Interactions with the Incorporeal
in the Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan Worlds

by

M. Scott Thompson

A Dissertation in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2014 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Jane E. Buikstra, Chair
Keith W. Kintigh
David R. Abbott
Lynne G. Goldstein

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
May 2014
ABSTRACT

This research explores how people’s relationships with the spirits of the dead are embedded in political histories. It addresses the ways in which certain spirits were integral “inhabitants” of two social environments with disparate political traditions. Using the prehistoric mortuary record, I investigate the spirits and their involvement in socio-political affairs in the Prehispanic American Southeast and Southwest.

Foremost, I construct a framework to characterize particular social identities for the spirits. Ancestors are select, potent beings who are capable of wielding considerable agency. Ancestral spirits are generic beings who are infrequently active among the living and who can exercise agency only in specific contexts. Anonymous groups of spirits are collectives who exercise little to no agency.

I then examine the performance of mortuary ritual to recognize these social identities in the archaeological record. Multivariate analyses evaluate how particular ritual actions memorialized the dead. They concentrate on treatment of the body, construction of burial features, inclusion of material accompaniments, and the spaces of ritual action. Each analysis characterizes the social memories that ritual acts shaped for the spirits. When possible, I supplement analysis of archaeological data with ethnohistoric and ethnographic information. Finally, I compile the memories to describe the social identities for the spirits of the dead.

In this study, I examine the identities surrounding the spirits in both a Mississippian period settlement on the Georgia coast and in several Protohistoric era Zuni towns in the northern Southwest. Results indicate that ancestors were powerful members of political factions in coastal Mississippian communities. In contrast, ancestral spirits and collectives of long-dead were custodians of group histories in Zuni communities. I contend that these different spirits were rooted in political traditions of competition. Mississippian ancestors were influential agents on cultural landscapes filled with contestation over social power. Puebloan ancestral spirits were keepers of histories on landscapes where power relations were masked, and where new kinds of communities were coalescing.
This study demonstrates that the spirits of the dead are important to anthropological understandings of socio-political trajectories. The spirits are at the heart of the ways in which history influences and determines politics.
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Prologue

In present day Mongolia, many people, particularly those who live traditional lives on the steppe, actively maintain a connection to the great Mongol conqueror and ruler Genghis Khan (1162?-1227). There is an enduring belief that the khan's spirit brings the Mongolian people blessings of modern life, that it protects them, and that it may even return one day to restore Mongolia to global prominence.

According to traditional beliefs, Genghis Khan's spirit maintained a presence in the physical world long after his death. All Mongolian warrior-herders carried Spirit Banners (sulde), made from a favorite stallion's hairs tied and twisted about a spear. The banner was always planted outside a camp tent to capture the power of the sky, wind, and sun, and then to channel it to the warrior. The identity and power of the warrior was so isomorphic with the banner that the warrior's soul was believed to reside in the tufts of horsehair after death. Supposedly, the lamas who resided in a monastery along the River of the Moon in central Mongolia protected and venerated Genghis Khan's banner and its resident spirit for centuries (Weatherford 2005).

When the Soviet army occupied Mongolia in the early twentieth century, their government clearly understood the power that Genghis Khan's spirit and memory held. The Soviets feared that the spirit of the khan could serve as inspiration for a national uprising. During the 1930's, Stalin's men ransacked monasteries, broke religious objects, and killed monks and nuns in a brutal campaign against Mongolian culture and religion. Stalin wanted to destroy the physical embodiment of Genghis Khan's soul, his sulde.

Supposedly, during an attack on the Moon River monastery, Genghis Khan's sulde was secretly removed to Ulaanbaatar for safe-keeping. It ultimately disappeared from the historical record (Weatherford 2005).
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The connection that some traditional Mongolian people still maintain with Genghis Khan’s spirit illustrates an intimate relationship among the spirits of the dead, history, and politics. The khan’s spirit and memory still command influence a millennium after his death. In many parts of the world, people foster ties with spirits of the dead who can participate in and even actively influence socio-political affairs. Moreover, the leaders of many political systems, from state level to small-scale formations, have appealed to influential spirits of the dead to legitimize their positions, to support decisions, to protect and bestow blessings on their polities, and even to mete out punishments.

This research is concerned with the spirits of the dead and their connections to political histories. It explores how people’s relationships with distinct kinds of spirits are embedded in socio-political traditions and long-term trajectories. Using the prehistoric mortuary record, I examine the ways in which certain spirits of the dead were integral “inhabitants” of two social environments with disparate political histories. I contend that the spirit’s participation in local socio-political affairs is related to historical traditions of competition.

In this study, I examine the spirits of the dead and their place within regional political histories in the Prehispanic American Southeast and Southwest, two social environments with dissimilar socio-political traditions. I address the different ways that distinct types of spirits engaged in and influenced Prehispanic communities in these two cultural environments. I investigate the social identities of the spirits of the dead in both a Mississippian period community on the Georgia coast and in several late prehistoric Zuni communities in the northern Southwest. Examination of these identities demonstrates that potent spirits of the dead – ancestors – were powerful members of political factions in coastal Mississippian communities. In contrast, steadfast spirits of the dead – ancestral spirits and collectivities of dead – were custodians of group histories in Zuni communities.
These different identities for the spirits of the dead were rooted in separate historical traditions of social competition. On the Georgia and South Carolina coast, and in other parts of the Mississippian Southeast, leaders and select lineages fostered relationships with potent spirits in settings rife with competition. I argue that the spirits were influential players in politics in this social arena where power was openly contested. In Western Puebloan communities, and other parts of the Ancestral Puebloan northern Southwest, social groups maintained relations with generalized spirits who did not intervene in political matters. Puebloan peoples typically did not compete over power and prestige publicly; rather, they masked power relations. I contend that the spirits were not active players in politics in this social arena where power was concealed. Rather, they curated social group identities and responsibilities in an environment where group histories were critical to community formation and socio-political dynamics.

The study demonstrates that the spirits of the dead are important to anthropological understandings of political trajectories, particularly in middle-range societies. The spirits are at the heart of the ways in which history influences and determines politics in specific social environments. Based on the relationships that people maintain with them, they participate in and influence political dynamics in particular manners. Spirits of the dead can be actors in power relations and can help to determine access to and transmissions of social power. They can be agents in the possession and transfer of other influential resources, such as property, rights to resources or ceremonies, and even knowledge. They can also serve as the keepers of group identities and their pasts, as the perpetuators of defining social relations and responsibilities. These different spirits embody and marshal history in their own ways.

The Problem

Many archaeological considerations of the dead hold an overly simplistic view of people’s relationships with spirits of the dead. Research has largely overlooked the identities of the spirits and the different ways in which they can participate in people’s affairs. In the current literature, many studies maintain that social groups either engage in ancestor worship or do not interact with spirits of the dead in important ways. Past research has focused disproportionately on these ancestors and has neglected to identify them precisely.
Whitley (2002: 119) summarized the issue in his argument that “there are too many ancestors in contemporary archaeological interpretation.” He claimed that finding evidence for ancestor worship and locating ancestors has become a popular interpretative trend, particularly in Neolithic British and European archaeology. The term “ancestor” is often used indiscriminately, and actually glosses different spirits of the dead who engage with people in different ways. These generalized “ancestors” are playing too many parts and are involved in too many social and cultural processes to provide meaningful interpretations about the influences of spirits.

The archaeological literature was and still is filling cultural landscapes with undifferentiated and vaguely defined ancestors. This research often does not explicitly identify the social identities of the spirits of the dead. In other words, it does not articulate who the spirits of the dead are and how they interact with people and communities. It is not able to describe formally the ways that different spirits participate in people’s affairs and the influences that they hold in social and political matters.

Whitley (2002) proposed that archaeologists should work to differentiate the spirits and to identify them in explicit ways. Researchers can then address people’s relationships with spiritual beings in detail. Moreover, they can also consider how the spirits are related to other elements and influences from the past. By addressing these issues, archaeologists can contribute to understanding the very real impacts that relationships with spirits have on socio-political affairs and on broader political trajectories (Whitley 2002: 122).

In this study, I refine concepts for people’s relationships with the spirits of the dead. The research presented here suggests that people form relationships with different kinds of spirits of the dead and that these spiritual beings have varying influence in the affairs of the living. I refine these relationships to explore how different kinds of spirits were involved in particular political histories and long-term, regional political traditions.

**Archaeological Mortuary Analysis and the Spirits of the Dead**

During the last fifty years, archaeological studies of mortuary ritual have been directed at understanding social relationships among the living. They have concentrated on interpretations
about socio-economic positions, social structure, and power dynamics. Past mortuary analyses have rarely considered spirits of the dead directly.

Contemporary research approaches to mortuary ritual largely stem from two interpretative frameworks: 1) a representationist and 2) a reflectionist perspective. The representationist framework focuses on the subject of ritual activities (i.e., the deceased person or persons). These studies attempt to describe who a person was when he or she was alive. Ultimately, they seek to outline social structure and recognize social positions. A reflectionist framework focuses on the persons who carried out and/or organized the mortuary ritual. It emphasizes interpretations about the living people, or the survivors, who conducted, participated in, and potentially manipulated mortuary rituals.

In their review of archaeological mortuary research, Sullivan and Mainfort Jr. (2010: 3) discussed the representationist framework and its historical influence. They argued that it “views nonrandom variation in mortuary ritual as representative of the deceased’s role in the social structure.” Representationist studies assume that mortuary rituals and their symbolism convey messages about and aspects of a person’s social position and his/her roles in life. These studies emphasize that patterns in rituals and associated symbolism represent similarities and differences in the deceased’s social roles and position. Broad patterns express a basic outline of social structure.

The representationist framework developed from Arthur Saxe’s (1970) and Lewis Binford’s (1971) works, which are collectively known as the Saxe-Binford research program (see Brown 1995). Saxe argued that people use funerary rites to fulfill their duty-status relationships to the deceased; thus, they express the broad range of the person’s social identities. He maintained that the end result of these rites –burials –materialize full social personalities. Extending these ideas to social organization, Binford contended that differentiation in burial programs is related to a society’s social organization (i.e., “level” of social organization).

The Saxe-Binford approach was simplified and operationalized in Tainter’s (1978), O’Shea’s (1984), Peebles and Kus’(1977) , and other scholars’ research. Tainter (1978: 113) summarized the research program in his assertion that “mortuary ritual is basically a
communication system in which certain symbols are employed to convey information about the status of the deceased.” In archaeological practice, the program supposes that the funerary rituals of a given society highlight certain parts of the deceased’s social identity and that, together, the parts symbolize a full social persona. The rituals employ specific burial treatments that represent each social persona appropriately (see Sullivan and Mainfort 2010: 4). Peebles and Kus (1977) outlined explicit methods for examining mortuary rituals to map social rank and status in burial populations.

Although the representationist framework formed the core of archaeological mortuary analysis for many years, it did not advance understanding of the spirits of the dead. Few studies addressed the identities of the spirits, and very few considered the relationships that people maintained with different spirits. Carr’s (1995) evaluation of the approach and its assumptions confirmed that these studies established important links between mortuary ritual and the deceased’s social roles. However, his work also demonstrated that mortuary rites and burial symbolism express many religious and philosophical ideas about the nature of life, death, and the soul. In particular, many aspects of burial ceremonialism convey messages about the fate of the soul(s) and the spirits that the dead become.

Since the mid-1990s and the early 2000s, research on the mortuary record has emphasized interpretations about the living people, or the survivors, who directed and participated in mortuary rituals. I use the term “reflectionist perspective” to describe these interpretations and conclusions. I suggest that this perspective views nonrandom variation in the mortuary record as reflective of survivors’ management and/or manipulation of burial programs and associated rituals. Reflectionist studies emphasize that the living conduct mortuary rituals and burial programs, and assume that these rituals and associated symbolism carry the participant’s messages and meanings. They underscore that patterns in mortuary ritual and symbols reflect the ways that people hosted, contributed to, and participated in them.

In general, the reflectionist perspective is aligned with political-economic approaches to mortuary ritual (Sullivan and Mainfort 2010, see also Brown 1995, Metcalf and Huntington 1991). Many of these studies address how the living use mortuary rites and burial programs to garner
prestige and to negotiate power relations. For instance, Kamp’s (1998) and Keswani ‘s (2004) research effectively demonstrated that, in some places, funerary rituals are a central arena for the construction of prestige. Metcalf and Huntington (1991) described an example in their interpretation of elaborate, elevated Berawan mausoleums. Aspiring Berawan leaders built monuments and hosted extended funerary rites for any relative who happened to die at an opportune time. The authors argued that leaders constructed these visible monuments and held expensive rites to aggrandize themselves, and not simply to memorialize an important or influential person who died. In fact, the deceased was often a regular member of the community.

The reflectionist approach has introduced interpretations about the supernatural and the spirits of the dead into archaeological research. It has encouraged archaeologists to consider how the living establish and/or use relationships with the supernatural (e.g., ritual paraphernalia, sacred spaces, and authoritative spirits) to claim and legitimize rights to resources (e.g., land, water rights, built properties, other sources of wealth) and even social power. Curet and Oliver (1998) argued that, within Prehispanic Puerto Rican communities, prehistoric leaders constructed “ancestors” and spiritual beings with higher ranks or status than those of regular villagers and that they established exclusive access to them. These authors claimed that leaders used their access to the supernatural to legitimize their positions and social power and to establish themselves as managers over local resources. Lau (2002) explored connections between prehistoric ancestor worship in the Northern Andes and the development of leadership ideologies and other socioeconomic strategies in the first millennium A.D. He suggested that local elites used ancestor ceremonies and feasting as political currency; they may have appropriated relationships with these “ancestors” to bolster their political authority.

This framework, however, has often led to indiscriminate interpretations about ancestor worship and ancestor cults. Eager to tie mortuary ritual to politics and economics, researchers have concluded that people in a study area engaged in some form of ancestor worship. A social group, or particular persons in that group, hosted mortuary rituals that had political and economic consequences, in part because the living venerated ancestors or participated in ancestor cults. In other words, archaeologists have invoked the ancestors as an explanatory tool near the close of
an argument. This research has not typically defined “ancestors” in an explicit way or identified them in a formalized manner.

Throughout this study, I contend that it is important to address the identities of the spirits of the dead as a primary research question. Archaeologists should work to identify the social identities that the living create for spirits in their communities. They should examine who the dead are, and what roles they play in various contexts, from households to cultural landscapes. It is only then that archaeology can appreciate the influence that relationships with spirits have in social and political affairs.

A Focus on the Spirits of the Dead

Some research has begun to concentrate inquiry and interpretation on the spirits of the dead. This work illustrates the import of addressing the spirits’ identities explicitly and examining their relationships with the living. It demonstrates how a focus on the spirits of the dead can place them in communities and on landscapes and can detail their influence in social affairs.

Morris (1991) and later McAnany (1995, see also McAnany et al. 1999) authored influential works that focused research and interpretation on the spirits of the dead. Morris (1991) argued that people’s relationships with ancestors often play a substantial role in the lineal transmission and inheritance of property. McAnanay’s (1995, 1999) research was directed toward identifying ancestors in prehistoric Mayan communities and among elite Mayan households. She argued that formative Mayan elites co-opted common family traditions of ancestor veneration; the elites used these traditions and augmented rites to legitimize their claims to social power (see Knight 1986 for an example in the Mississippian world).

Morris and McAnany’s research emphasized that identifying the spirits of the dead and explicating relationships with them can lead to nuanced understandings of how the spirits influence people’s lives and social affairs. It highlighted the importance of locating the spirits in their historical-cultural contexts and examining how they fit into these environments. However, their work did not advance much beyond the examination of ancestor worship and ancestors. Although these authors worked to define the terms “ancestor worship” and “ancestor” formally, they did not differentiate other spirits of the dead and their relationships with the living.
Some contemporary archaeological research has begun to address different identities for spirits of the dead in particular historical-cultural environments. For example, several chapters in Rakita et al.’s (2005) volume *Interacting with the Dead: Perspectives on Mortuary Archaeology for the New Millennium* explored specific identities for spirits of the dead in the mortuary record. Malville (2005) demonstrated that Tibetan Buddhist beliefs about the spirits of the dead determined mortuary rites and continued interaction with remains. In another chapter, Duncan (2005) explored how ritual acts of veneration or violation to human remains shaped particular identities for spirits of the dead.

