transformation of the body or a select set of body parts.

Each step of this overall process was performed and constituted as a particular postmortem human sacrificial laying-in ritual. Typically, therefore, these rituals were structurally sequenced with the material outcome of an earlier laying-in phase being recruited to serve as the sacrificial medium of the next ritual. How this likely worked is fairly straightforward. For example, following the personal soul release rite, i.e., the funerary ritual, the body was wrapped in a mourning shroud and exposed on a *scaffold altar*. That is, since this exposure enabled the deterioration of the soft tissue, the latter counting as a sacrifice to the celestial deities, the scaffold can be termed an altar scaffold. Therefore, this scaffold-mediated laying-in phase constituted a postmortem sacrifice of the living souls immanent in the flesh. The latter rite was terminated when the bones of the exposed deceased were gathered and cleaned of any excessive flesh and skin, the latter being cremated, and formed into a sacred bone bundle and curated in an *altar crypt*, often constructed as a rectangular log feature on the floor of a renewal lodge and temporarily covered by earth (Heidenreich 1978; Trigger 1969, 1976). Then, at the appropriate time, the buried or “entombed” bones would be retrieved and used, either in the same site or at another equivalent site, to mediate another postmortem human sacrificial rite, possibly involving the breaking of the bones to extract and cremate the bone marrow, and so on.

In short, the mortuary residue of a given sacrificial ritual stage, generically referred to as a laying-in phase, served as the warranting medium for the subsequent phase. The sequence could be varied from flesh removal as a sacrifice to the

Celestial deities to bone deposition as sacrifice to the Underworld deities, to retrieval of the bone deposition and cremation to the deities of the Middle World—those of the west, the north, the south, and/or the east, as the case may be. In effect, overall, the postmortem human sacrificial ritual process was constituted as a *chaîne opératoire* trajectory and different regions could take on slightly variant forms of processing.

Yes, no doubt some lethal human sacrifice was performed on the mortuary floors of the great timber structures that I refer to as renewal lodges. But I have long argued that this was probably a minority practice during the Middle Woodland period. Far more important was the performance of the above-noted sequencing of postmortem human sacrifice. Postmortem human sacrifice always was a post-funerary ritual process and it was complex because it entailed the sequential releasing of the multiple living souls of different bodily categories. The sequence of rites releasing the living souls, therefore, returned these potent entities to the sacred natural order for rebirth.

POLITIES AND HETERARCHIES: ALTERNATIVE COMMUNITY TYPES

COMMUNITY POLITY MODEL

It should be clear now that I certainly do not deny that cemeteries are real material cultural features generated by communities. Indeed the above warrants the claim that when cemetery CBLs prevail in a region, this is because the communities are constituted as particular types. I have referred to them generically as community polities. With the prevalence in the Hopewellian literature of treating sites having CBLs, often referred to as burial mounds, as embodying community cemeteries, another prevalence is to treat these major earthwork sites as the civic, religious, social, and political centers of these community polities. There is no doubt that polities in prehistory were real. Interestingly, anthropological knowledge to that effect has been accumulated and actual community polities have been identified and complexly classified. But these are largely located in the Old World, in Africa, in pre-classical and classical Europe, and in huge areas of Asia. And the standard view also represents them as exemplified by the Hopewellian earthworks and other similar earthworks in the Eastern Woodlands, in North America. While obviously varying, the common-denominator core of attributes of community polities, a core that I have noted as having been recognized in the archaeological literature, is that community polities are communities having descent-based lineage kinship structures and that typically claim and practice exclusive territo-

rialism. I have argued that lineage structures characteristically suppress the possibility that autonomous cult sodalities can or would emerge (Byers 2011, 2015). The significance of this claim is that for those who choose to continue speaking of Ohio Hopewellian CBLs using the funerary/cemetery idiom necessarily are committed to speaking of the Ohio Hopewellian community *as a community polity* and from this follows all the entailments generated by the polity structure, in particular the necessity that the community has to preserve, defend, and, if possible, expand its exclusive territorial module of land. I have nominated this understanding of a social system, prehistoric or historic, as the Community Polity model.

Discussion. I think it is a good social model in that it usefully highlights essential structural dimensions that, if any given social system has them, would constitute the communities of a regional social system as polities. But, it also follows that although a good social model, applying the model to the mortuary dimension of an archaeological record of a prehistoric human social system by treating the CBLs of that record as cemeteries when they were not cemeteries but some other type of CBLs necessarily leads to systematic misinterpretation of this archaeological record and our misunderstanding of the type of prehistoric regional social system and its community type that prevailed—in this case, in the Ohio Middle Woodland period.

This is why it is important “to get it right.” That is, if there is a systematic relation between the regional social system and the dual set of CBLs, i.e., cemetery and world renewal CBLs, of that region and that enabled and generated these dual CBL features, then what kind of community would or could have generated this dual set of CBLs, particularly when the world renewal CBL set became very prominent in the landscape while the former or cemetery CBL set was almost archaeologically invisible? Above I noted that the system of Hopewellian world renewal CBLs was generated by cult sodality heterarchies while the cemetery CBLs were generated by a type of community that was, in many ways, the opposite to the community polity—the complementary heterarchical community. Since a regional system of community polities generates only one type of CBL, the cemetery CBL, and the patterning of the latter is largely a structural replication of the community polity, i.e., mortuary studies of cemetery CBLs play such an important role in advancing archaeological reconstruction of prehistoric community polities, this requires modelling the Middle Woodland period social system in dual terms—community and cult sodality heterarchy. And the patterning of the world renewal CBL bears no relation to the social structure of the communities except that it was the unique non-polity nature of the community structure that enabled

the cult sodality heterarchy to emerge, when it did. That is, regional social systems of the Middle Woodland period in the Eastern Woodlands require a dual community/sodality social model to explain the dual cemetery and world renewal CBLs—the Dual Complementary Heterarchical Community/Cult Sodality Heterarchy model, or simply the Dual Heterarchy model. A summary explication of this model now follows. Full explication can be found in my earlier publications (Byers 2011, 2015).

THE DUAL HETERARCHY MODEL

I have already noted above the regional autonomous systems of social formations responsible for the Hopewellian world renewal CBLs, referring to and characterizing them as regional systems of autonomous cult sodality heterarchies progressively related as first-, second-, and dispersed third-order cult sodalities. Since cemetery CBLs are generated by communities, then in any given region, parallel to the Hopewellian system of cult sodality heterarchies and their world renewal CBLs would be a system of communities and their cemetery CBLs. But these communities would not be community polities. In community polities same-age/same-gender age-sets are not autonomous groups, i.e., sodalities, but are assimilated into the lineage structure as sets of siblings and generational parallel cousins constituting these structures of lineal kin as ranked lineage structures. Hence the age-sets are subsumed to the lineages and subordinated to the ranking senior leadership of these lineages (Dillehay 1992). The cemetery CBLs of a community polity, therefore, are rank structured and replicate and “renew” the spiritually dominant ancestors of the social world of the living rather than renewing and enhancing the immanent sacredness of the land. This means that the communities of a social system that sustains a dual system of cemetery and world renewal CBLs are not community polities but complementary heterarchical communities.

The complementary heterarchical community—as an autonomous social formation—consists of a dual social-structural axis, kinship and companionship, and this dual axis generates and sustains a key or core dual structure of clans and sodalities. The kinship system is based on filiation, tracing kin filiation through the living parents and generations, and usually favoring one parent or the other, i.e., matrilineal or patrilineal. Typically, the community is structured into two sets of named clans, or moieties, and the clans of these moieties are exogamous so that a person must find a spouse in a clan of the opposite moiety. The age-set sodalities are groups of companions linked by shared age and gender and the persons interact indepen-

dently of their individual kinship filiations. In effect, the clan system sectors the community into mutually autonomous but exogamous kinship groups while the sodality system sectors the community into mutually autonomous age-set sodalities by erasing the kinship structures that might link age-set participants while highlighting their same-age/same-gender relations. This dual sectoring ensures that clans and sodalities maintain arm's-length relations so that clans avoid intervening in the affairs and tasks of the sodalities, and vice versa. This avoidance relation constitutes the relative autonomy of sodalities and clans, which enables sodalities to relate autonomously with each other cross-communally, thereby generating the cult sodality heterarchy that I noted above. The autonomous nature of the first-order heterarchy facilitates its allying with other like heterarchies to generate the second-order heterarchy, and so on. In effect, in any region two parallel social formations can emerge, the system of complementary heterarchical communities and the system of cult sodality heterarchies. The facility of regional and, importantly, even transregional alliances, particularly of cult sodality heterarchies, is further promoted by the fact that kinship filiation promotes and largely corresponds with what I have termed *inclusive territorialism*—the belief and practice shared by the social components of this world that no one owns land such that others can be excluded. Rather, a community relates to the land that it regularly exploits as the custodians and neighboring custodial communities recognize that each has the priority duty to care for the land that it habitually exploits. But priority to care for the land does not mean exclusive priority over the use of the land. Therefore, neighbors cannot be denied access to the resources embodied in the lands of their custodial neighbors but, typically, they must consult with their neighbors when they need to hunt and so on in their neighbor's inclusive territories, i.e., where their neighbors have primary care-giving duties, in order to verify where the most currently available game and wild crops are.

Inclusive territorialism promotes the absencing of exclusive boundaries and filiation erases the exclusive dominance of the clan over the social life of its members and this combination, in contrast to lineal descent and exclusive territorialism of community polities, enables and promotes the formation of cult sodality heterarchies and the practice of widespread travel by age-sets to participate in the mortuary ceremonialism of their neighboring regional and even transregional cult sodality heterarchies. I maintain that this network of interrelations and interaction in prehistory is mapped by the distribution of the Hopewellian ceremonial assemblage (Byers 2011, 2015).

A THIRD CRITICAL ALTERNATIVE?