Other research has begun to document how people fashion specific identities for the spirits of the dead and how they construct potent ritual deposits and memorialized landscapes. In a recent influential work, Brown (2003a) proposed that early leaders at Cahokia created an elaborate burial deposit buried beneath Mound 72 to construct tableaux of potent mythological significance. The living arranged human remains, as if they were artifacts, into a set of scenes that reference an important origin story, and, in doing so, likely materialized that story and its heroes in a specific place on the Cahokian landscape. In addition, Brown (2010) described a similar argument in which Mississippian leaders arranged human remains into a cosmological pattern at Spiro, a large mound center in Oklahoma. King (2010) has suggested that some elaborate burial deposits at Etowah were attempts to transform individuals into mythological or other important ritual characters.

*The Importance of the Spirits of the Dead*

I advocate studying the spirits of the dead, because they are intricately intertwined with social groups and their histories. The spirits of the dead are integral members of nearly all social groups, inhabitants of most cultural landscapes, and key actors in political histories. They are embodiments of the past, but they often have important influences on social and political affairs in the present.

Foremost, the spirits of the dead are vital for a complete anthropological understanding of any social environment. Characterizations that do not consider a social group’s spirits are missing many of the “persons” who are (or were) part of it. Lineages and other kin-based groups are not
just communities of the living; they are communities of the living and the dead (Chambert-Loir and Reid 2002a). Anthropological research must account for the spirits of the dead if it is to appreciate social organizations in their full forms. Moreover, research must address the important roles that the spirits of the dead play in social affairs if it is to describe social dynamics thoroughly.

Similarly, the spirits of the dead are principal inhabitants of many cultural landscapes. Anthropological considerations of cultural landscapes that do not locate the spirits and describe the spirits’ place(s) on them are neglecting locations that hold great cultural significance (Buikstra and Charles 1999, Charles and Buikstra 2002). The landscapes that people shape include the spaces and places of both the living and the dead. People not only devote particular spaces to interring the remains of the dead and constructing memorials, but they also dedicate features to remembering and interacting with spirits safely (Goldstein 2010). In addition, people often maintain beliefs about where the spirits of the dead continue to reside on landscapes.

As Whitley (2002) has suggested, the spirits are also critical to people’s conceptions of and continuing relationships with their past. In short, the spirits of the dead – as remembrances of the dead and their accomplishments – are incarnations of history. Where people maintain relations with influential spirits of the dead, these spirits make the past available in the present. They even tend to distill the import of the past and enhance the power that it carries forward. Where people remember distant spirits of the dead who wield little socio-political influence, these spirits separate the past from the present. They steadfastly retain people’s histories.

Finally, the spirits of the dead can play significant roles in the evolution of social power and in the character of power relations within a society. Recent research has begun to describe how select groups of people establish relationships with potent and influential spirits to generate and accrue power over decision-making. In other cases, social groups retain ties to spirits who preserve histories that can legitimate access to resources and placement in particular social positions. The nature of these relationships can have a profound impact on the ways in which people handle, display, and negotiate social power. Moreover, the development of relationships with particular spirits can influence broader changes in socio-political complexity.
Together, these influences and roles indicate that the spirits are deeply embedded in socio-political trajectories. They are important residents of social and cultural landscapes, and they help to shape the character and transmission of power relations, as well as other influential resources. The spirits are key agents in understanding local and regional political histories.

Addressing the Problem

This study uses a comparative approach to explore different social identities for the spirits of the dead and their connections to particular political histories. In the analyses that follow, I examine the identities of the spirits in two cultural environments where people likely maintained relationships with different kinds of spirits of the dead. I attempt to describe how they were integrated into communities and how they participated in community affairs. Ultimately, I situate these different spirits of the dead in their respective regional political trajectories and traditions of social competition.

Here, I attempt to identify particular spirits of the dead in a Mississippian and in several Ancestral Puebloan communities. Current conceptions of spirits of the dead in prehistoric North America suggest that people in the Mississippian world fostered relationships with potent spirits, while people in the Puebloan world maintained ties to static, remote spirits. Most researchers who study Mississippian communities maintain that select lineages, leaders, and ritual specialists established preferential access to supernatural beings and associated ritual paraphernalia and practices (e.g., Brown 1997, Knight 1986, 1990). Archaeological and ethnohistoric evidence identify specialized ritual structures where people shaped spirits from remains of the dead and then likely interacted with them (Blitz and Livingood 2004, Brown 1990, Dye and King 2007, King 2004, Swanton 1911, Waring 1968a). Moreover, statues and icons found in some parts of the Southeast and depictions of certain figures on shell objects and copper plates likely represent supernatural beings (Brown 2001, Smith and Miller 2009).

In contrast, most Southwestern archaeologists and ethnohistorians assume that residents of Ancestral Puebloan communities did not commonly engage with potent spirits of the dead. Rather, Puebloan social groups retained ties to generalized spirits who resided in various places on the landscape (see Ellis 1968, Malotki and Gary 2001, Parsons 1926). People memorialized
these spirits in simple ways, made offerings to them, and likely held some ritual observances for
them (e.g., Bunzel 1932, Cushing 1979, Parsons 1916, Stevenson 1904). Potential interactions
with powerful spirits in the prehistoric Southwest have largely been interpreted as attempts to
destroy malicious beings and forces (e.g., Darling 1999, Walker 1998, Walker 2008).

Past work, however, has not focused research on the social identities of the spirits of the
dead in the Prehispanic Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan worlds. It has not explicitly asked
who the dead were in prehistoric communities, and what kinds of relationships people maintained
with them. Moreover, it has not thoroughly described the ways in which the spirits of the dead
participated in community affairs, and how they were integrated into the cultural landscape and
political trajectories.

The Data

I examine the social identities for spirits of the dead in a Middle to Late Mississippian
period (circa AD 1150 - 1450) community on the Georgia coast and in two Ancestral Puebloan
communities in the Zuni region of the northern Southwest. For the Mississippian case, I analyze
mortuary data from the Irene Mounds site, a primary mound center with a large burial mound and
mortuary structure. For the Ancestral Puebloan case, I examine burial data from the large, late
Pueblo IV and Historic period ( circa AD 1350 – 1680) settlements of Hawikkuu and Kechiba:wa
(or Kechipawan).

Near present day Savannah, Georgia, the Irene Mounds site was a civic/ceremonial
center occupied principally during the Middle and Late Mississippian periods. It was the focal
point of a loosely integrated polity that consisted of several outlying secondary centers and
scattered residential villages (Pluckhahn and McKivergan 2002).The site included a large
platform mound, an adjacent burial mound, a large council house, a mortuary structure
surrounded by two wood post enclosures, and a number of fenced enclosures, one of which may
have bounded a plaza. Under several different directors, Works Progress Administration (WPA)
archaeologists conducted a near complete excavation of the site between September 1937 and
December 1939 (Caldwell and McCann 1941, Depratter 1991, Schaeffer 1939).
The Irene mortuary data set used in this study includes information on 267 individuals buried in 250 burial facilities (see https://core.tdar.org/project/380979 for data used in this study). I collected these data from excavation reports and records curated with the National Anthropological Archives (NAA) in Suitland, MD. I principally referred to analysis sheets that recorded burial feature information, excavation and unit descriptions in reports, notes that described excavation of the mortuary structure, and sets of published and unpublished maps.

Located along the Zuni River, Hawikku and Kechiba:wa were two large pueblos southwest of the modern-day pueblo of Zuni. Howell (1994a, 1994b, 1995, 1996) and Kintigh (1985, 2000) place the occupation of these two towns from the late Pueblo IV period to the early Historic period, or from approximately AD 1350 – 1680. Both pueblos consisted of multiple, irregular-shaped roomblocks arranged around several plazas. Village residents buried most of the deceased in extensive extramural cemeteries located on the immediate outskirts of the two villages.

The Hendricks-Hodge Expedition of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation excavated Hawikku from 1917 to 1923 (Smith et al. 1966). The expedition gathered a tremendous mortuary data set, as it focused excavations on the cemeteries adjacent to the large roomblocks. In 1919, the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition conducted some test excavations at the neighboring village of Kechiba:wa. Then, in 1923, a joint expedition between the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation and Louis Clark, Director of the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Cambridge in the U.K., continued work at the site. These excavations resulted in a second, complementary mortuary data set.

The burial sample from Hawikku consists of 966 individuals, while the sample from Kechiba:wa includes 259 individuals (see https://core.tdar.org/project/380979 for data used in this study). My use of these data owes a great deal to the efforts of other researchers. Smith, Woodbury, and Woodbury (1966) compiled Hodge’s excavation notes on Hawikku in the 1960’s and published the results. More recently, the combined work of Brenda Shears, Keith Kintigh, and Todd Howell has produced accessible digital records for the archaeological work at both Hawikku
and Kechiba:wa. This digital information and summary data tables are the primary data used in the analyses presented here.

*Examining Social Identities for the Spirits of the Dead*

The study’s analyses are designed to identify particular spirits of the dead in the mortuary records of these communities. I use a descriptive framework that defines social identities for different kinds of spirits. In many ways, this framework functions as typology for the spirits of the dead.

The framework describes several distinct identities that people commonly shape for spirits of the dead in different cultural settings around the world. I refer to them as 1) ancestors, 2) ancestral spirits, and 3) collectivities of anonymous dead. People use particular mortuary ritual processes to shape ancestors, ancestral spirits, and collectivities of the dead, and they interact with them in distinctive ways. Most importantly, the living attribute different degrees and kinds of influence to these spirits. Ancestors can exercise powerful influence and frequently intervene in social and political affairs, while collectivities of anonymous dead hold little influence in socio-political affairs and almost never intervene in these matters. Thus, these spirits participate in community affairs in different ways.

The analyses attempt to recognize the defined social identities for spirits of the dead – ancestors, ancestral spirits, and collectivities of dead – in the Irene polity and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I examine the performance of mortuary ritual to identify the creation of/interaction with ancestors, ancestral spirits, and/or collectivities of anonymous dead. I assume that these performances (i.e., the ways that people conduct mortuary ritual) shape particular social identities for the spirits of the dead. Ultimately, it is how the living prepare, inter, and interact with the dead that determines the spirits’ identities.

In this study, I assess several elements that comprise the performance of mortuary ritual: 1) treatment of the body, 2) construction of the burial facility, 3) inclusion/decommissioning of material goods, and 4) the places where mortuary ritual occurred. I consider the social memories that each element created for the spirits in a given community. Then, I use these interpretations of social memories to construct an argument about the social identities that people fashioned for the
spirits in that community. This allows me to arrive at several conclusions about the ways that these spirits participated in social and/or political affairs.

Initially, I examine the performance of mortuary ritual in the Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan cases separately. I attempt to follow the same procedures and analyze the same ritual elements in each of these communities. The purpose of these analyses is to permit comparison of the different ways that the spirits participated in prehistoric Mississippian and Zuni communities.

At the end of the study, I explicitly address the different ways in which Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan spirits engaged in community affairs and were involved in regional political histories. I compare and contrast the performance of mortuary ritual in a Mississippian settlement and two Ancestral Puebloan towns. More importantly, I compare the social identities that these mortuary rituals shaped for the spirits in each community. I then place these particular spirits of the dead on the Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan landscapes and situate them in regional political histories. This comparative approach and discussion demonstrates that distinct kinds of spirits are embedded in particular historical traditions of socio-political competition. The spirits were rooted in and were significant contributors to these broad political trajectories.

Performance, Mortuary Ritual, and Social Memory

The anthropological concept of performance offers tools to examine the creation of social memories and identities for the deceased. It provides a structure for understanding how people, through mortuary rituals, construct different kinds of social memories for the dead and establish social identities for them. Moreover, it provides a means for archaeological research to link material remains of mortuary ritual to interpretations about social memories surrounding the dead.

Anthropological approaches to performance contend that it is both scripted and creative action. In other words, ritual performances produce venues in which participants can examine, contest, and even create social memories and identities. Inomata and Coben (2006) have argued that Hymes’ (1975) definition of performance is the most applicable to archaeological data. Hymes considered performance to be a realized and creative course of events, which are beyond the every day, and which are only interpretable and repeatable in individual cultural domains. This
definition implies that mortuary performances follow pre-determined sets of actions and use highly recognizable symbols with multiple layers of meaning. Furthermore, it suggests that these performances re-configure participants’ social identities, principally the deceased’s identity.

In this study, I contend that the performance of mortuary ritual creates social memories about the spirits of the dead and ultimately constructs certain social identities for them. I am chiefly interested in understanding the social identities of the spirits of the dead. It is these identities that determine the ways that spirits participate in the affairs of the living. Moreover, they determine how much influence spirits can wield in these affairs.

This argument is based on a particular understanding of mortuary ritual. Here, I define mortuary rituals as prescribed acts that 1) transform the deceased into a member of the dead, and 2) establish relationships between the living and the dead. Foremost, mortuary rituals both effect and mark a profound change in a deceased person, from a member of the living to one of the dead. Second, these rituals memorialize the deceased. These remembrances shape interactions and relationships with the spirits of the dead.

This definition of mortuary ritual includes both funeral ceremonies – those ritual actions that take place between death and disposal of the remains – and post-funerary ceremonies. Funeral ceremonies are those ritual actions that take place between death and interment (or destruction) of the remains. Post-funerary ceremonies are prescribed actions that occur after a principle funeral and that continue relationships with the dead. They include acts that remember the deceased, that continue to change the identity of the spirit, and/or that involve interaction with the spirits of the dead. In the following discussion, I clarify these aspects of mortuary ritual.

*Transforming the Deceased*

Death changes the physical person into something other than a living being. It changes the animated body into a corpse. For many societies around the world, there is also a spiritual alteration at death. The “soul” of the living person either transforms into some kind of spirit of the dead, or it disappears in the creation of a new incorporeal entity.

The performance of funerary rituals effects the transition from a member of the living community to one of the dead. Both van Gennep's (1960 [1909]) and Hertz’s (1960 [1907])
seminal research demonstrated that funerary rituals mark the social death of an individual. These acts and subsequent post-funerary ritual actions transform the individual into a recognizable incorporeal form. They change a person into a spiritual or supernatural being.

Recent archaeological studies on the transformative effects of funerary practices have highlighted culturally-specific identities created for the dead. For example, Rakita and Buikstra (2005) suggested that crematory practices in the American Southwest accomplished a complete release of the body and the soul from this world; cremation created spiritual entities that transferred seamlessly to the supernatural. In contrast, Andean mummification arrested the liminal period of body and soul to create an ancestral figure suspended between the world of the living and the realms of the dead.

**Memorializing the Dead**

The performance of mortuary ritual not only transforms the deceased into a member of the dead, but it also produces remembrances that situate the spirits of the dead in the world (Chesson 2001, 2007, Kuijt 2001). In other words, performances generate memories that place the dead – that tell us where the spirits of the dead reside, how to interact with them safely, etc. Foremost, mortuary rituals often commemorate the life of the deceased. Second, they shape how the living continue to remember and interact with spirits of the dead.

In the absence and loss that death brings, survivors often engage in ritual actions that recall a person’s or peoples’ lives (Chesson 2007, George 1996). Many funerary traditions include oratories, which provide highly crafted remembrances of the dead person’s life (Taylor 2000). The physical acts of various mortuary rituals, as well as the use of material objects, also cement memories of the dead (Hallam and Hockey 2001, Rowlands 1993). Finally, the construction of physical places and memorials for the dead inscribes their memory on the landscape (Bloch 1996, Bradley 1998, Del Alamo and Pendergast 2000, Schwartz 2007).

Mortuary rituals often go beyond the commemoration of life. They also serve as arenas for the active creation of new memories surrounding the dead. Foremost, funerary rituals create the first remembrances of the individual as a member of the dead (Bloch 1996, Laneri 2007, Rowlands 1993). These ritual performances also establish culturally appropriate ways to continue
memorializing spirits of the dead. A large number of social groups around the world have calendric rites and/or periodic celebrations that remember their dead and promote communions with the supernatural. In addition, some groups maintain active relationships with the spirits of the dead (Antonaccio 1995, Chung and Wegars 2005, Kyu 1984).