The Dual Complementary Heterarchical Community/Cult Sodality Heterarchy model stands in opposition to the current and prevailing archaeological view of the community of the Middle Woodland period that treats it as a community polity and, of course, the great Ohio Hopewellian earthwork sites are spoken of as the civic-ceremonial centers of the Ohio Hopewellian community polities. This view is expressed as the Vacant Center–Dispersed Hamlet model or thesis (Prufer 1964, 1996; Dancey and Pacheco 1997; Greber 2006; Pacheco 1993, 1996, 1997). However, a recent community modelling of these sites has been put forward by Ruby et al. (2005) that promises to enable interpreting the archaeological record differently. They call it the Multiple Community model. In my view it has important potential because they also differentiate between the great Hopewellian sites, these being where many of the most impressive CBLs are found, and the multiple dispersed hamlets distributed around these sites, treating these as two *different* and mutually autonomous types of communities. Only the earthworks are identified with the Hopewellian CBLs and, according to them, these were built and used by groups that could be properly identified with the Hopewellian assemblage, and, indeed, they refer to these groups as symbolic communities. At the same time, the dispersed hamlets were built and occupied by different types of groups consisting of coresidents. Clusters of near-neighbor coresidential hamlet groups are referred to under this model as residential communities. The Multiple Community model effectively sectors the symbolic and residential communities as mutually autonomous and exclusive, despite the fact that spatially they are contiguous. They specifically identify the Hopewellian assemblage, i.e., the monumental earthworks, the great timber mortuary features, the “graves” and the Hopewellian artifactual assemblage often associated with these “graves” as “symbolic communities,” while the residential communities are identified with and embody the everyday assemblage of the Middle Woodland period of Ohio.

Hence, just as I argued above under the Dual Complementary Heterarchical Community/Cult Sodality Heterarchy model that these social formations are mutually autonomous, so they also argue that the residential and symbolic community formations are mutually autonomous. Indeed, equivalent to my identification of the graded sizes of the Hopewellian earthwork sites as indexing first-order and second-order heterarchies, they sector the grade sizes into *local* and *regional* symbolic communities with lesser Hopewellian earthworks manifesting local and the greater Hopewellian earthworks manifesting regional symbolic communities, respectively.

Does this mean that our terminology is synonymous and that to avoid redundancy I should shift to speaking of cemetery CBLs and symbolic community CBLs? It certainly would appear to be advisable. But, while I support their approach—for it clearly assigns to the autonomous symbolic community formation responsibility for the Hopewellian assemblage, and I assume this would include the mortuary CBLs—I would not do so. This is because there is a serious theoretical fault in the elucidation and articulation of this model. A careful and critical reading of their work makes it clear that the “symbolic community” and the “residential community” social formations, which they assert are autonomous, are not really autonomous at all. This becomes clear when they argue that the symbolic community formation, particularly the regional symbolic community, as represented by the Hopewell Mound Group site, for example, served as a source of finding spouses for the residential communities that are found near to and clustered around the lesser earthwork locales, thereby ensuring that the latter avoided transgressing the incest taboo by intermarrying.

They called these widely distributed residential communities tied through long distant bonds of intermarriage “brokered” by interaction in the regional symbolic communities “sustainable communities.” They were not postulated as social formations in their own right but, instead, were treated as the functional outcome of the residential communities scattered around the lesser symbolic communities actively avoiding transgressing the incest taboo imperative. That is, they particularly noted that the regional symbolic community locales, more than the local symbolic community locales, were important nodal centers for channeling long distance intermarriage. But this claim has important entailments with regard to the residential community formation itself. It entails that the components of any given residential community had to avoid intermarriage with each other and if this is the case, then they therefore were constituted as exogamous lineages. This further means that the earthwork sites that were identified under their scheme as “local symbolic communities” were the community centers of these exogamous lineages.

Indeed, in their seminal paper, the proponents illustrated and exemplified their model by giving brief sketches of the settlement patterning in each of the three major areas where the Hopewellian earthwork sites are most well represented—both as “local” and “regional” symbolic communities—Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. In each case they specifically identify the Hopewellian social systems of these three regions as embodying exclusive territories structured by lineal descent systems, albeit they suggested that the exclusive territorialism varied slightly between these regions (Ruby et al. 2005; also see Carr 2005b).

In short, the Multiple Mound model reduces to being an elaborate reformulation of the current orthodox Vacant Center–Dispersed Hamlet model. Indeed, both the latter and the Multiple Community model specifically speak of lineal descent and exclusive territories. Since I claim that the Multiple Community model effectively reduces to being a complicated version and re-elucidation of the Vacant Center–Dispersed Hamlet model, I will simply use the latter model, which is essentially a Community Polity model, to contrast with my own notion of the complementary heterarchical community.

THE ENTREPRENEURIAL/FUNERARY MODEL

Christopher Carr (2005a) has strongly argued that North American archaeology has mistakenly characterized the widespread distribution of the Hopewellian assemblage as indexing what Joseph Caldwell (1964) postulated in the 1960s to be the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. Carr has proposed an alternative scheme of social mechanisms to explain the transregional distribution of this unique ceremonial assemblage, one that is also piggybacked on Carr's strong commitment to the cemetery CBL and the exclusive territorialism of the community polity view as he expressed it in the Triple Alliance model, an auxiliary of the Multiple Community model (Carr 2005b). Drawing on anthropological analogy, Carr has strongly argued that the widespread association of the Hopewellian ceremonial assemblage with cemetery CBLs is not the outcome of transregional inter-community polity interaction mediated by mortuary cults performing interregional funerary ritual, as Caldwell (1964) claimed in his classic Hopewell Interaction Sphere model, but instead, this distribution was the unwitting outcome of two processes unrelated to the mortuary use and association of this assemblage as such: (1) the ongoing operation of several unrelated social mechanisms, including long distance marriage exchange practices, the pursuit of individual shamanic and related powers, long-distance ordeal quests, and so on; and (2) the locally based mortuary practices generating funerary burials circumstantially in association with Hopewellian features and artifacts. By claiming that the deceased found in the funerary features, i.e., "graves" and "tombs," on the floors of the Hopewellian type "charnel houses," were circumstantially associated, he is denying that these artifacts were used to constitute Hopewellian rituals, as such, but were simply the result of the core premise of the Funerary or Cemetery model, namely, that the deceased were given funerary treatment in accordance with the social standing they had in their lifetime, whether achieved or inherited (ascribed). Hence, the presence of these artifacts was unrelated to Hopewellian ritual, as such, but simply to their being

useful as status symbols whereby the community polity registered the social standing of the deceased during his/her funeral.

Given what I have already said about the dual specialization of the mortuary sphere as allocated between clan and sodality, I quite disagree with his claim that the aggregations of these deceased index cemeteries as postulated under the funerary view. Instead, viewed under the Cult Sodality Heterarchy model, these were world renewal CBLs and the mortuary practices they served to mediate were post-mortem human sacrificial world renewal practices by which living souls were systematically released. In these terms the felicity and success of these rituals hinged on the proper use of the Hopewellian artifacts. Therefore, this association of the deceased with the Hopewellian assemblage was intrinsic and, furthermore, that it was only because those responsible took themselves to be performing the mortuary-mediated behaviors in the appropriate material context, a recognized Hopewellian earthwork, and through the mediation of appropriate Hopewellian artifacts and features—symbolic pragmatic tools of ritual—that they counted as and were the postmortem human sacrificial rituals as intended.

Now with regard to the former (1), the set of diverse and unrelated social mechanisms promoting long distance travels, these hinge largely on individual and not collective practice and motivation to undertake long travels in order to pursue personal quests, ordeals, and goals of enhancing these careerists in their local community social standing. This combination of long distance individual entrepreneurial-like pursuits and the contingent nature of the Hopewellian artifacts with community funerary practices is what I have nominated as the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model (Byers 2011, 2015). It would be a good model if it was applied to the appropriate archaeological record, e.g., that record generated by community polities. And if so, it would show that the spatial reach of interaction among community polities these mechanisms enabled would be very limited, indeed, given the operating premise of exclusive territorialism and mutual suspicion among polities. But I maintain that Carr has applied it to the archaeological record of a social system that was not based on community polities but on the above noted dual social system consisting of complementary heterarchical communities and cult sodality heterarchies.

THE “SO-CALLED” HOPEWELL INTERACTION SPHERE THESIS

As a result of being a good model applied to the wrong archaeological record, the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model has promoted what I have called the “So-

Called” Hopewell Interaction Sphere thesis. This is the skeptical claim that there ever really was such an interregional social entity of the type that Caldwell (1964) labeled the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. Instead, this widespread distribution of the Hopewellian assemblage, particularly Hopewellian CBLs, a distribution which archaeologists definitely acknowledge occurred, is simply an epiphenomenal and unwitting outcome of the above individualistic pursuits and, therefore, the association of Hopewellian artifacts with the funerary features, as Carr’s view puts it, was simply because they served as status symbols and were used to display in death the social standing of the deceased during his/her lifetime. My contrarian view, as you might suspect, is the opposite. Hence, just as the mortuary practices of the prehistoric Native North American communities were much more complex and richer than we can rationally allow for under the Community Polity model and its associated Funerary/Cemetery model, so the complex transregional distributional interaction that this assemblage indexes was more complex and much richer than the current Community Polity model and Entrepreneurial/Funerary model allow for and that, in fact the above “So-Called” thesis is itself false.

I claim that there very much was a “living and kicking Hopewell Interaction Sphere” (Byers 2011, 2015). However, its social nature was not quite as Caldwell postulated it to be. He characterized its broad widespread regionalism as mediated by funerary rites, and spoke of the Hopewell Interaction Sphere as linking many disparate community polities through cooperative participation in a funerary mortuary cult system. I also characterize it in mortuary terms, not in funerary, but in world renewal postmortem human sacrificial terms. Further, while the scope of the transregional regional network of social relations and mortuary-mediated interactions that characterized it may have been slightly less than imagined by Caldwell, the intensity and regularity of the interaction that sustained it were likely greater than he imagined. I have called this transregional sphere of mortuary-mediated ceremonial interaction the fourth-order Hopewellian ceremonial sphere. During the Middle Woodland period, it embraced much of the Midwest and the central and lower Mississippian Valley region and my overall social characterization of it was that it was a transregional system of postmortem human sacrificial rituals that was sustained by and that promoted the system of Hopewellian sacred games *tournées*.