Continued Remembrance of and Interaction with Spirits of the Dead

The complete performance of mortuary ritual involves both funerary ceremonialism and post-funerary ritual actions. In some instances, funerary rites are only the beginning of continued remembrances for and interactions with the dead. These acts serve to transform the deceased and mark the start of a new relationship with the spirit that the deceased becomes. They fashion initial social memories of the spirits. Then, protracted rites and post-funerary ritual acts can continue to memorialize the spirit and to transform it in new ways. It is these actions that often form active social memories and identities for spirits of the dead.

Several researchers have advocated separating mortuary rituals from other post-funerary rituals for interacting with the dead. Specifically, Fortes (1965), Morris (1991), and other authors have argued for an academic distinction between mortuary ritual and ancestor cults (see Gluckman 1937 for the original distinction, see also Freedman 1966, Goody 1962, Watson 1988). Morris (1991: 150) described mortuary ritual as “the rite-of-passage ceremonies which separate the deceased from the living, producing the archaeological remains of burials which we excavate”. He differentiated these acts from ancestor cults, which he identified as “those rituals which provide continued access to the deceased in the afterworld” (Morris 1991: 150). Although he readily acknowledged that the two are intimately related and that they fade into one another, he presented several examples to highlight the separation.

I argue that it is important to recognize a basic distinction between funerary ceremony and protracted rites that include post-funerary ritual acts. However, I contend that a strict separation between the two denies the role that funerary preparations and rites play in creating social identities for the dead and the ways that they establish relationships between the living and the dead. A stringent separation also does not highlight the connections among funerary rites that are tied to the immediate death of a person and protracted rites that are triggered by other
concerns, particularly with the development of the spirit. It is important to view these rites as part of a process – from funerary acts that transform the deceased around time of death, to subsequent acts (well after immediate death) that continue to alter the spirit and/or that continue relationships with it.

Moreover, I argue that this academic division is difficult to recognize in actual mortuary behavior. For example, some communities perform secondary funerary rituals or even tertiary funerary rituals (which can involve handling and moving the remains of the deceased) that assist in maturation of the spirit. It seems impractical to categorize these actions as either mortuary ritual or some form of post-funerary ancestor worship or cult.

Social Memories and Social Identities for the Spirits of the Dead

In the performance of mortuary ritual, I posit that the prescribed ways in which people of a particular social group conduct funerals and burials shape that group’s social memories of the dead. Furthermore, the culturally acceptable ways in which people continue to remember and to interact with spirits of the dead create additional memories. These memories may not agree and they may even be somewhat inconsistent or contradictory. These contrary memories lead to interesting, individual nuances in beliefs about the spirits of the dead and the ways that people can or should interact with them. These conflicts need not be entirely resolved to construct composite social memories, as people are frequently comfortable with certain contradictory memories and ideas.

Social memory is a concept that links historical memories, particularly memories that collective groups hold, with social identity (French 1995, Middleton and Edwards 1990, Olick and Robbins 1998). “It asks how and why [people] come to think of themselves as members of a group with a shared (though not necessarily agreed upon) past” (French 1995: 9). It is a common or collective history; it is a collective history that often shapes an identity.

When social memories build and reinforce themselves, they can coalesce into a social identity. Together, the social memories surrounding the dead coalesce into social identities for spirits of the dead. In psychology and anthropology, social identity is a sense of who a person is based on their group memberships and on the common history of each group (Hogg and
Ridgeway 2003, Hogg et al. 1995, Tajfel and Turner 1979, 1986, see also Tajfel 1979). For example, the social identity of one person might include student, anthropologist, a New Yorker, an American. The identity “New Yorker” is shaped by a shared history with other people who live in New York (i.e., the social memories of New Yorkers) and by the sense of what it means to live there and to share that history.

Through the performance of mortuary ritual, people build a series of social memories about the dead and the spirits of the dead. These memories shape ideas about who the spirits of the dead are, where they reside, and how the living may (or may not) interact with these spirits safely. Thus, these social memories form social identities for the spirits of the dead.

**Spirits of the Dead in Prehispanic Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan Communities**

In the chapters that follow, I examine the performance of mortuary ritual to explore the social identities for spirits of the dead in prehistoric Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan communities. These chapters address the ways in which Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan spirits of the dead participated in local community affairs. The examination of spirits in these two social environments leads to interpretations about the connections between particular spirits of the dead and regional political traditions and histories.

Chapter 2 discusses the problem that this study addresses in a broader context. It reviews anthropological approaches to and understandings of the spirits of the dead. I use this review to identify portions of each approach that inform my examination of the spirits. In particular, I highlight research that has described social identities of the spirits of the dead in many cultural settings around the world. This past research forms the basis for a framework that I use to recognize the identities of the spirits in the archaeological record.

In Chapter 3, I construct a framework for defining the social identities of the spirits of the dead. This framework describes several distinct identities that people commonly shape for spirits of the dead in different cultural settings. I refer to these identities as 1) ancestors, 2) ancestral spirits, and 3) anonymous groups of dead. Each of these identities is associated with different degrees of influence among the living and with different ways of participating in community
affairs. In the research that follows, I use these identities to understand how different spirits of the dead participate in the affairs of the living.

Chapter 4 outlines the identification of these separate social identities for spirits of the dead in the mortuary record. Here, I describe how I examine the performance of mortuary ritual in the Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan archaeological records in order to recognize the identities of the spirits in Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan communities. I detail this study’s statistical analyses of mortuary ritual; these analyses characterize the social memories that surrounded the spirits in Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan settlements. I also discuss the interpretation of these social memories and resulting conclusions about the social identities of the spirits in Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan communities.

Chapters 5 and 6 address the performance of mortuary ritual in a Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan communities. In Chapter 5, I examine mortuary ritual at the Middle and Late Mississippian period Irene Mounds site on the Georgia coast. In Chapter 6, I evaluate mortuary ritual at the late prehistoric Zuni villages of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I endeavor to characterize the identities of the spirits of the dead in each of these communities. In addition, I describe how the spirits participated in these communities.

Finally, Chapter 7 concludes the study. I review the social identities of the spirits in the Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan communities that I examine. Moreover, I compare and contrast the ways in which these spirits participated in community affairs and influenced socio-political events and dynamics. The chapter ends with a consideration of the spirits’ place on the Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan landscapes and within regional political histories. It suggests that different kinds of spirits are rooted in disparate traditions of socio-political competition. Moreover, the spirits are significant agents in the cultural and historical evolution of political trajectories.
CHAPTER 2
The Anthropology of the Spirits of the Dead

Social cultural anthropologists have long maintained an interest in people's relationships with spirits of the dead. Countless ethnographic studies have documented what specific social groups believe about death and the spirits of the dead. In addition, influential ethnologies have examined how some social groups situate spirits of the dead in their social structures.

Past research has drawn attention to different spirits and their roles among the living. However, much of this research has not focused explicitly on differentiating the spirits of the dead and defining their identities. Instead, it has concentrated disproportionately on ancestors and on relationships labeled as ancestor worship and ancestor cult. In fact, Sellato (2002) recently asserted that his examination of past literature located many different, indiscriminate references to ancestors and ancestor worship.

Here, I review anthropological understandings about the spirits of the dead. I discuss several primary research approaches to the spirits: 1) descriptive, 2) functionalist, 3) political-economic, and 4) power. I extract from each approach what is useful for this study. In particular, I highlight results that recognize distinct social identities for particular spirits. In the following chapters, I apply these ideas to construct a framework that explicitly defines identities for certain spirits of the dead. It is this framework that guides examination of the spirits of the dead in the prehistoric mortuary record.

Are All Spirits of the Dead “Ancestors” and All Interactions Ancestor Worship?

Initially, anthropological approaches to the spirits of the dead were largely descriptive. Social cultural anthropologists detailed particular social groups, and often documented their beliefs about spirits of the dead. This ethnographic work created a scholarly record of spirits of the dead in different parts of the world, although researchers did not yet distinguish among the spirits formally.

Most early anthropological considerations of the spirits used the term “ancestor” in a very general way. They often applied it as a general gloss to identify many, if not all, the spirits of the
dead. Eventually, Gluckman (1937) described an initial distinction among simple interactions with the spirits and “ancestor cult.” His emphasis on the ancestors and on an “ancestor cult” served as the primary tool for differentiating spirits of the dead for many years.

The Term “Ancestor”

The anthropological study of spirits of the dead is intrinsically linked to the term “ancestor” and to the phrase “ancestor worship.” In the past, researchers have referred to all spirits of the dead as ancestors, and, alternatively, have identified a very select, elite group of spirits as ancestors. The effort to differentiate the spirits of the dead and to understand their influence in the world is, in many ways, an effort to identify ancestors precisely and then the other spirits of the dead in comparison.

The term “ancestor” has two meanings – a common one and an anthropological one. In common vocabulary, “ancestor” means forbearers. In particular, the word refers to the forbearers of a descendant person or social group. It can refer to the physical people who came before, to historical notions of these people, or to the spirits of these people. In this case, it is a general term for the spirits of a descendant group’s forbearers.

In anthropology, the term “ancestor” is a complicated one (Sellato 2002). Broadly, it refers to a “limited category of forbearers who are regarded as more potent than others” (Chambert-Loir and Reid 2002a: xix). There are many vague and sometimes contradictory uses of this broad meaning in the anthropological literature (see Sellato 2002: 1 - 2, 12 - 13). Specific anthropological definitions of “ancestor” identify very particular, potent spirits of the dead and describe their characteristics (e.g., Keightley 2004, McAnany 1995, Sellato 2002). Contemporary research continues to refine the term and the ideas surrounding it (see Chapter 3).

In addition to the word “ancestor,” anthropologists have also derived the phrases “ancestor worship,” “ancestor cult”, and “cult of the dead.” Initially, early twentieth century researchers introduced these phrases to distinguish broadly defined ancestors from other spirits (i.e., to separate more potent spirits from less potent ones). It is important to note that the phrases largely differentiated the ritual actions associated with influential spirits from other funerary rituals. Thus, they refer to ritualized acts and ceremonial programs that involve
interaction with the physical remains of the deceased and/or the spirits of the dead. Many applications of these phrases were imprecise and did not explicitly describe identities for the spirits of the dead.

Throughout this chapter, I use both a common meaning and a broad, historical anthropological meaning of “ancestor.” I attempt to present the term in the various ways that past anthropological studies used it. In subsequent chapters, I develop and then apply a specific anthropological meaning for “ancestor.” To draw a distinction between these two uses, I write the general term with no italics – ancestors – and the specific term with italics – ancestors.

In this study’s analysis and interpretations, I avoid use of the phrases “ancestor worship” and “ancestor cult.” They are not particularly helpful in defining anthropologically-useful identities for spirits of the dead or in recognizing these identities. In addition, the discipline of religious studies maintains a technical definition of the word “cult” that is at odds with its usage and connotation in the phrase “ancestor cult.”

**Early Descriptions of “Ancestors” and Ancestor Worship**

Early anthropological approaches to the spirits of the dead recognized only ancestors (in the general sense). More specifically, early classic social cultural anthropologists referred to nearly all spirits of the dead as ancestors of the social groups that they studied. They focused primarily on including accounts of the spirits and people’s relations with them in ethnographic studies of social groups around the world. Researchers rarely identified different kinds of spirits of the dead in their work.

Late nineteenth and early twentieth century studies about the spirits of the dead were predominantly descriptive. They detailed the many and varied forms of the ancestors and ancestor worship in particular study areas. For example, Addison (1924) described the range and diverse forms of ancestor worship among selective groups of people throughout Africa. He declared that “there are few tribes whose religion has been reported with any care that do not appear to practice ancestor worship in some form” (Addison 1924: 155). This statement illustrates the broad, rather vague meaning for ancestor and ancestor worship that Addison and many of his contemporaries used to label spirits of the dead. In modern anthropological parlance, he was
stating that many African social groups remember spirits of the dead and that they interact and/or memorialize them in varied ways.

In seminal anthropological works, Bronislaw Malinowski (1916) and Raymond Firth (1936) provided rich descriptions of ancestors and spirits of the dead within Pacific Island communities. Malinowski (1916) detailed the formation of Trobriand spirits from the *baloma* (an individual’s soul), the places where these spirits reside on the Trobriand landscape, and the relationships that the living have with them. He discussed people’s interactions with the spirits of the dead and the influence that the spirits retain in magic and spells. Firth (1936) considered Tikopia spirits of the dead. He documented Tikopia practices of burying the dead in the house and then making offerings to the spirits of the dead before each meal.

In his later synthetic works, Firth (1955, 1967) situated the Tikopia spirits of the dead in a portrayal and understanding of Tikopian social order. He effectively embedded his descriptions of the spirits into Tikopian social structure, and suggested that the spirits were representations or symbolic restatements of that structure (see Fortes 1965). He determined that the Tikopian fate of the soul and its destination reproduced the social order and carried it into the next life where it could be maintained, interpreted, and perhaps negotiated.

As anthropology catalogued and described ancestors in varied settings, researchers began to separate them in a basic way from other spirits. Gluckman (1937) provided one of the first distinctions among the spirits of the dead. In his discussion of ancestral cults, he described ancestors as spirits who are more potent than others. He stated that “an ancestral cult may be defined as the belief in the continued interference of ancestral ghosts in the affairs of their living kin and continual ritual behavior by” these kin to the spirits. He noted that some social groups maintain “ancestor cults” (i.e., relationships with ancestors) while others do not. Furthermore, he raised the issue of other spirits of the dead and supernatural beings.

**Towards Identities for the Spirits of the Dead**

As anthropology moved beyond description, researchers incorporated ancestors and spirits of the dead into analyses of social systems. They attempted to explain the presence of
ancestors and the purposes of ancestor worship. Anthropologists first used a functional approach and then adopted political-economic approaches to consider potent spirits of the dead.

These two approaches led to important early understandings about the identities of the spirits of the dead. They helped to describe who ancestors are and characterize what they do. I describe these understandings of the spirits and extract relevant information. In the next chapter, I use some of this work to construct a framework that I find useful for describing some identities for the spirits.

Functional Approaches to the Spirits of the Dead

In the early and middle 20th century, anthropological studies of the spirits of the dead used functionalist approaches to explain the spirits’ influence among the living. These approaches emphasized the importance of ancestor worship to social cohesion. Researchers suggested that interaction with ancestors helped to maintain group cohesion in several ways: 1) regulating moral codes and 2) maintaining descent principles in certain kinship systems.

In the following discussion of functional approaches, I review each of these purported functions attributed to the spirits of the dead. I emphasize that this research led to differentiating some spirits of the dead – or, more precisely, to defining types of ancestors – as anthropologists refined the spirits’ roles in social systems. These typologies and definitions are helpful for constructing a framework to delineate different social identities for the spirits.

Many cultural anthropologists of the period supposed that ancestor worship served moral functions. For example, Eiselen and Schapera (1937: 270) posited that people’s relations with ancestors regulated moral attitudes in the African communities that they studied. These authors suggested that ancestor worship was connected to a particularist morality. Norbeck (1961: 172) later summarized the moral influence of ancestors. He reasoned that traditions of ancestor worship operate indirectly as a force toward conformance with the ideals of behavior…”

Radcliffe-Brown (1945) rooted relationships with ancestors in his structuralist approach to kinship systems. He argued that ancestor worship fulfilled certain social functions in specific kinship systems. More specifically, he proposed that it maintained social group solidarity in societies organized on the basis of lineages and cults (Radcliffe-Brown 1945: 37). Subsequently,
Middleton and Tait (1958) proposed that traditions of ancestor worship are more likely to occur in societies organized around unilineal descent groups, such as the segmentary lineage groups of the Lugbara, Nuer, and Tiv in Africa.

In *The Birth of the Gods*, Swanson (1960) conducted one of the first systematic analyses of the relationships between ancestor worship and kinship systems. He conducted a statistical analysis on data from 50 non-Western societies to identify correlations among participation in ancestral cults and particular kinship arrangements (in Swanson’s coding scheme, ancestral cults referred to interaction with any active spirits of the dead.). The results suggested that ancestral cults occur more frequently in societies that are organized around clans and lineages than in societies primarily organized on different systems. Such research on the association between ancestor worship/ancestor cults and unilineal descent groups had a rather profound impact. Bradbury (1966) eventually insisted that anthropologists limit considerations of ancestor worship to cases in which the living and the spirits of the dead share a genealogic relationship.

Tatje and Hsu (1969) then posited that particular types of ancestor cults (i.e., relationships with particular kinds of ancestors) were associated with the character of different kin systems. The key development was the differentiation of the spirits of the dead, and recognition that these different spirits held different roles in attendant social groups. These authors described neutral spirits, undifferentiated spirits, malicious-capricious ancestral spirits, punishing ancestral spirits, reward-punishing ancestral spirits, and benevolent-rewarding ancestral spirits (Tatje and Hsu 1969: 156 - 161). However, they were still interested in tying the spirits to basic functions in kinship systems. They suggested that the different ancestors upheld the primary characteristics of relationships (e.g., the brother-sister relationship, father-son relationship) that defined certain kin arrangements.

Building on Swanson’s (1960) and Tatje and Hsu’s (1969) work, Sheils (1975) explicitly defined the term “ancestor worship” and developed a widely applicable classification for different types of ancestors. He developed this classification to evaluate relationships among different kinds of ancestor worship and specific kinship systems, marriage arrangements, and subsistence patterns. Here, I focus exclusively on his consideration of the spirits of the dead, although the
relationships he located among potent spirits and single lines of descent (particularly those with complex family units) are interesting.

Sheils’ classification was based on the amount of involvement that the spirits had with their descendants. He defined the following types of ancestor worship: 1) absent, 2) otiose, 3) active, and 4) supportive. In otiose ancestor worship, the ancestors exist and are aware of the living’s activities, but they do not interfere. Active ancestor worship pertains when the spirits are “involved in the lives of their descendants but do so on a largely capricious basis…” (Sheils 1975: 428). Finally, in supportive ancestor worship, the ancestors intervene in the affairs of their descendants and reward or punish them for deeds and obligations.

Sheils’ classification represents a central contribution for several reasons. First, the scheme was not focused directly on ancestor worship and types of ancestor cult; it was centered on different kinds of spirits of the dead (Unlike Tatje and Hsu’s and other authors’ schemes, it did not appeal to the relative character of the ancestor-attendant relationship [e.g., punishing, benevolent].). Second, the classification described the different spirits’ involvement, their actions and influences. It highlighted, although simply, different ways that spirits participated in the affairs of the living.

Beyond Functionalist Approaches, Towards Political-Economics and Authority

Eventually, anthropological research began to extend considerations of ancestors beyond kinship systems and into political-economic realms. Researchers posited that ancestor worship helped to establish and legitimize socio-political inequalities, both within the family and outside of it. Many argued that interactions with ancestors supported inequalities, because these interactions appealed to an innate authority that the spirits held. I contend that these approaches to ancestor worship extended understandings about the spirits’ actions and influences in social and political affairs

Based on his work with the Tallensi in Africa, Fortes (1965, see also 1961, 1976) demonstrated a connection between ancestors and leadership positions within individual descent groups and households. He contended that privileged relationships with ancestors helped to legitimize a son’s transition to his father’s position as lineage or household head. He argued that
people transformed the authority of a father into a supernatural authority, “backed by the whole hierarchy of the ancestors” (Fortes 1965: 185). The eldest, inheriting son assumed responsibility for the mortuary rituals that instilled the authoritative father as an ancestor and also for continuing to maintain proper relations with the whole host of familial ancestors. As he did so, the son also announced his succession to the head of the house and the influence that this position carries.

Fortes' (1961, 1965, 1976) central contribution was endowing the ancestors with authority, and situating the ancestors in socio-politics (see Calhoun 1980). He stated that it is the “jural status as parent … vested with authority that is transmuted into ancestorhood” (Fortes 1965: 133). In other words, mortuary rituals help to separate the deceased’s individual, social, and political identities, and then use the authoritative portion to create an ancestor. Through continuing remembrances and ritual observances, living descendants (i.e., family successors, such as eldest sons) then interact with this influential ancestor spirit at the lineage level – in political contexts and domains. A privileged relationship with these spirits (i.e., access to supernatural authority) can help to legitimize a person’s claim to a local leadership position.

In his edited volume entitled Ancestors (1976a), Newell and other authors demonstrated that ancestors acted and held authority in venues beyond the immediate family and households. Newell’s (1976b) essay in particular suggested that ancestors’ behaviors and influences were not limited to the deceased’s familial relationships. Influential spirits of the dead could display unique behaviors, such as punishing behaviors, which were not part of their living identities (e.g., the spirit of an affectionate mother meting out punishments). Rather, spirits’ behaviors were primarily rooted in relationships that people maintained with them as spirits. Moreover, potent spirits exerted their own particular influences based on the social group who remembered and interacted with them.

Sheils (1980) then extended arguments for the creation of active, powerful dead, further into the realm of politics. He reasoned that the seating of familial arrangements in socio-political structures lead to enhanced roles for ancestral beings in the politics of the living. He recognized that, where a ruling family is the basis for political organization, politically ambitious lineages can
perform mortuary rituals that extend their ancestors’ authority beyond the immediate family to influence others.

Sheils (1980) proposed that people create and interact with “superior ancestral beings” in centralized states or other political formations that are organized on kinship lines. The term “superior ancestral being” describes powerful spirits who have influence over all people in a polity, beyond immediate descendants. They are the ancestral beings of “royal clan[s], lineage[s], and extended famil[ies] who [have] sole right to rulership” in political systems that are the “virtual ‘property’ of a family group” (Sheils 1980: 248). For instance, among the Ashanti of Africa, the king’s lineage maintained exclusive relations with superior ancestors while other lineages in the polity upheld interactions with their family’s ancestors. However, only the king’s ancestors could influence events and people throughout the society.

**Implications for Examining the Spirits of the Dead in the Archaeological Record**

Functional and political-economic approaches to the spirits of the dead led to important advancements in the anthropological understanding of the spirits of the dead. Functionalist research resulted in classification schemes for different kinds of ancestors, schemes which acknowledged that there are different types of spirits of the dead. Political-economic studies began to describe how ancestors participated in social groups and influenced affairs.

It is important to note, however, that these approaches also contributed to an excessive focus on ancestors. Many studies used the term indiscriminately, and did not define it in a formal way. Moreover, those studies that did develop classification schemes professed to differentiate different types of ancestor worship (and not to separate different spirits of the dead). Researchers often rushed to locate ancestors and to establish an innate connection to a supernatural authority. Thus, such studies encouraged others to find ancestors in their study areas without problematizing the identities of the spirits and their relationships with people.

In the research that follows, I use Sheils’ (1975, 1980) scheme to develop a framework that describes several social identities for different spirits of the dead. I base this framework on the relative agency, or action, that the living attribute to the spirits. In the next chapter, I introduce the framework and describe different kinds of spirits that I find useful to consider in this study. I
discuss the different ways that these spirits participate in the affairs of the living and the different amounts of influence that they wield.

**Potent Spirits of the Dead and Power**

As anthropological understandings of the spirits of the dead have evolved, research has adopted approaches that emphasize power dynamics. Over the past twenty years, this research has focused on the association between potent spirits of the dead and socio-political power. It has primarily considered how exclusive relationships with ancestors (i.e., ancestor worship or ancestor veneration) furnished power to influential people or groups of people, such as elites or politically motivated persons.

Historical anthropology and archaeological research has contributed substantially to these discussions. These works have concentrated on the development of relationships among potent spirits (ancestors, superior ancestral beings, etc.) and elite persons, families, and other social groups and organizations. They have described how people and/or particular groups of people form exclusive connections with these spirits and beings, and then how they use that connection to draw supernatural power and authority.

This research also illustrates that relationships with potent spirits of the dead have appreciable significance in middle-range social systems and even in early state formation. In fact, these relationships can form a key component of socio-political systems, with positions, organizations, and official actions dedicated to them. The research discussed here indicates that connections to these spirits are often critical sources of power in these fluid arrangements. Over time, people’s maintenance and institutionalization of these relationships can help them to legitimate authority.

I briefly discuss research approaches directed at power and their contributions to current understandings of the spirits of the dead. Here, I focus on historical anthropology and archaeological works, because they have the most bearing on this study. This research represents some of the initial attempts to characterize relationships with particular spirits of the dead. The works discussed here underscore the importance of defining ancestors and potent spirits of the dead and of identifying their actions and influences.
Again, it is important to recognize that this research perpetuated the focus on ancestors and ancestor worship. Anthropologists (particularly archaeologists) have tended to privilege connections between ancestors and elites, particularly acts of ancestor veneration, because these bonds presumably involved transfers of power. Researchers have rarely considered the ways in which other spirits participated in communities and occupied cultural landscapes.

**The Ancestors Bestow Power**

Mary Helms’ (1988, 1998) research has been influential for explicating associations among the material world, the supernatural, and power. In several works, she addressed how politically ambitious persons obtained access to supernatural elements and then used them as political resources, often to gain social power. She demonstrated that relationships with ancestors and potent spirits of the dead were important to middle-range political strategies and organization.

More specifically, Helms’ (1988, 1998) work illustrated the close affinity between potent spirits of the dead and the institutionalization of power in middle-range social systems (i.e., chiefdoms). She argued that politically ambitious persons frequently used knowledge and direct relationships with supernaturally-charged people, places, objects, and spirits as political resources. In her book *Access to Origins* (1998), Helms explicitly stated that elites are closely associated with ancestors; she even suggested that they sometimes embodied supernatural forces. She constructed a cross-cultural argument demonstrating that ambitious aristocrats often established special relationships with ancestors through associations with agnatic kin, and that, in this way, aristocrats legitimized their access to power and authority. Thus, leaders and elite lineages maintained rights to particular supernatural powers and resources, and very nearly became supernatural beings themselves.

McAnany’s (1995, see also McAnany et al. 1999) research detailed how relationships with potent spirits contributed to accumulations of social power in early state formation. She described the development of exclusive interactions with beings akin to Sheils’ (1980) superior ancestral beings in burgeoning lowland Mayan city states. Most importantly, her work documented these interactions and important changes to them in the Mayan archaeological record.
In her book, McAnany (1995) argued that Mayan house groups (in the tradition of the Levi-Straussian "house") transformed influential lineage members into ancestors. The continued remembrance of and interaction with these beings helped to maintain house estates and access to resources. She suggested that elite, eventually royal Mayan families co-opted practices of lineage-/house-based ancestor veneration. Elites used these practices to install potent ancestors, who then validated these families' claims to power over others. Ancestor veneration in royal households and courts invoked powerful cosmological symbols, places, and beings to establish the semi-divine nature of the royal line.

Keightley's (1990, 1996, 1999, 2001, 2004) work described the shaping of royal ancestors in early imperial China, and detailed the complex relations between these spirits and the royal family. His research demonstrated that developing and maintaining these relationships in an early state involved real material goods and very real power, often with life-and-death consequences. It also illustrated that these interactions were not simply benevolent; they also involved punishment and violence.

In a series of publications, Keightley described the critical role that formalized relationships with ancestors played in establishing and legitimizing the Shang dynasty's authority during the late Bronze Age (ca. 1200 – 1045 BC). Historical narratives and archaeological data indicate that emperor Wu Ding and his son Zu Jia routinized and institutionalized interaction with the royal family's ancestors as an official state responsibility. They solidified the family's and their specialized priest's exclusive access to these ancestral beings. Keightley (1990, 2004) argued that these leaders limited participation to the royal lineage, because performance of these rituals not only validated status but also granted access to power.

The king, his immediate family, and court priests communicated with, propitiated, and bargained with these powerful beings on behalf of people under Shang control. In a precise schedule of five regular rituals, the king and royal family made routine offerings, sacrificial pledges, appeals, and reports in order to gain the ancestors' favors and solicit their advice. Frequently, they bargained with these beings by offering sacrificial victims for an ancestor's help in a specific event or by promising the practice of particular rituals if there would be no disasters,
no troubles, and a good harvest. Sanctioned priests maintained a full schedule of sacrifice, propitiation, and remembrance. In addition, the king and court priests communicated with the ancestors and received their advice through divination with animal bones. Keightley (2004: 11) noted that "ancestor worship was inextricably tied to the successful exercise of power, both spiritual and political."

Surviving texts and royal decrees from the late Shang demonstrate that the influence of the royal ancestors stood at the apex of a hierarchy of ancestral beings, which mirrored the social hierarchy of the living. The king’s communications with these ancestors commanded compliance from the other houses and lineages in the Shang state. Later in the Shang dynasty, the ruler Pan Geng appealed to the advice and governing authority of deceased kings to support his decision to move the capital. Keightley (2004: 35) provided a quotation from the Shangshu text's “Pan Geng” chapter.

> If you, the myriads of people, do not attend to [my commands]...the former rulers ... will send down on you great punishment for your crime, and say, 'Why do you not agree with our young descendent,...?'. When they punish you from above, you will have no way of escape ... Our former rules will restrain your ancestors and fathers ..., (so that) your ancestors and fathers will reject you, and not save you from death ....Your ancestors and fathers urgently report ... to my High Rulers ..., saying, 'Execute great punishments on our descendants.' (pt. 2, paras. 11 – 14)

This passage highlights the king's intimate communications with spiritual beings that could influence the entire realm and its people. More importantly, it emphasizes the very real powers that these high ancestral beings wielded. They had the ability to control lower level ancestors of the common people and to mete out punishments that may even result in death.

**The Implications of Power**

Historical anthropological and archaeological approaches to the spirits of the dead have begun to describe relationships that some people had with particular, influential spirits of the dead. This kind of work details the development of these relations and examines the ways in which they unfolded, through ritual programs and historical events. Research like McAnanay's and Keightley's demonstrates how potent spirits directly intervened in political and economic affairs. In some instances, their influence had an impact on life and death.
Moreover, these works illustrate the importance of powerful spirits of the dead to middle-range political systems and to incipient states. They do not simply attribute significance to ancestors within political organizations. They attempt to describe the ways in which the spirits and interactions with them contributed to these systems. They document the development of interactions with the spirits and track their evolution. Such research firmly establishes that the ways in which the spirits participate in communities matter. The spirits’ participation determines their influence and social power.

In the analyses that follow, I build on these research directions. I focus on recognizing the identities of the spirits of the dead in two middle-range communities in prehistoric North America. I characterize these identities to understand how the spirits of the dead participated in social and political affairs in these towns. I am particularly concerned with addressing how different kinds of spirits can engage in community affairs in different ways.

With a robust understanding of different spirits of the dead and their influences, anthropological research can address “why” questions surrounding relationships with these spirits. In particular, it can consider why some people establish relations with potent spirits – ancestors – and other people do not. Here, I do not directly examine the “why” of ancestors or other spirits. But I do embed and locate certain kinds of spirits in particular socio-political histories and traditions.

**Why Ancestors? Tales of Social Competition and Power Dynamics**

When Gluckman (1937) recognized relationships with ancestors as unique, he asked why some social groups shape these beings and maintain interactions with them while other groups do not. Many anthropologists who have addressed the spirits of the dead in their work have considered that question: why do some people create ancestors (e.g., Fortes 1965)? Researchers have sought answers primarily in moral attitudes, kinship systems, and subsistence patterns/economics. Nevertheless, this fundamental question remains without a satisfactory answer.

Conventional wisdom holds that social groups that are in the process of a political-economic escalation (i.e., an increase in complexity) build relationships with ancestors. Past
research indicates that groups that maintain lineage-based kin systems and that are engaged in economic intensification (e.g., agricultural) are more likely to fashion relationships with potent spirits than groups who do not (e.g., Sheils 1975). As social groups institutionalize leadership positions and economic rights through lineage-based household, they increasingly engage with ancestors.