THE FOURTH-ORDER HOPEWELLIAN CEREMONIAL SPHERE

But it is not sufficient for me to simply assert the prehistoric existence of this ceremonial sphere. I must demonstrate it. How? First, it is important to explicate

this model. The Hopewellian Ceremonial Sphere model claims that the above noted distribution of the Hopewellian ceremonial assemblage within a given region indexed a multiple set of dispersed third-order cult sodality heterarchies. Each of these sustained a set of Hopewellian world renewal rituals constituting a *primary* (Hopewellian) *ceremonial sphere*. The cooperative and reciprocal visitation of age-set sodalities among and across the dispersed third-order cult sodality heterarchies of a given region to participate in the sacred games *tournées* and related world renewal rituals each hosted constituted the latter cooperative interaction as a *first-order regional Hopewellian ceremonial sphere*, e.g., the first-order Ohio Hopewellian Ceremonial sphere. Reiteration of cooperative and reciprocal visitation and interaction of age-set sodalities between heterarchies of two or more neighboring first-order ceremonial spheres constituted a second-order ceremonial sphere, e.g., the second order Indiana–Ohio Hopewellian ceremonial sphere, and so on, to the fourth level. The basic principles are hereby laid out and I have elaborated on them and nominated the postulated set of first-order to fourth-order Hopewellian ceremonial spheres in my book, *Reclaiming the Hopewellian Ceremonial Sphere* (Byers 2015).

The key players in this system were the dispersed third-order heterarchies. Each mobilized and scheduled both the suite of world renewal postmortem human sacrificial rituals constituting their primary Hopewellian ceremonial sphere and the associated sacred games *tournées* that typically were a critical part of any heterarchy-wide ritual cycle. Age-set sodalities of their participating cult sodalities would attend as Soul Keepers bearing the sacred bundles of the deceased embodying their living souls to serve as sacrificial offerings as well as participants in the heterarchy's sacred games *tournées* system. The latter games were particularly the “drawing card” that would attract age-set sodalities from distant heterarchies situated within the first-order Hopewellian ceremonial sphere as well as from more distant second-order or even third-order Hopewellian ceremonial spheres. These age-sets as Soul Keepers (Hall 1997) would typically bear the sacred bundles embodying the bones and their living souls of deceased and these bundles served as warrants enabling their effective participation in the sacred games *tournées* of either their own heterarchy or of any distant hosting cult sodality heterarchies that they were transiently visiting (Byers 2015). Winning and losing of the sacred games entailed winning or losing these sacred bone bundles. The rest of this paper is devoted to showing the adequacy of my alternative view, which reclaims the broad scope initially captured by Caldwell's view, while correcting it by replacing both

the community polity and the funerary ritual view that he supported by the Dual Complementary Heterarchical Community/Cult Sodality Heterarchy model and the postmortem human sacrificial view that is promoted under the Mourning/World Renewal Mortuary model, and simultaneously by demonstrating the inadequacy of the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model to explain this distribution.

MODEL ELUCIDATION

Of course, it is important to acknowledge that the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model is correct to argue that long distance ordeal quests and shamanic know-how quests were performed in prehistoric times just as anthropology has attested that they have been performed by persons in historic Native American communities. One of the more prominent of these social practices that Carr (2005a) included in the above list of individual entrepreneurial exchange mechanisms was long distance marriage exchange practices. But I claim that these mechanisms, including marriage exchange, alone are insufficient to explain the formation and the transregional distribution of the Hopewellian assemblage. If in fact they were, as argued by Carr, then given that these practices were actively carried out in historic times by the indigenous North American communities that were first encountered by European interveners, it follows that when the Europeans arrived they should also have encountered a transregional system of individualized interaction of an equivalent spatial scope to the transregional distribution of the Hopewellian assemblage. There was not. This says that an important and necessary factor was not operating in these Late Prehistoric/Protohistoric period times or, if it was operating, it was suppressed by other factors. I have argued that the factor that Carr missed was, in fact, the widespread transregional practice of what I have termed custodial franchising of Hopewellian sacred bundles, the latter enabling the performance of the various specialized cult sodality postmortem human sacrificial rituals, and by the equally widespread transregional sacred ball game *tournees*, recognizing that these latter games were an intrinsic part of the cult sodality specialized task sphere of postmortem human sacrificial rituals.

CUSTODIAL FRANCHISING OF HOPEWELLIAN SACRED BUNDLES

Carr's (2005a) social mechanisms of pursuit of specialized religious beliefs and know-how (e.g., shamanic practices) focused on how an individual could gain a sacred bundle that embodied powers enabling the bearer to perform shamanic séances of various sorts. He followed David Penny (1989) in this case, who has

insightfully spoken of the body of exotic Hopewellian knowledge and know-how tied to a ritual practice as a ritual prerogative; but he characterized the holding of the ritual prerogative in proprietorial terms, as something owned by the individual, and the transfer of the ritual prerogative in commercial buying-selling terms. I find both characterizations to be inappropriately applied to traditional Native North American communities and, by extension, to their prehistoric predecessors. I have suggested referring to the ritual prerogative as a *ritual usufruct copyright*, with the latter notion including both the background cultural knowledge/belief and the expert practicing know-how, as well as the character of the social activity that it made possible (i.e., ritual). Further, instead of using the buying-selling idiom to characterize the transfer of the ritual usufruct copyright, I treat the transfer as a species of franchising, in particular custodial franchising. “Buying-selling” is appropriate in societies having commercial markets, and, moreover, it is a form of transfer that extinguishes the rights-of-use (i.e., usufruct) over the object being sold. I am sure that Carr would deny that the shaman who “sells” the “ritual prerogative” thereby self-denies the rights to perform it. The shaman retains the ritual prerogative, or the ritual usufruct copyright, while endowing it on the apprentice. The notion of franchising has this sense. Therefore, we could say that the shaman “franchises” the ritual usufruct copyright(s) to the apprentice who, in turn, becomes a shaman while the franchising donor shaman retains his/her own ritual powers. But “franchising” has to be modified since in our social world franchising is a contractual obligation that enables the franchiser to extend control over the franchisee’s exercise of this proprietorial copyright. This means that the recipient is a subordinate and not an autonomous party. To emphasize that the franchise transfer is not of this nature, I have termed it *custodial franchising*, with the sense that the custodian has the exclusive prerogative over exercising their ritual usufruct copyright. Hence, a custodial franchising event of a shamanic ritual usufruct copyright entails the teaching of the protocols and rules of production and practice that make up this copyright to the visiting apprentice and part of the mode of instruction includes the production of a sacred bundle under the supervision of the master donor shaman. The recipient apprentice then exercises the ritual usufruct copyright under the master’s guidance in a séance and this counts as and constitutes the successful custodial franchising transfer. The recipient is now a master in his/her/their own right and, of course, can return home. This party, retaining full autonomy, can in turn choose to transfer the same ritual usufruct copyright to another party, and so on. I have argued that the custodial ritual usu-

fruct copyright is symbolically embodied in a sacred bundle and this bundle contains all the sacred icons by which the shaman is able to exercise his/her powers.

But restricting the custodial franchising transfer to the individual shaman-apprentice level will not be sufficient to explain and account for the distribution of the Hopewellian assemblage since much of the assemblage entails not individual but collective parties. The Hopewellian earthwork is the outcome and context of a collective endeavor and therefore it is necessary to characterize the custodians of Hopewellian sacred bundles in collective or group terms. Therefore, while the focus on buying-selling instead of franchising is the first inadequacy of Carr's entrepreneurial thesis, his focus on the individual-to-individual transfer is the second one. But this can easily be repaired. Carr notes that small groups of young persons, for example, might travel some distance on an ordeal quest in order to participate in rituals in an exotic place. This practice can be rephrased by noting that the group could and would be an age-set sodality and its purpose would be to participate as recipient franchisees in a custodial usufruct ritual transfer event, thereby becoming the collective custodians of a Hopewellian sacred bundle that enabled them to perform a given Hopewellian ritual and this would include producing a sacred bundle that endowed them with the custodial right to build the sacred earthwork in which the ritual was to be performed. Also, in virtue of the close and amicable relations they now have with the cult sodality who acted as the custodial franchisers, it also would enable them to make return trips to participate in the sacred games *tournées* along with the custodial franchiser age-set sodalities of the very same cult sodality heterarchies from which they derived their original Hopewellian sacred bundles, and so on. The shift from the buying-selling and the individual-to-individual idiom of the entrepreneurial aspect of Carr's model to the custodial franchising among and between equivalently ranked age-set sodalities from different and spatially distant cult sodality heterarchies enables explaining both the unique formal patterning of the Hopewellian ceremonial assemblage and its widespread distribution.

Therefore, this distribution indexes a widespread network of relations that was both generated and that promoted ongoing long distance interaction. And the most dominant interaction that this network enabled was the sacred games *tournées*. I will combine the sacred games *tournées* and the custodial franchising views into the Sacred Games *Tournées*/Custodial Franchising model and test it against the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model, treating each as presupposing respectively the Dual Complementary Heterarchical/Cult Sodality Heterarchy model and the

Community Polity model, in order to demonstrate which is the preferred model for explaining the Hopewellian ceremonial assemblage and its transregional distribution. I initiate this demonstration by addressing what I have termed the *extreme displaced mortuary deposition* feature. I focus on this because comparing the truth standing of these two models by using each to explain this same now widely recognized feature can test which model is the better approximation of the nature of the responsible social system. The model that enables the most coherent explanation of the distribution of this unique mortuary feature is the rational model to choose as the preferred characterization of the responsible social system.