Recent social cultural research indicates, however, that political-economic intensification is not a sufficient explanation. Sellato (2002) described a notable case in which one highly stratified social group in Indonesia did not shape ancestors, even though many other groups in Indonesia did maintain relations with influential spirits of the dead. He demonstrated that the central Aoheng peoples and likely all Kayanic groups of Indonesia did not “know of ancestors” (Sellato 2002: 15). These people did not engage with influential spirits of the dead in socio-political negotiations, perhaps because social positions and status were rigidly fixed.

The archaeological literature also suggests that intensification and complexity do not adequately explain ancestors. In a comparative analysis of Eastern Woodland traditions, Brown (2003b) addressed the origins of controlled interactions with powerful dead in the North American archaeological record. He demonstrated that the elite of maize-agricultural societies often co-opted collective burial practices to monopolize control of the supernatural. His conclusions, however, suggested that it was not the adoption of maize agriculture, nor was it the attendant shift in land use strategies that led to exclusive relationships with powerful spirits.

Anthropologists should consider that satisfactory explanations for ancestors and active spirits of the dead lie beyond the specifics and details of social structure, and within larger social processes. In other words, it may not be possible to reduce ideas and beliefs about spirits of the dead to singular roles in kinship, subsistence economies, and political-economic systems. Instead, researchers should recognize that a social group’s ties to spirits of the dead are deeply embedded in a cultural trajectory. The shaping of certain kinds of spirits and the evolution of relationships with them is intimately connected to history.
Ancestors, History, and Traditions of Social Competition

I suggest that influential spirits of the dead are often associated with historical trajectories of social competition. A review of relevant anthropological literature indicates that influential spirits play important roles in cultural and historical settings where people are openly engaged in social contests and competition. Here, I concentrate on the spirits’ connections to contests over property and resource rights, social positions, and political power and authority.

Rights to Land and Resources.

In his influential work, Morris (1991) articulated an association between ancestors and the transmission of property rights across generations (see Goody 1962). He argued that relationships with ancestors were a part of social conflicts among groups and that these relationships determined access to resources and political power. He illustrated how relationships with spirits of the dead influenced conflicts in a comparative history of Athens and Rome. He noted that it was important to place the dead in the history of social competition within these two places.

Ethnohistoric and archaeological research on imperial Andean societies has also documented a close association between ancestors and access to proprietary resource rights (Mantha 2009). Andean people’s active relationships with ancestral beings reckoned membership in ayllu organizations, which were corporate landholding groups (Salomon 1991, 1995, Spalding 1984). Although the ayllu was not a single descent group, founding ancestors passed to their descendants the rights to ayllu resources and social positions. Sherbondy (1982: 22) stated that “[i]t is …essential to be able to make a claim to lands and waters by citing an ancestor. In the case of a conflict with another ayllu, the older ancestor has precedence.” Andean people placed their mummified remains of ancestors in caves and in stone structures on the landscape to create a geography of memorialized dead and place-deities that marked territory and resources.

Negotiating Social Standings.

Relationships with ancestors are also associated with competition for social positions. Within lineages and/or households, dealings with ancestors are often tied to inter-generational tensions
over succession to head-of-household positions (Fortes 1965). In addition, interactions with ancestors are important to the relative social standing of lineages or other social groups within a larger community. These interactions play a substantial part in groups’ contestations over prestige and power.

In China, people’s relations with ancestors were central to competing claims for leading social positions within lineages. Freedman (1966: 118) noted that Chinese “ancestor worship… threw certain organizational principles of the lineage into relief and expressed ideas central to the competition within … the lineage communities.” He observed that all sons frequently inherited equal portions of land upon the death of their father. However, only the eldest son inherited the ancestor shrine and all its responsibilities. Inheritance of the shrine conveyed his ascendance to head of the household.

Chinese ancestors also played fundamental roles in social competition among lineages, particularly among prominent and wealthy houses. Freedman (1966) described how families in the “New Territories” of south China created ancestors through successive burial rites and body processing. People disinterred the worthy dead from primary burials, defleshed the remains at designated ritual grounds, and buried the processed remains in covered pots along hillsides away from residences. Moreover, powerful lineages often created extremely influential dead by moving remains into a tertiary burial crypt. The interment of potent ancestors followed principles of feng-shui, a geomancy technique for placing graves and buildings in accord with astrological considerations.

Rival lineages and factions occasionally sought to sap the power of their opposition by disrupting the feng-shui of ancestors or even harming the remains of potent ancestors. Freedman (1966: 139) observed that “the surest way to destroy a rival for good is to tear open his ancestral tomb and pulverize the remains they contain … bones are descent; without them one is cut off from the most powerful source of ancestral benefits.” Successful patrilineages also maintained highly visible ancestor halls that announced the prowess of their ancestors to other lineages. These halls housed ancestor tablets and hosted ritual and secular activities. Primarily men’s clubs, the halls showcased and honored generations of ancestors through display of ancestor...
tablets (Freedman 1966, 1970). Freedman (1966) described one hall that, at the time, contained records of ancestors through forty-two generations.

Establishing Authority.

Finally, relationships with ancestors are related to struggles over political power and the legitimation of authority. Leaders and politically ambitious people use their connections to potent spirits to garner influence and power over others (see Sheils 1980). They also reference particular ancestors to demonstrate a historical sanction for access to social power.

For example, struggles over succession to the Thai kingdom’s throne directly involved relationships with royal ancestors. In Thailand during the 19th century, a would-be king’s claim to a frequently contested crown was based on his ability to secure an exclusive relationship with royal ancestors (Metcalf and Huntington 1991, Wales 1931). The Thai kingdom engaged in frequent wars over population. It also experienced continual conflict over succession to the royal throne, as kings had many wives and concubines throughout the realm.

Access to interactions and relationships with the royal line of ancestors, particularly the ritual actions for installing the previous king as a royal ancestor, played a fundamental role in competition for the crown (Metcalf and Huntington 1991, Wales 1931). An aspiring king went through his coronation rites as the recently deceased king was transformed into a royal, potent ancestor. A claimant to the crown, whether he was a rightful heir or a usurper, carefully positioned himself to help transform the previous king into a royal ancestor and thus establish a relationship with the generations of royal ancestors whose remains were housed as relics in the palace. A newly coronated king’s claim to the crown was firmly substantiated and legitimized by his connection to the line of royal ancestors (Metcalf and Huntington 1991: 140 - 141).
CHAPTER 3
The Social Memories and Identities of the Dead

In the following chapter, I use anthropological understandings of the spirits of the dead to differentiate among several different kinds of spirits. I construct a classification for the social identities of certain spirits in settings throughout the world. This classification is based on the amount of agency (i.e., action and/or influence) that the living attribute to the spirits. It describes three principal types that I find useful for this study: 1) ancestors, 2) ancestral spirits, and 3) collectivities of the dead.

The social identities of the spirits of the dead incorporate a host of information about incorporeal beings in a given community. These identities “place” the spirits within the cultural landscapes that people construct around their communities. Most importantly, the social identities define who the dead are and what influences they exercise in the affairs of the living. They also help to establish where the spirits reside, how they come to reside in particular abodes, and how the living can safely interact with and/or remember them. In fact, some social identities necessitate that spirits of the dead leave altogether and that the living forget them.

Social Identities for the Spirits of the Dead: Ancestors, Ancestral Spirits, and Collectivities

The cultural anthropology literature is full of descriptions documenting the myriad ways in which people remember or, in some cases, forget their dead (see Sheils 1975, Sheils 1980, Swanson 1960, Tatje and Hsu 1969). Accounts from different parts of the world describe a broad assortment of social identities for spirits of the dead. For instance, people remember and/or identify persons who have passed on as supernatural beings, spirits, ghosts, shades, etc. Previous anthropological research can help to differentiate the ways in which people in disparate cultural settings identify spirits of the dead.

The review of past research presented in Chapter 2 suggests that one useful way of identifying the spirits is related to the degrees of agency attributed to non-corporeal beings. Swanson (1960), Tatje and Hsu (1969), and Sheils (1975) based their classifications of spirits on the amount of activity and influence that people attributed to them. Sheils’ (1975: 428)
classification for the spirits of the dead is the most parsimonious of the categorizations and the most broadly applicable to archaeological research.

Sheils’ (1975, 1980) work defined three types of spirits with different amounts and types of agency: Superior and supportive ancestors are those spirits who are actively involved in the lives of their descendants and who reward and punish people for fulfilling obligations. Active ancestors are sometimes involved in the lives of their descendants but only on a capricious basis. They do not have the power to reward and/or punish. Otiose ancestors are generic spirits who watch their descendants’ lives but who refrain from acting. Finally, some people do not create memories of ancestors.

Based on these previous works, as well as recent ethnographic treatments, I construct a framework that situates identities for the spirits of the dead along a continuum (i.e., a continuous classification scheme). The framework’s foundation is the amount or degree of agency that people attribute to the spirits of the dead in socio-political affairs. This scheme assists the identification of separate kinds of spirits who exercise different amounts and types of agency in socio-politics.

Here, I focus on three social identities that people craft for spirits of the dead: ancestors, ancestral spirits, and anonymous groups of spirits. Each of these identities is located within a different region of the continuum that describes the spirits’ agency or influence. There are likely additional identities, for other kinds of spirits, which future research might locate along this continuum.

Ancestors are the select, potent spirits of the dead who are capable of wielding a considerable amount of agency in socio-political affairs. Ancestral spirits are generic spirits of the dead who are infrequently active in the world of the living and who exercise agency in specific contexts. Finally, anonymous groups of spirits are collectives who exercise very little direct agency in socio-political affairs. They can be referenced and maintain influence in other spheres of people’s lives.
Ancestors

In general, anthropological considerations of the dead have treated the term “ancestor” rather casually. Many authors have used “ancestor” as a gloss for “the dead,” “dead forbearers,” and “spirits of the dead” in cultural settings around the world (e.g., Metcalf and Huntington 1991). This usage neglects to recognize ancestors as unique kinds of spiritual beings, separate from other spirits, ghosts, and collectives. It also limits academic understanding of the distinctive ways that people interact with ancestors and other named supernatural beings (see Steadman et al. 1996).

Several recent studies focusing on interactions with the dead have begun to clarify indiscriminate uses of the term “ancestor” (e.g., Helms 1998, Metcalf and Huntington 1991, Shafer 2003, Stohr and Zoetmulder 1968). Foremost, Chambert-Loir and Reid’s (2002a) and Sellato’s (2002) exploration of the potent dead in Indonesia demonstrated that ancestors are clearly identified, socially important beings. These authors’ ethnographic research suggested that “not everybody becomes an ancestor” (Sellato 2002: 13). Rather, under a specific anthropological definition, ancestors are the elite among the dead, the successful dead, and/or the spirits of remarkable people whose deeds are worthy of remembrance and some degree of reverence (Sellato 2002 cites Granet 1980, Krauskopf 1991, Stohr and Zoetmulder 1968). They are the select dead whose power and/or success, in this physical world or in some other, allow them to influence the affairs of the living.

Geinart (2002) described the creation and maintenance of ancestors in the Laboya community of Sumba, Eastern Indonesia. She observed that, ideally, a marapu (an ancestor) is someone who died long ago, and above all is remembered as having been a particularly powerful and rich person. A marapu is [someone] who acquired a ‘big name’…” (Geinart 2002: 33). Traditionally, The transformation of a deceased person to an ancestor depended on the status that the person achieved in life and on the ability of his descendants to perform the proper rituals.

The living identify both men and women as marapu. In general, men have become ancestral beings for their remembered prowess in war, social influence, and/or wealth. In the modern day, men compete for prestige and influence through elaborate feasts that showcased
their ability to mobilize far-reaching social connections. Women have become these beings for their perceived success as mothers.

The living feed a *marapu* and address him/her regularly in prayer to maintain proper relations with the being. In return, the *ancestor* send “cooling down” blessings often in the form of rains to ensure good harvests of rice, maize, and tubers. Displeased, disappointed *marapu* become “hot,” and broadcast disease and accidental death among communities, cattle, and crops.

A number of authors have tied the creation of *ancestors* and the maintenance of relationships with these beings to lineages and/or houses (*sensu* Levi-Strauss). In his considerations of ancestor veneration, Fortes (1961 see also, 1965, 1976, 1987) drew a distinction between *ancestors* as named beings that reference lineage heritage and other generalized spirits of the dead. Interactions with ancestral beings help to promote supernatural influence in the affairs of the lineage or house and to validate the lineage’s/house’s history. Building on Fortes’ and Freedman’s (1966, 1967) work, McAnany (1995 see also, 1999) declared that “only specific individuals in a descent line become ancestors…”. Her examination of Mayan interactions with the dead suggested that *ancestors* in the Mayan world were select, venerated dead of lineage groups and were tied in place and in name to households. She argued that the living placed the bodies of ancestral beings in deposits inside residential compounds. Lineage and/or house members performed elaborate rituals to the named beings in these contexts “to insure the chain of continuity in resources … between the generations” (McAnany 1995: 161).

In her work on the power of origins, Helms (Helms 1998: 35) identified *ancestors* as distinctive types of supernatural beings primarily associated with family groups and/or households (see Fortes 1976). She described two types of ancestral beings: one that is specific and named, and one that is distant and related to a house (*sensu* Levi-Strauss). She defined specific ancestral beings as the “named dead of the house who are remembered [for] having achieved exceptional socially significant goals while still physically alive” (Helms 1998: 35). These *ancestors* are often “juridical and authoritative”; they require continual service for their ability to influence the fortunes of a household positively or negatively (Helms 1998: 38). In other words,
named ancestors hold clout in the household and among its members. An ancestor’s power to judge the actions of a household and to provide or withhold access to resources encourages house members to maintain a proper relationship with the being.

Although Chambert-Loir and Reid (2002b: xxi) asserted that ancestors are by definition benevolent, it is more accurate to state that ancestors are supernatural actors who can influence the physical world. In general, the living maintain reciprocal relationships with these beings. People continue to communicate with ancestors through interactions that honor them and that provide them with provisions, particularly food and drink. If the living acknowledge ancestors and feed them well, then ancestral beings protect their descendants, offer them guidance toward the “right path” in important decisions, and often lead them toward prosperity. However, if the living neglect the ancestors, then these supernatural beings may punish descendants with natural disasters, crop failures, diseases, and even mortal accidents. The presence and influence of ancestors are evident in their gifts and their punishments.

The creation of ancestors requires the performance of extended ritual events to install these select beings in their proper, powerful place among the dead. Several authors have noted that funerary rituals alone are not enough to appoint a spirit to the status of ancestor (Krauskopf 1991: 65, Metcalf 1982, Sellato 2002:13-15). In his synthetic remarks on Asian and African ancestral beings, Fortes (1976: 7) declared that “death itself does not confer ancestorhood”. Metcalf (1982: 23), in his interpretation of the Berawan nulang festival, suggested that even secondary funerary rites do not function as a “kind of ancestor factory…”

Rather, the living install ancestors through a series of ritualized stages that can stretch over months or years and that cumulatively elevate the spiritual being into a select position among spirits of the dead (Buikstra and Charles 1999, Charles and Buikstra 2002, Morris 1991, Sellato 2002: 14 - 15). Generalizing from a variety of Asian ancestral beings, Fortes (1976: 7-8) observed that it is as if the living nurture the dead to maturation through stages that mirror physical maturation (see also Fortes 1965). Fortes (1976) and Sellato (2002) characterized these ritual events as further separation rites, similar to a secondary death that moves the select, remembered spirits into their new status. In some instances, these rites help to further purify or
consecrate these powerful dead to ensure safe interaction with them. They might involve provisions to enable (or perhaps entice) the ancestor to return safely to the physical world or at least communicate with the physical world when summoned. In addition, they may involve procedures to prevent the being from appearing unannounced.