Demonstration. Extreme displaced mortuary deposition is identified by the finding of a deceased person or parts thereof buried in a CBL site far from the region where this person was born and raised. There have been a number of such features identified empirically, both those who had been born and raised in Ohio during the Middle Woodland period but were buried in Illinois, and vice versa. The explanation for this cultural practice has been given under the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model as being the result of long distance interregional marriage exchange alliances between sets of individual trading and exchange partners. In contrast, under the Sacred Games *Tournées*/Custodial Franchising model, it can be explained as the stochastic or random consequence of cult sodality Soul Keepers of sacred bone bundles winning and losing in the sacred games *tournées* of the local heterarchies that they are visiting. Which model is rationally preferred and favored can be determined by which gives the more coherent explanation of this featural distribution.

I have critically analyzed two case studies dealing directly with explaining the extreme displaced mortuary deposition feature. Both were focused on the Ohio Hopewellian and Illinois Havana Hopewellian mortuary data, one carried out by Dana Beehr (2011) and the other by Deborah Bolnick and David Smith (2007). The latter identified extreme displacement through mtDNA analysis of dental samples derived from mortuary depositions at Hopewell Mound Group in Ohio, mostly from Mound 25, and from the Pete Klunk site in the lower Illinois River valley. In the former case, Dana Beehr carried out a comprehensive strontium-isotope analysis of dental samples also derived from Hopewell Mound Group, again mostly from Mound 25, and, in this case, from the Utica Mounds and the Albany Mounds sites of the upper Illinois River valley.

I think that both case studies were successful in that they clearly demonstrated that extreme mortuary displacements were not uncommonly performed across

both regions during the Middle Woodland period and by social groups responsible for major Hopewellian earthwork sites embodying CBLs. The researchers must be congratulated for their excellent work. Along with several other similar studies, we now have firm empirical evidence that we did not have before, which allows us to claim that transregional interaction between the social systems that shared mortuary practices and the same general Hopewellian archaeological record was a very significant part of that social world. But do these confirm the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model and the “So-Called” thesis or do they confirm the alternative Sacred Games *Tournées*/Custodial Franchising model, the latter being an ancillary of the Cult Sodality Heterarchy model?

In fact, the two sets of researchers unproblematically operated within the premises of the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model, as expressed by Carr (2005a), treated here as an ancillary of the Community Polity model. They identified the relevant sites as being or as containing cemetery CBLs and the communities as being polities based on unilineal kinship systems (Ruby et al. 2005). From these assumptions emerged the logical conclusion that the only way these extreme displaced mortuary depositions could be possible was as a result of transregional intermarriage and this means that these persons in youth migrated to these distant communities and became in-laws and their graves were incorporated into the cemetery CBL mounds of the community polities into which they had respectively married. The problem is that, despite the validity of these two natural scientific methods, mtDNA and Strontium-Isotope analyses, to enable us to detect the occurrence of extreme displaced mortuary depositions, the two parties generated mutually opposing social structural conclusions. Beehr (2011) concluded that the onus of marriage exchange entailed primarily females migrating from Illinois to Ohio and the two social systems were patrilineal and practiced patrilateral postnuptial residency while Bolnick and Smith (2007) concluded the opposite, that the onus of migration was males from Ohio to Illinois and the social systems were matrilineal and practiced matrilineal postnuptial residency. They also recognize an internal contradiction in their findings in that while the mtDNA findings supported transregional in-migrating males, the skeletal morphological comparison of females suggests in-migrating of unrelated females, i.e., patrilineal descent and patrilateral postnuptial residency.

Of course, the biological structures do not determine social practices, i.e., they only make the social practices a community carries out possible. If these practices are enabled and constrained by the social structures, then these contradictions in

findings reveal the inadequacy of the social model that the two sets of researchers are independently applying, this being the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model and its underlying premise that the communities involved were polities. Most importantly, while these two studies derived their dental samples from different Illinois CBLs, most of the Ohio dental sample data each used were derived from the same CBLs at Hopewell Mound Group.

CONCLUSION

Can the findings of these analyses be explained in non-contradictory terms under the Sacred Games *Tournées*/Custodial Franchising model? My answer is “yes.” Given the above contradictions, it is clear that the kinship structures and marriage practices of the social systems in which these deceased were born and raised are largely irrelevant to explaining this patterning. What is relevant is the regular practice of transregional interaction among cult sodalities operating as Soul Keepers bearing some of the sacred bone bundles of the deceased from their home region and using these as warrants and gambling tokens in fast and furious and serious sacred games *tournées* that effectively were a form of human living soul sacrifice to the gods of the locale regions. Games generate random outcomes and these outcomes motivate replays. Winners gain sacred bundles and bear them back to their home regions where they are used to perform world renewal rituals in their own cult sodality heterarchy CBLs, and they would often be host to visitors from these same distant regions who, motivated by their earlier losses, were determined to win back replacement sacred bone bundles, and so on (Byers 2015, 2018). The findings that were contradictory for the Entrepreneurial/Funerary model become affirmative findings for the Sacred Games *Tournées*/Custodial Franchising model and its associated Cult Sodality Heterarchy model since the distribution of these extreme displaced mortuary depositions is precisely what we could expect such long distance transregional sacred games to generate. Hence, the distribution of these extreme mortuary depositions can be adequately characterized and explained as the result of stochastic or randomized outcomes of Soul Keeper cult sodalities from distant regions actively participating in locally hosted sacred ball game *tournées*.