To return to the ancestors in Sumba, Eastern Indonesia, Geinart (2002) provided a noteworthy description of the installation of ancestors in the Laboya community. Her discussion revealed a close connection among Laboya social organization, the arrangement of settlements, and marapu (the ancestors). In general, Laboya society is divided into kabihu (roughly translates to “clan”) and uma (“lineage” or, more precisely, “house”). Each kabihu has an ancestral couple, a man and his wife or wives, who are accorded founding status; these ancestors are called Inya, Ama (“Mother, Father”). Similarly, an uma has an ancestral couple. The house occasionally maintains memories of and interactions with other well-known, successful, and/or prestigious uma members who have passed on as well.

The members of an uma live in a circle of houses that surround a central courtyard containing the marked graves of deceased relatives. The doors of the residential dwellings face the tombs. Each grave bears the name of a famous ancestor whose bones rest in the tomb. Thus, the construction of a tomb for a well-known person, whose memory continues to grow after death, can strengthen an uma, and can even be occasion for founding a new uma. The essence/power or names of an uma’s marapus reside within the house’s attic.

Instatement of a marapu and the establishment of safe interaction with the being involves two funerary events and a third ritual event to call the being’s power into the house’s attic. However, even prior to death, a man must have constructed his own megalith and tomb to have a chance at becoming a founding ancestor. The construction of this tomb ensures it bears his name, and that it sits in front of his house as it potentially grows into a separate, new uma.

The first funerary rite takes place in the house. Family members prepare and wrap the body, and then place it in the tomb. Traditionally, between the first and secondary funerary rituals, the person separates into their two constituent elements: mawo (the shadow, reflection, or breathe; associated with the body) and dewa (a personal power or essence; associated with
reputation or name). The bodily fluids that emanate from the rotting body contain the mawo, which flow back to a spring and ultimately transform into rain or fluvial waters. The dewa separates from the physical body and travels to meet the ancestors and other long-dead.

The second funeral, which can occur several years later or only several days later, ensures that the dewa begins its journey to meet the marapu, who will help the soul become an ancestor. Many relatives and other associated people gather in a ritual sacrifice of large animals, particularly buffalo, and take part in a communal feast. The first animal slaughtered is a gift to the named ancestors of the deceased who take the soul; the second is an offering to the deceased’s departed mother and father; and the third is presented to the mother’s brother as a replacement for the physical body. Geinart (2002: 45) concluded that “[i]t is the task of the forefathers and mothers and ultimately of those who have attained the stage of marapu to transform the deceased into life-giving components.” Any additional animal sacrifices are ostentatious displays that enhance the memory of the deceased’s power and prestige. A strong collective memory of a person’s influential deeds in life in conjunction with the amount of pomp and circumstance at his/her second funeral typically hastens the transformation to marapu.

The final recognition of completed transformation into an ancestor involves the installation of the new marapu’s essence and/or power into the uma, a re-incorporation into the house. Living house members perform a third, separate ritual event, sometimes years after the second funeral, to call the ancestor’s dewa into the attic of the house. There, the dewa resides as a pool of ancestral power or “big names” available to the house. It protects the uma, and provides a foundational power from which the house can draw.

A full range of mortuary rituals, as a series of performances that continue past death and initial burial, are necessary to transform the deceased into a mature, named ancestor who can influence the affairs of the living. In many ways, these ritual performances represent stages and transformations in the maturation of an ancestor. They involve the use of a full complement of mortuary symbolism to purify the spirit, foster its relationship with other powerful spirits so that it might learn to interact with the living safely, to grow the power of the being, to enhance the identify and name of the ancestor, and finally to continue a proper relationship with the ancestor.
Although only some researchers adhere to a specific definition of ancestors, several authors have documented the creation of and interaction with these beings in other cultural settings. The presence of ancestors has been observed in select ethnic groups of Borneo (Chambert-Loir and Reid 2002b, Sellato 2002), in prehistoric Incan communities of the central Andes (Hastorf 2003, Isbell 1997, Salomon 1995), in ancient Greece (Antonaccio 1995, Gallou 2005), in the Mayan world (Gillespie 2000, McAnany 1995, McAnany et al. 1999), and in Okinawa (Tanaka 1975, 1977).

Ancestral Spirits

Sellato (2002) noted a subtle but important distinction between ancestors and ancestral spirits, or what might be called spirits of forbearers. In contrast to ancestors, who are select dead wielding agency among the living, ancestral spirits are generalized dead who exercise a limited, context-specific agency in living communities. These spirits are most commonly the remembered dead of self-identified social groups (e.g., descent groups, ethnic groups, political communities, etc.). Meskell (2001), Thomas (2000), and Pearson (1999) stated that these spirits are referenced and/or summoned for interaction at occasional events that emphasize a prosperous continuity with the past. The documentation of ancestral spirits in specific cultural-historical settings frequently finds a contrast between the recent dead, who are remembered more vividly, and the long dead, the remembrance of whom has faded.

Traditional Japanese practices of spirit veneration suggest that living family members maintain and interact with ancestral spirits. Mortuary ritual in Japan involves a series of ceremonial events, stretched over many years, which transform familial (ie, or lineage) dead into collective spirits called senzo or into a group of higher-level, abstract spirits known as kami (Goss and Klass 2005, Ooms 1976, Yonemura 1976). In addition, it includes routine daily and annual practices that help people to maintain relationships with both the recent-dead and the long-dead.

Through the historic and modern era, Japanese mortuary ritual has become a combination of long-established Shinto beliefs and Buddhism. The shogunal government required families to enroll in a Buddhist congregation during the latter half of the feudal era, in the Tokugawa period, and to perform some of the worship of ancestral spirits in a Buddhist style.
(Takeda 1976). Thus, some material culture associated with spirit veneration is noticeably Buddhist, and many words that refer to the state of the spirit are derived from Chinese Buddhist terms. For example, the word senzo comes from the Chinese hsien-tsu, meaning “ancestor” (Takeda 1976: 131).

Funerary rituals and the first set of post-funerary rituals transform a member of the recent dead to a new buddha, or hotoke. Traditionally, the living have 49 days to help the deceased become hotoke. Within one or two days of death, the family cremates the remains. Within a week, family members glean the burned bone from atop a tray, place the cremains in an urn, and then deposit the urn in the family tomb. The deceased joins the collective dead of the family, as all the remains of an extended household (ie) or a part of a lineage are buried in the same pit.

The deceased receive a posthumous name called kaimyō just after death. The name usually consists of one character from a person’s name in life, an indication of the person’s age group at death, and a highly personalized reference to the person’s character or qualities (Goss and Klass 2005: 46-47, Ooms 1976: 65-66). Family, or ie, members inscribe the name and occasionally other information; such as date of death, age at death, and relationship to the household head; on two tablets known as ahai or ihai. Mourners often leave one tablet at the family tomb and, after 14 days, place the other on the household butsudan, a Buddhist altar devoted to ie ancestral spirits. In the modern area, some families inscribe posthumous names and death records in a book that resides on the butsudan. The tablets and records associated with the family altar are among the most important family possessions (Goss and Klass 2005: 46-47, see also Maeda 1976, Smith 1976). Family members also erect memorial slats called tōba at the grave. These also bear the posthumous name of the deceased.

The Japanese term for the recent dead is shirei, which translates to “ghost” or “spook” (Goss and Klass 2005: 43). The newly dead are wandering spirits who may cause harm to the living if they are not attended to, guided, and encouraged to become mature, enlightened spiritual beings. Thus, during the first 49 days after death, family members restructure the relationship between the living and newly “born” spirit. They engage in communication, make sure to inform the deceased that they are in fact dead, and make reconciliations. Family members also might
perform a variety of ritual practices, which include throwing salt, turning the remains, continually burning incense, and a daily offering of water, to purify/placate the spirit and to help it settle in the grave. At the time of the funeral and just after, mourners bring offerings of koden, or “incense money,” to the family as an expression of a social relationships and a reminder that the deceased continues to be part of the community. After the 49 days, the family reciprocates with a gift half the value of the koden to the donor to reinforce the bond and to acknowledge the continued relationship with the deceased.

When a recently dead family member becomes hotoke on the 49th day, he or she is now available for interaction as an ancestral spirit (Goss and Klass 2005: 45). The ie holds a memorial service on this day to mark the occasion as the fully formed spirit settles in the family tomb (Ooms 1976: 67). The ancestral spirit is from this point forward honored, remembered, and communicated with through objects associated with the butsudan (Goss and Klass 2005: 46-47, see also Maeda 1976, Smith 1976). They are also remembered through visits to the family tomb. Through time, the individuality of the spirit fades as it becomes associated with the multiple generations of ie ancestral spirits honored at the altar and at the family tomb (see Ooms 1976: 65-69).

Family members often hold memorial services for hotoke on anniversary occasions. People may hold some form of observance at the following anniversaries of death: 100 days, 1 year, 3 years, 7, 13 years, 17 years, 23 years, and 33 years (and sometimes 55 years and even 100 years). These ceremonial occasions not only allow the family to honor, remember, and interact with the spirit, but they also serve to help the family slowly forget the spirits individuality (Ooms 1976, Yonemura 1976). These events mark the maturation of the spirit as its relationships with family spirits grows stronger and it fades into the collectivity of ie spirits.

At the 33rd (or 55th) anniversary, the hotoke loses all individuality and merges into the collectivity of ancestral spirits, who start with the founder (see Yonemura 1976: 179). The spirit is now senzo, a member of the ie’s collective spirits. Family members cease memorial services for the individual spirit, and they decommission the tablet. The living may bury the tablet in the tomb,
deposit it in a temple, or even cast it into the river. In some parts of Japan, mature ancestral spirits are *kami*, spirits of the earth and/or of the household and its grounds.

The ritual installation of a mature spirit is a long-process, some 33 years, of seating the spirit's identity among the household’s ancestral spirits. It is a process of removing or forgetting individual identity in favor of a collective one. Family members hope to install the spirit as a member of the *ie*’s ancestral spirits to strengthen the house. In general, families perceive that these household spirits and *kami* form the foundation of the *ie* and offer it protection and blessings. They concentrate interaction on displaying gratitude to the spirits and on maintaining basic relationships with the spirits to increase their protection.

People continue to interact with ancestral spirits on two festival occasions. During the *O bon* or *bon* festival, the major summer festival in Japan, family members invite the dead back into their communities and homes. People welcome the recent-dead, who are the spirits of people who have passed since the last *bon*, with personal sentiments. They may also recognize founding figures or spirits in individual ways. In general, though, families interact with *ie* ancestral spirits as a collective group. Family members also recognize and interact with ancestral spirits at the New Year’s Festival (Takeda 1976, Yonemura 1976). Research of Japanese folk traditions, prior to the introduction of Buddhism, suggests that these events are present-day adaptations of festivals for the ancestral spirits. Japanese tradition held that the spirits of the dead return to the family twice each year, once in the spring at the night of the full month and a second time in the fall at the night of the full moon (Takeda 1976: 122).

Ethnographers and archaeologists infrequently distinguish between *ancestors* and ancestral spirits, as defined in this study. Nevertheless, several researchers have documented interaction with ancestral spirits in Neolithic European traditions (Barrett 1988, 1994, Thomas 2000) and in ancient Egypt (Meskell 2001). In addition, some authors have recorded the presence of ancestral spirits alongside *ancestors* in Old China (Freedman 1970, Grana-Behrens and Wang-Riese 2008, Watson and Rawski 1988), Okinawan (Tanaka 1977), Andean and Mayan communities (Hastorf 2003, McAnany et al. 1999, Salomon 1995).
Anonymous Groups of the Dead

In some cultural-historical contexts living communities do not maintain ancestors, nor do they foster relationships with ancestral spirits. Instead, the sphere of the living remains separate from a rather anonymous collectivity of the dead, who exercise very little agency in socio-political affairs. Surviving communities recognize these dead and may reference them in some contexts. However, they do not interact with them in a regularized way, and they do not anticipate that the dead have the ability to impact directly events or relations in the world of the living.

In Sri Lanka’s North Central Province, prior to broad-based Westernization, many people performed traditional mortuary practices that, in general, created anonymous groups of the dead. Walters’ (2003) research documented a layered set of mortuary rituals that includes Buddhist funerary practices and Theist (Hindu) necromancy. Sinhalese Buddhist funerary ritual deanimates the deceased and removes any traces of identity or essence from this world. The Buddhist monks who preside over funerals deliver a clear philosophical message to forget the deceased. Walters (2003: 116) stated that the monks “push the karmic heap called ‘the person’ on the next plan of samsāra; while they preach their sermons about … impermanence, essencelessness, and dissatisfactoriness…” The dead person simply represents the irrefutable and inevitable loss of human life. Monks continue to reinforce forgetting the dead, who are forever gone, at almsgiving rituals that mark the first week after death and at additional almsgiving ceremonies. They present sermons that transfer the merit of almsgiving to whatever the dead have become, far beyond this world.

A village sohompitiya (literally “place of corpses”) clearly reflects the Buddhist view of death as final, endless, repetitive, and ultimately meaningless, as well as the predilection to forget the dead. The living do not maintain the sohompitiya and do not visit it unless a funeral occurs. People place remains in a small jungle clearing on the land until it becomes too full to hold additional remains. Then, villagers open a new clearing in an area where burial likely took place many years ago. The cemetery contains no grave markings. There are simply graves upon graves, and pieces of ash and bone littering the ground surface. In addition, the small plot of land
holds the decaying remains of past funerals and evidence of animals burrowing for human carrion.

The Buddhist funerary practices attempt to counteract local Theist (Hindu) necromancy that can reanimate the generic dead, often for nefarious purposes. According to Walters (2003), Nāyakkers from south India introduced Theist necrotechnologies in the 18th century when the area was under the rule of the kings of highland Kandy. These practices appeal to Sohon deviyo (“the god of graves”), who lives in cemeteries not only to protect corpses but also to aid necromancers in evil doings. Assisted by other demons, he can reanimate corpses to scare the living to death, construct a weapon from reanimated crematory ash, and use skulls to imprison cows and women. Local healers use language from texts, mostly in the form of mantras and yantras, to “afflict rivals with the dead and to undo the rivals’ own use of the dead against oneself and one’s patients” (Walters 2003: 117). Although Theist necromancy engages the dead and attributes some agency to the animated dead, these practices interact with the unidentified remains of anonymous dead. In fact, it is likely that some of the power and fear attributed to these manipulated beings is their grotesque lack of humanness and identity.

Ariés (1975) historical documentation of Western attitudes toward death illustrates a long history of anonymous groups of dead in Western Europe. He suggested that the principle concern in mortuary ritual of the Middle Ages was that a person’s spirit had access to purifying or protective virtues, to have an advantage in the final judgment and/or to be protected from the fires of hell. His research and the work of others (e.g., Binski 1996, Gordon and Marshall 2000) indicate that the living perceived little differences in the identities of the deceased, beyond the elevated status of saints and martyrs. In addition, they anticipated little to no interaction with the dead with the exception of appeals to saints and other departed holy figures.

Through the Middle Ages and into the 16th century, residents of Western European towns buried the dead almost exclusively in association with churches and monasteries: inside the church, around its walls, or in the surrounding area. Survivors reserved space in the church for the wealthy. They buried the well-to-do and influential residents of the town in the dirt beneath the flagstones of church floors. Members of wealthy families interred their deceased in a church to be
as close as possible to the remains and relics of saints or to holy altars, whose virtues might help to protect and purify the deceased's soul.

People placed most of the deceased, the commoners and the poor, in aitres (French), rectangular churchyards directly associated with monasteries and churches. The poor were buried in communal ditches that were several yards deep and several yards wide. Survivors performed little body preparation beyond sewing the corpse into a burial shroud. When town residents filled all plots in the church or filled one ditch, they re-opened a previously used plot or ditch and removed the remains. They placed the bones of the long-dead, whether they be remains of the influential or the poor, in charnel houses perched along the edges of the cemetery yard and even displayed skeletal elements in artistic arrangements in arcades and ossuaries above the charnel houses (Ariés 1975: 18-25). Town residents also used the aitres as central gathering places. People met there for social and business purposes, and even to dance and gamble. In some towns, merchants built shops along the charnel houses and people built homes adjacent to the charnel houses and arcades.

Aries' (1975: 22) historical descriptions demonstrated that living persons in Middle Age towns of Western Europe created large collectivities of dead, who had little to no influence in people’s socio-political affairs. The placement and treatment of a person's remains were “of little concern so long as they [resided] near the saints, or in the church, near the altar of the Virgin or the Holy Sacrament.” The remains of nearly all the deceased were eventually collected together in communal piles in charnel houses and displayed in arcades. Moreover, the living used the spaces of the dead for the business and pleasure of the living, and not for interaction with spirits of the deceased.

In general, ethnographic and archaeological research tends to focus on the active dead, either ancestors or ancestral spirits. Many scholars center analyses and interpretations on patterns of interaction with the dead, and rarely treat lack of interaction. Detailed research on anonymous groups of spirits is scarce. Several researchers, however, have identified anonymous groups of dead among prehistoric Great Lakes and mid-Atlantic indigenous groups (Brown 2003b), the Ainu (Munro 1963, Ohnuki-Tierney 1981), and Danish Iron Age populations (Parker
Pearson 1993). In addition, historians and anthropologists have also described collectivities in many Western Christian traditions (Ariés 1975, Brown 2007a, Metcalf and Huntington 1991).

Recognizing the Social Identities of the Spirits of the Dead

I now briefly summarize the classification of social identities for certain spirits of the dead. I condense the classification scheme described in the above sections into a visualization (Figure 3.1). This chart highlights the defining characteristics of ancestors, ancestral spirits, and anonymous groups of the dead.

![Figure 3.1. Characteristics of ancestors, ancestral spirits, and anonymous groups of the dead.](attachment:image.png)
People create ancestors through protracted, specialized ritual actions and persistent interaction with these beings. The living attribute appreciable amounts of agency to these spirits, and allow them to intervene in their social and political affairs. As a result, ancestors are the few, elect spirits of the dead.

People shape ancestral spirits through a few extended or otherwise defining mortuary rites and maintain periodic interaction with these spirits. They attribute minor amounts of agency to these beings. Thus, ancestral spirits are generalized spirits associated with particular social groups.

Finally, people fashion anonymous groups of the dead through relatively simple mortuary rites that emphasize uniformity. They do not maintain direct interactions with these spirits. The living attribute very little agency to these groups of dead. As a result, anonymous groups of dead are large collectives of spirits who are removed from the physical world.

I use the classification presented above in this study's examination of prehistoric mortuary ritual. More specifically, I attempt to recognize these social identities for the spirits of the dead in the Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan mortuary records. The next chapter describes how I examine the performance of mortuary ritual to identify ancestors, ancestral spirits, and/or anonymous groups of the dead in a Mississippian and two Ancestral Puebloan communities.
CHAPTER 4

Identifying Ancestors, Ancestral Spirits, and Anonymous Groups of the Dead in the Mortuary Record

This study examines the performance of mortuary ritual to understand the social identities that surrounded the spirits of the dead in Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan settlements. More specifically, it seeks to characterize the ways in which different spirits of the dead participated in local social and political affairs. In doing so, this research attempts to illustrate that different kinds of spirits are rooted in particular political historical traditions. I now outline this study’s analysis of mortuary ritual in the prehistoric mortuary record. In addition, I discuss the interpretation of the spirits’ social identities from patterns in ritual activities.

The analyses assume that the performance of different kinds of mortuary rituals shape different social memories and identities for the spirits of the dead. They are designed to distinguish mortuary programs that promote active memorialization of select, powerful dead (i.e., ancestors) from programs that create remembrances of inactive ancestral spirits and collective spirits of the dead. In general, these analyses focus on identifying mortuary rituals that use differential treatments to highlight specific individuals, versus ritual practices that use uniform treatments to emphasize social groups.

Examining the Performance of Mortuary Ritual to Understand the Spirits of the Dead

This study’s analysis of mortuary ritual is based on a logical progression. As previously discussed, I contend that performances create social memories for the spirits that the deceased become (see Chapter 1). Different types of performances and mortuary rituals produce different kinds of memories. Together, individual rituals and their associated memories fashion social identities for spirits of the dead. Ultimately, it is the full performance of mortuary ritual and the full set of social memories that shape the social identities for the spirits in a local community.

Here, I conduct analyses of several performance elements, or mortuary ritual elements, to characterize the social memories that they create. I examine 1) the preparation and treatment of the remains of the deceased, 2) the construction of mortuary facilities (i.e., features, such as
pits, tombs, etc.), 3) the inclusion (or decommissioning) of material items in mortuary contexts, and 4) the spaces and places of these ritual elements. I analyze the first three elements separately. To address placement, I assess the spatial contexts and distributions of each of ritual element.

In addition, I consider a fifth ritual element that is particularly important – continued interaction with the spirits of the dead. These ritual actions can occur in the vicinity of the remains and/or mortuary facility; however, they frequently occur in places away from the grave (Morris 1991). For instance, it is rather common for people to remember and even to feed spirits of the dead at domestic shrines in the home. Here, I do not rely on evidence from the mortuary record alone. To evaluate potential interactions with the spirits, I evaluate critically the ethnohistoric and ethnographic records.

The challenge is to understand how these ritual elements – body treatment, mortuary facilities, etc. – create different kinds of social memories, memories that ultimately lead to distinct identities for the spirits of the dead. More specifically, the next task is to detail body treatments, mortuary facility (feature) constructions, material association (grave good) patterns, and spatial contexts that shape different kinds of memories for the dead. This task requires describing the material remains and expressions that lead to separate social memories for the spirits.

Before discussing material correlates, I briefly clarify these different social memories. It is memories about the agency and influence of the spirits that fashion their social identities. Thus, social memories that attribute agency to select dead fashion ancestors. Memories that establish limited agency for particular groups of dead help to create ancestral spirits. Social memories that remove the dead from the living and that diminish their agency shape groups of anonymous dead.

I describe material correlates for these different memories in the following sections. More specifically, I discuss how the selected ritual elements – body treatments, mortuary facilities, mortuary accompaniments and ritual objects, and mortuary spaces and places – help to construct particular social memories for the spirits of the dead. For each element (e.g. for body treatment), I describe material correlates for social memories that bestow agency to select dead, and
correlates for memories that restrain or reduce agency for collective groups of dead. In other words, I present correlates for those social memories that shape ancestors, ancestral spirits, and collectivities of anonymous dead.

**Body Treatment**

Mortuary rituals that create and install ancestors involve body treatments that promote interaction with remains of select dead. If we accept Hertz’s (1960 [1907]) notion that the fate of the body represents the fate of the soul, then these protracted rites help to transform the spirit of the dead, as it matures, into a potent ancestor (see also Carr 1995). Thus, these performances frequently include extended or elaborate body treatments, often in the form of multiple stages of processing. Examples of extended treatments include curating the body while it decomposes, drying the body, smoking or burning remains, defleshing, and disarticulation.

Additional body processing makes the remains and the spirit increasingly safe for people to interact with, enhances the spirits ability to arrive when invoked, and even distills the socio-political power of the being (e.g., Fortes 1965, Fortes 1976, Keightley 2004, Sellato 2002). Moreover, these successive treatments often enable the living to house the remains in special places among the living (see Hutchinson and Aragon 2002). The extra processing and housing provides the spirit and its increasing influence a home in the community, where it can be honored and consulted.

A number of archaeologists have noted that extended body treatments and/or relocation of the remains can result in intentional and unintentional bone loss (Bloch 1971, Bradley 1998, Kuijt 2001, McAnany 1995, Porter 2002). In some instances, the living curate select skeletal elements as powerful talismans. In others, they transfer to a final repository only some elements or fragments that stand for the whole being. Regardless of specific practices, people simply loose some portions of the body in acts of intensive body processing and relocation.

In the Thai kingdom during the 19th century, a yet-to-be-crowned king and his royal court performed multi-stage mortuary rituals to transform the deceased king into an ancestor (Metcalf and Huntington 1991: 136 - 141, Wales 1931). The performance of these ritual acts involved several stages of body treatment and continued reduction in the amount of curated
remains. After dressing the past monarch in extravagant clothing, attendants placed him in a golden urn. The golden urn sat in the palace for at least one hundred days while the flesh decayed and fluids drained from the body. While the body resided in the urn, the court oversaw the construction of an elaborate funeral pyre. The dead king’s bones were eventually removed from the urn, cleaned, dressed with oils, placed in a sandalwood box, deposited atop the funeral pyre, and then cremated in an incredible display. After the pyre burned through the night, the newly crowned king and his immediate family searched through the ashes to glean the past monarch’s fragmentary remains. Some of the burned fragments were presented to the dead king’s children in amulets. The remaining fragments were placed in a golden vase and curated in the royal palace to memorialize the ancestor and to facilitate royal interaction with this powerful being.

In ethnographically-documented mortuary programs that create generic ancestral spirits and/or anonymous groups of the dead, people perform mortuary rituals that involve relatively minimal or at least uniform treatment(s) of the body. These programs emphasize that most, if not all, the deceased become the same type of spirit, and thus that each spirit joins a collectivity of the dead. The vast majority of the remains receive the same degree and type of processing. Any variability in the type of body treatment is generally related to the deceased’s age, sex, or perhaps manner of death.

Programs that create generic ancestral spirits may include simple extended treatments that are applied uniformly to nearly all the dead. The additional processing serves to mature the spirit and enable basic interactions with it for a limited period of time. Japanese families perform ritual act of cremation, collect the cremains, and then inter them in a family tomb to continue simple relationships for a defined period of time.

Programs that create anonymous groups of dead typically involve very basic treatments for nearly all the dead. Medieval Christian mortuary programs of Western European towns exemplify this uniform destiny of the spirit through a uniform treatment of remains (Ariés 1975). The living buried the vast majority of the deceased in large, co-mingled deposits in trenches located in the churchyard. At some juncture, the trench was re-opened and the remains exhumed.
to create space for the newly deceased. The disinterred bones were placed in collective piles, often separated by skeletal element, within ossuaries, which were often decorated with human remains.

*Mortuary Facility*

Mortuary rituals that create and install *ancestors* often include the construction of facilities that remind people that the spirits are still present and active in the community. Thus, they are associated with prominent, elaborate, and/or rare facilities to house remains of select dead. People build these structures to maintain a visual memorial of the spirit of the dead on the landscape and/or to facilitate continued interaction with *ancestors*.

In the Mayan world, ruling lineages built large pyramidal temples at the focal point of civic ceremonial complexes as monuments to powerful spirits of the dead, and they constructed elaborate tombs within them to house the remains of elite *ancestors* (Ashmore 1991, Coe 1956, 1988). Non-elite lineages buried the remains of their immediate *ancestors* in residential contexts, often beneath two- to three-meter tall shrines, and occasionally transformed these spaces into domestic mausoleums (McAnany 1995, Welsh 1988).

In Prehispanic Andean communities of Peru, members of an *ayllu* placed the mummified, preserved remains of influential dead in masonry shrines or sacred caves in special places on the landscape (Salomon 1991, 1995). People made pilgrimages to these shrines and other places that housed the remains of *ancestors* to feed them and maintained active relationships with them. The royal families of China’s Shang dynasty built lavish tombs for deceased kings who were to become *ancestors*, and erected large mounds over these tombs as visible monuments to the spirit (Keightley 1990, Liu 2004).

Because mortuary rituals that install active, powerful dead can involve multiple stages, they may also require the use of multiple facilities to house the remains during these stages (see Hutchinson and Aragon 2002). The initial facility is a temporary one for the corpse of an important person, as people relocate the remains when the new incorporeal being passes through several ritual stages on its way to becoming an *ancestor*. Thus, the first facility is likely to be less
ostentatious than the final resting place. In fact, it may be quite modest or even crude if its purpose is simply to retain the remains for processing or to promote defleshing.

After the remains of a potentially powerful spirit have resided in an initial facility for a period of time, people transfer them for additional treatment to a place designated for these ritual actions. The living might move all or some of the body to a mortuary structure where the corpse is defleshed, to a building where the bones are cleaned and/or preserved, to cremation grounds, or to other kinds of facilities where additional processing can transmute an ordinary spirit of the dead into an ancestor.

Once the remains are processed, the living then relocate at least some of the remains of influential dead to a final facility that memorializes the spirit, sometimes through display of remains, and promotes interaction with that spirit. It is important to recognize that only the remains of select dead are removed from an initial facility or a processing facility and then interred in a prominent memorial. For example, Freedman (1966) observed that families in the “New States” of China generally exhumed most of the dead from a shallow primary burial, but left the lesser dead (who perhaps became ancestral spirits) in pots (secondary facilities) in the defleshing grounds. Powerful and wealthy families relocated the bones of full ancestors to tertiary burial crypts where they could be memorialized and honored.

In contrast, mortuary programs that fashion ancestral spirits and merge spirits with anonymous collectivities entail the construction of conventional, often simple burial facilities. They may also involve placing these facilities in spaces that are removed from lived spaces, such as away from residential areas.

Among the Nuer bands that Evans-Pritchard (1948) studied, mortuary rituals transitioned the spirit to an anonymous ghost and helped it to depart so that the spirit could join a distant collective of ghosts and spirits. Immediately after death, a small group of senior kinspeople dug a basic grave for the deceased without ceremony. The group removed nearly all the clothing and ornaments from the corpse, shaved the body, deposited the corpse in a deep pit on a lining of oxhide, covered the body with another hide, and then heaped dirt into the pit. Several days later, kin stamped down the heaped dirt to remove any trace of the mortuary facility. Evans-Pritchard
(1948: 57) stated that “graves are not places of cult and are not long remembered” and that he “never heard a man speak of the grave of an ancestor or kinsman.” The physical presence and memory of the deceased was to be so thoroughly removed from the group that the person’s hut could be re-occupied after ritual cleansing and his/her personal possessions redistributed.

In the North Central province of Sri Lanka, formal Theravāda Buddhists mortuary rituals deanimated the body and moved the spirit to other planes of existence, with collectivities of the dead (Walters 2003). People placed the dead in the village sohompitiya, or “place of corpses.” This basic cemetery was simply a set of unmaintained clearings in the jungle where families heaped new graves upon old ones, and did not hesitate to disturb the remains of the long-dead. Moreover, family members were not even concerned enough about the body or the remains to prevent animals from digging and scavenging among the graves (Walters 2003).

Here, it is important to mention anthropological interpretations of collective burial practices. Mortuary rituals that involve the placement of multiple individuals (or at least the remains of multiple individuals) in one mortuary facility may memorialize select dead, place the remains and spirit of the dead among a collective group, or simultaneously symbolize both (e.g., Dunham et al. 2003, Hertz 1960 [1907], Hutchinson and Aragon 2002, Metcalf 1982, Metcalf and Huntington 1991, Porter 2002, Weiss-Krejci 2004). Thus, each interpretation of collective burial is contingent upon other ritual practices and the context of the mortuary facility.

Bradley’s (1998) discussion of Neolithic funerary monuments in Western Europe provides a clear example of the contextual nature of collective burial practices. His synthetic research suggested that Neolithic people housed multiple generations of dead in closed-chambers to place the spirit of the dead among a collective of familial dead. Archaeological evidence indicates that the chambers were rarely opened, and the remains were infrequently disturbed. In contrast, later in the Neolithic, people placed particular members of the dead in open passageway tombs to situate them among active, remembered spirits of familial dead. Data from these mortuary contexts indicate that Neolithic people frequently entered these tombs and interacted with the remains. They may have even removed portions of bodies, such as certain long bones, to keep
as talismans and trophies to invoke the spirit of the dead. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that people were interested in interacting with active spirits of the dead.

In another example, Dunham et al. (2003) argued that the collective burial of processed remains in prehistoric burial mounds in Virginia represented both the memorialization of select dead and their unification with collective spirits of the dead. These authors suggested that protracted rites leading to the communal burial of the remains distinguished spirits of elect dead and promoted some interaction with the remains, while their burial in a collective mound merged their spirits with a collective social group. Each of these examples illustrates that researchers should consider collective mortuary facilities carefully and in the context of other mortuary ritual practices.