REFERENCES CITED

- Beehr, Dana Elizabeth. 2011. Investigation of Middle Woodland Population Movement in the Midwestern United States Using Strontium Isotopes. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Graduate College, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Bolnick, Deborah A., and David Glenn Smith. 2007. Migration and Social Structure among the Hopewell: Evidence from Ancient DNA. *American Antiquity* 72:627–644.
- Byers, A. Martin. 2004. *The Ohio Hopewell Episode: Paradigm Lost, Paradigm Gained*. University of Akron Press, Akron, Ohio.
- . 2010. The Turner-Hopewell Axis: Exploring Interaction through Embankment Form and Mortuary Patterning. In *Hopewell Settlement Patterns, Subsistence, and Sacred Landscapes*, edited by A. Martin Byers and DeeAnne Wymer, pp. 228–242. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- . 2011. *Sacred Games, Death, and Renewal in the Ancient Eastern Woodlands: The Ohio Hopewell System of Cult Sodality Heterarchies*. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- . 2015. *Reclaiming the Hopewellian Ceremonial Sphere: 200 BC to AD 500*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- . 2018. *The Real Mound Builders of the Eastern Woodlands: A Critical Realist Prehistory of the Hopewellian and Mississippian Ceremonial Assemblages*. Lexington Books, Lanham, Maryland.
- Caldwell, Joseph R. 1964. Interaction Spheres in Prehistory. In *Hopewellian Studies*, edited by Joseph R. Caldwell and Robert L. Hall, pp. 135–143. Scientific Papers 12. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- Carr, Christopher. 2005a. Rethinking Interregional Hopewellian “Interaction.” In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, pp. 575–623. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- . 2005b. The Tripartite Alliance among Scioto Hopewellian Communities and the Questions of Social Ranking. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, pp. 258–338. Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York.
- Dancey, William S., and Paul J. Pacheco. 1997. Community Model of Ohio Settlement. In *Ohio Hopewell Community Organization*, edited by William S. Dancey and Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 3–19. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- Dillehay, Tom D. 1992. Keeping Outsiders Out: Public Ceremony, Resource Rights, and Hierarchy in Historic and Contemporary Mapuche Society. In *Wealth and Hierarchy in the Intermediate Area*, edited by Frederick W. Lange, pp. 379–422. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington, DC.
- Greber, N’omi B. 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.
- Hall, Robert L. 1997. *An Archaeology of the Soul: North American Indian Belief and Ritual*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Heidenreich, Conrad E. 1978. Huron. In *Handbook of North American Indians: Northeast*, edited by Bruce G. Trigger, pp. 368–388. Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC.

- Lankford, George E. 2007a. The Great Serpent in Eastern North America. In *Ancient Objects and Sacred Realms: Interpretations of Mississippian Iconography*, edited by F. Kent Reilly III and James F. Garber, pp. 107–135. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- . 2007b. The “Path of Souls”: Some Death Imagery in the Southeastern Ceremonial Complex. In *Ancient Objects and Sacred Realms: Interpretations of Mississippian Iconography*, edited by F. Kent Reilly III and James F. Garber, pp. 175–212. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Pacheco, Paul J. 1993. Ohio Hopewell Settlement Patterns: An Application of the Vacant Center Model to Middle Woodland Period Intracommunity Settlement. PhD dissertation, Ohio State University. University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- . 1996. Ohio 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.
- . 1997. Ohio Middle Woodland Intracommunity Settlement Variability: A Case Study from the Licking Valley. In *Ohio Hopewell Community Organization*, edited by William S. Dancey and Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 41–85. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.
- Penney, David W. 1989. Hopewell Art. PhD dissertation, Department of Art History and Archaeology, Columbia University, New York.
- Prufer, Olaf. 1964. The Hopewell Complex of Ohio. In *Hopewellian Studies*, edited by Joseph R. Caldwell and Robert L. Hall, 35–83. Scientific Papers 12. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- . 1996. Core and Periphery: The Final Chapter on Ohio Hopewell. In *A View from the Core: A Synthesis of Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*, edited by Paul J. Pacheco, pp. 406–425. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.
- Ruby, Bret J., Christopher Carr, and Douglas K. Charles. 2005. Community Organization in the Scioto, Mann, and Havana Hopewellian Regions: Comparative Perspective. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, pp. 119–176. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.
- Trigger, Bruce G. 1969. *The Huron: Farmers of the North*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- . 1976. *The Children of Aataensic: A History of the Huron People to 1660*, Vol. 1. McGill-Queen’s University Press, Montreal.
- Von Gernet, Alexander. 1993. Saving the Souls: Reincarnation Beliefs of the Seventeenth-Century Huron. In *Amerindian Rebirth: Reincarnation Belief among North American Indians and Inuit*, edited by Antonia Mills and Richard Slobodin, pp. 38–54. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.