Inclusion of or Decommissioning Material Objects

Mortuary programs that fashion social memories of ancestors can involve placing rare and/or supernaturally charged items in close association with the remains or the mortuary facility. If deposited in the grave, items can represent individual possessions or other items associated with the remains, votive offerings to enhance the spiritual power of the grave, and/or attempts to decommission powerful items with the corpse. If placed in the fill above a grave or in other contexts indirectly associated with the feature, then the material culture likely represents post-funerary offerings to the spirit of the dead and/or attempts to enhance the memorial (the remains, the grave, and the full mortuary facility).

Porter (2002) observed that it is important to consider the context of both the grave itself and the associated mortuary accompaniments prior to interpretation. Multi-stage burial treatments can have a profound impact on the inclusion of material items in a mortuary context. People are less likely to incorporate expensive and/or rare items in temporary contexts than they are in final interment facilities.

From the Neolithic period to the late Shang dynasty of the Bronze Age, powerful and influential lineages in China installed and honored their ancestors with incredibly lavish offerings (Keightley 1990, Liu 2004). A Neolithic burial, dated to ca. BC 2500, at the Liangchu site of Ssu-tun in Kiangsu illustrates the incredible appointment of select dead at a time when ruling lineages
maintained active relationships with influential ancestors to consolidate social power. Ritual participants placed the body atop ten burned jade disks. Moreover, they surrounded the deceased with an array of jade and stone tools and ornaments, which included a perimeter of 27 jade tubes. Five out of a total of 24 jade disks in the burial were broken in half and placed in different areas of the grave.

In the late Shang (ca. BC 1200 – 1045), the memorialization of ancestors with lavish and rare accompaniments, including large numbers of sacrificed retainers treated almost like possessions, amplified. The tombs at the royal cemetery of Hsi-pei-kang were cruciform, ramped vaults that contained some of the finest items that Shang craftsmen could create. Moreover, Keightley (1990: 30) estimated that some of the four ramp tombs have held the remains of up to 300 elite accompaniers, guards, and sacrificial victims, all to serve and honor the ancestral being.

McAnany (1995: 55 - 59) described the creation of a Mayan Formative period ancestor that involved the inclusion of rare and/or expensive material accompaniments. At K‘axob, several secondary burial deposits were interred in a deep, oblong trench at the edge of a low pyramidal structure. The remains were associated with a marine shell amulet, shell tinklers, carved bone implements, jade beads, and several interesting ceramic vessels of diverse forms. One vessel had a flamboyantly flared rim and a cross painted in its base. A circular pit adjacent to the trench contained additional remains and several vessels, including one with the same painted cross motif. These deposits were covered by a low platform that likely served as an ancestor shrine. At some time, two dedicatory offerings were interred in the platform to memorialize the shrine and its resident ancestors.

Programs that create memories of ancestral spirits and anonymous groups of the dead rarely if ever distinguish any member of the dead with rare or lavish items, and they certainly do not enhance the power of these dead with supernaturally charged artifacts. Rather, these programs tend to emphasize uniform distributions of material items that are decommissioned in mortuary contexts. Any differential inclusion of material possessions with the remains of the dead is the result of cultural ideals about a person’s age, sex, or basic social identity at the time of death.
The Nuer are a rather extreme example. As discussed in a previous section, Nuer peoples quickly and efficiently transmuted their dead into anonymous ghosts and urged them to leave this world. They placed almost no material items in graves or in association with mortuary features. Occasionally, a family member placed a senior woman’s pipe or favorite pot in the upper fill of the grave. The vast majority of the deceased's material possessions, even their home, were cleansed and then redistributed among the living members of the band (Evans-Pritchard 1948).

**Spaces and Places for the Deceased and the Spirits of the Dead**

Mortuary programs that fashion social memories of *ancestors* often involve the designation of spaces within a community for the spirits of the dead. More specifically, they tend to dedicate places for both the residence of the spirits and for interacting with them. In general, people delegate these spaces by placing the remains of the dead and/or mortuary facilities in conspicuous, prominent locations within the built or natural environment. They may house some or all of the remains in domestic contexts or in specially constructed facilities that occupy central places in the lived environment. Alternatively, they may shelter the remains in spaces devoted to the spirits of the dead, but maintain places and/or structures in domestic contexts and in the community at large for continuing relationships with active spiritual beings.

McAnany (1995) demonstrated how different mortuary practices can designate special spaces on the landscape for *ancestors* in unique ways. She illustrated, with a comparison, that the management of place to memorialize select dead is culturally specific and contingent on local histories (see Parker Pearson 1993). In the Classic period Mayan lowlands, lineages performed ritual actions in domestic and in public spaces to create *ancestors* and to continue memorialization of these beings. Both non-elite and elite families curated the remains of influential dead in association with residential contexts, and, in some instances, created domestic mausoleums in honor of the spirit. In Classic period residential compounds, people buried the remains of some deceased under the floors of dwellings and in patio spaces, or within small pyramidal platforms, called *oratorios*, which likely served as shrines. Royal Mayan lineages interred their powerful *ancestors* in massive funerary pyramids at the heart of Classic period...
cities. Commemoration of these beings undoubtedly involved large public gatherings in communal plazas that flanked the pyramids.

McAnany (1995) contrasted the Classic Mayan use of space to install and venerate ancestors with Freedman's (1966, 1967) description of the Chinese use of space to interact with potent spirits. Families in the "New Territories" of China stored and memorialized the bones of influential spirits in tombs physically separate from residential contexts. They instated an ancestor by removing his or her remains from the defleshing grounds, placing the bones in a tomb (a tertiary context), and then performing regular public rituals at this tomb (see Freedman 1966). People, however, still engaged in ritual actions in residences and at special commemorative ancestor halls built in prominent locations in communities. Women maintained small shrines and ancestor tablets in the family home, while men participated in remembrance rituals in the presence of ancestor tablets kept in ancestor halls.

In both the Mayan and Chinese cases, however, people engaged in ritual actions at residential shrines. Thus, regardless of cultural understandings and uses of space, people tend to reserve some places in lived spaces for active spirits to highlight their close proximity. They invite these beings into their communities and homes.

In contrast, mortuary programs that shape social memories of ancestral spirits and anonymous groups of the dead involve ritual practices that remove remains and mortuary contexts from lived spaces. In general, they include mortuary rituals that emphasize the departure of the spirit from the community and that accentuate the distance between the living and the dead. These ritual events send the spirits of familial dead to join a collective group of spirits in some physically and/or cosmologically distant place, from which spirits rarely return. Thus, people may engage in burial practices that show little concern for the location of remains and mortuary features, or practices that intentionally disassociate remains and mortuary contexts from lived spaces.

In Japan, traditional ritual actions involve visiting spaces and places in local neighborhoods and on the larger landscape, removed from lived spaces, to remember and commemorate generic ancestral spirits. Families attend to communal tombs in local cemeteries,
and people may occasionally visit the many temples that dot the Japanese landscape to provide places for ancestral spirits and other supernatural beings.

In the Nuer example, Evans-Pritchard (1948) noted that people were rarely troubled with the placement of the corpse. If a person died at home, a small group of senior family buried the individual quickly and unceremoniously outside of the house and even obliterated all traces of the grave in an attempt to forget any physical presence of that individual. If a person died away from home, out in the bush, anyone who found the body and buried it on the spot was entitled to compensation for the trouble. In the North Central part of Sri Lanka, Theravāda Buddhists placed the deceased in unmaintained cemeteries in the jungle away from all lived spaces (Walters 2003). Finally, in Medieval towns of Western Europe, people deposited the dead in close association with monasteries, churches, and the burial locations of saints and martyrs in hopes of delivering the spirits of their family members to a heavenly kingdom safely (Ariès 1975). They even put the remains in mass graves in which bones co-mingled in recognition that the spirits aspired to join a collective host in heaven.

**The Analysis**

In the remainder of the chapter, I outline an analytic procedure that characterizes the performance of mortuary rituals from material remains in the archaeological record. The goal is to describe mortuary rituals in a way that permits interpretations about the social memories they create, particularly memories about the agency and influence of the spirits. These descriptions and their interpretations lead to a composite picture of the social identities surrounding the spirits of the dead.

This procedure assesses 1) body treatment, 2) construction of mortuary facilities, and 3) inclusion of accompaniments in separate analyses. During the analysis of each of these ritual elements, it also evaluates 4) the spaces and places of ritual actions. The purpose of each analysis is to characterize the social memories that a given ritual element crafted for the spirits of the dead. For instance, the purpose of examining body treatment is to describe the kinds of social memories that the identified body treatment(s) shaped for the spirits. Through each analysis, I
build a full description of the performance of mortuary ritual and the social memories surrounding
the spirits of the dead.

Overall, each analysis distinguishes mortuary ritual programs that differentially
memorialize select members of the dead from programs that uniformly memorialize nearly all
(i.e., large groups) of the dead. The previous discussion of each ritual element demonstrates that
distinctive, often extra-ordinary ritual actions directed at a small group of the dead shape active
memories for these spirits. These actions frequently appear elaborate or symbolically-expensive
in comparison to more common (i.e., regular, or "baseline") treatments or actions. In contrast,
uniform, often generic actions directed at large groups of the dead fashion static and anonymous
memories for the spirits. These actions appear simple in comparison to protracted treatments or
actions in other programs.

Thus, the analysis of each ritual element is designed to distinguish among several
patterns in the mortuary record. I use the mortuary ritual traits discussed above to define these
different material patterns. To return to the example of body treatment, I refer to the material
correlates described in the previous sections to distinguish material patterns that selectively
memorialize particular members of the dead from those that uniformly memorialize all the dead.
An analysis of body treatment might suggest that different treatments were reserved for different
members of the dead; moreover, rare treatments might involve extended processing. These
treatment patterns are consistent with ritual programs that selectively memorialize elect dead.

Another brief example can illustrate how the complete analysis of one ritual element
works. To examine mortuary facilities, I conduct a statistical analysis that identifies patterns in the
construction of burial facilities and contexts within the mortuary record. I have designed the
analysis to distinguish material patterns that selectively memorialize a small group or groups of
the dead from those patterns that uniformly memorialize nearly all the dead. Again, I refer to the
material correlates described above. I expect that elaborate and/or unusual facilities that were
reserved for certain members of the dead help to memorialize them selectively. In addition, rare
facilities that are associated with prominent, elaborate, or especially meaningful architectural
features or spaces in the built environment (e.g., mounds, central plazas, kivas, etc.) also craft
these selective memories. In contrast, I expect that standard and/or simple facilities that were used to inter nearly all the dead contribute to uniform memorialization.

I now discuss the multivariate statistics that I use in the analysis of most ritual elements. First, I describe the statistical procedures multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) and multidimensional scaling (MDS). I concentrate the description on how these geometric statistics permit me to recognize material patterns that create different groups of the dead from patterns that create uniform groups of the dead. Then, I provide an example of MCA, a multivariate procedure that has not been used frequently in archaeological studies.

**Analysis Procedures and Statistical Tools**

In the analyses that follow I use a class of multivariate statistics that are sometimes referred to as homogeneity analyses. These statistical tools evaluate each ritual element’s – body treatment, mortuary facility construction, etc. – relative uniformity. They determine whether a ritual program was applied differentially to small groups of the dead, or it was applied uniformly to nearly all the dead. Moreover, they allow me to describe how a given ritual program (i.e., a body treatment program) or procedure treated the group(s).

The multivariate statistical techniques are also geometric. In other words, they create graphic displays of the data’s relative uniformity. These graphs, or geometric spaces, construct groups of cases (e.g., burials or individuals) that share similar characteristics (e.g., mortuary ritual treatment characteristics). They also separate cases that have different characteristics. The overall shape of the graph, or the distribution of cases across the graph, is interpretable. Moreover, placement of groups and individual cases in the space, as well as the shared characteristics of groups and cases are also interpretable.

I use multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) to examine body treatment and mortuary facility data, when samples permit (I conduct the MCA in IBM SPSS Statistics 20, and produce graphical displays in JMP Pro 10.). MCA attempts to define homogeneous groups in data sets. It has been designed specifically to work with nominal, or categorical, data (LeRoux and Rouanet 2010). The object of the procedure is to display graphically the rows and columns of a data table (where rows are individual cases and columns are categorical variables) in a low-dimensional
space such that cases within the same category are close together and cases within different categories are far apart (Gifi 1990, LeRoux and Rouanet 2010). Hoffman and de Leeu (1992) noted that MCA is similar to multidimensional scaling (MDS) in its approach, but is preferable for the geometric analysis of similarities and differences among categories.

I conduct MCA on body treatment categorical data and on mortuary facility categorical data. The procedure places individuals who share body treatment characteristics close together; conversely, it separates individuals who received different treatment characteristics. Thus, it attempts to create treatment procedure groups (i.e., treatment types) in a low-dimensional space. The MCA graph then permits interpretation of these groups. It allows me to explore the demographic profiles (i.e., age and sex) of any identified groups, and to explore the distribution of other meaningful traits across the space.

I focus on multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) to analyze mortuary accompaniment (i.e., artifact) data (Again, I conduct MDS in IBM SPSS Statistics 20 and produce the graphical displays in JMP Pro 10.). Similar to MCA, MDS is a data reduction technique that attempts to arrange objects (cases or variables) in a space in such a way that it reproduces observed distances between these objects as accurately as possible (Kruskal 1964, Kruskal and Wish 1978). The procedure constructs a graphical display of these distances in a low-dimensional space.

In this study, I conduct MDS on the presence/absence of particular artifact types in the mortuary record. The procedure performs a statistical algorithm on a similarity or a dissimilarity matrix, which expresses “distance” between each artifact and every other artifact in the analysis. The MDS produces a graph that shows variance among the co-occurrences of material accompaniments. The distribution of artifacts across the graph permits interpretation about the distribution of objects in the mortuary record. Moreover, it can identify rare artifacts that warrant additional examination.

Both MCA and MDS produce graphical data spaces that aid additional exploration. I use the graphs to examine the spaces and places of these ritual elements. I evaluate the potential
association of identified groups with particular places in the built environment. Furthermore, I consider the impact that placement had in defining or highlighting particular groups.

*Multiple Correspondence Analysis: An Example*

Multivariate statistical procedures are not used frequently in mortuary analysis. In particular, they are not commonly used to create data spaces that can be explored and then interpreted. MCA is especially under-represented in archaeological studies.

I provide an example of MCA to demonstrate how the procedure works. For this example, I consider a topic that is more straightforward and more accessible than mortuary ritual. I present an analysis of food. Let us assume that a friend and I very much enjoy eating phở, a Vietnamese soup, and that we are interested in differences among the soups at separate restaurants in our metropolitan area. We would like to know if there are definable differences in the phở served at phở restaurants in this locality. Moreover, we would like to know if there are different groups of soups and if they are related to quality. Can we determine, to some extent, what makes certain soups "tastier" than others?

In this example, another phở aficionado and I visited a series of phở restaurants in a defined area. We sampled one bowl of phở at each of 10 restaurants, and recorded categorical data for each bowl at each restaurant (Table 4.1). We recorded information for the following variables: broth flavor, broth consistency, noodles, meat quality, vegetables/herbs, and soup balance. For each variable, we determined a reasonable variable state that described the soup (see cells in Table 4.1). Each state is a basic characteristic. A state is not treated as "ranked" in respect to the others; it is simply different.
Table 4.1. Phở (Vietnamese soup) data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soup</th>
<th>Broth Flavor</th>
<th>Broth Consistency</th>
<th>Noodles Quality</th>
<th>Meat Quality</th>
<th>Vegetables/Herbs*</th>
<th>Soup Balance**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soup1</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Thick</td>
<td>well done</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup2</td>
<td>Bland</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>under done</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup3</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>well done</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup4</td>
<td>Salty</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>over done</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup5</td>
<td>Bland</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>well done</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup6</td>
<td>Oily</td>
<td>Thick</td>
<td>well done</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup7</td>
<td>Oily</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>over done</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup8</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>well done</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup9</td>
<td>Salty</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>over done</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup10</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>well done</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The “Vegetable/Herbs” category records the amount and freshness of vegetables and herbs served with the soup. Excellent = many fresh vegetables and herbs; fair = moderate amount of vegetables and herbs; poor = few fresh vegetables and herbs.

** The “Soup Balance” category records the equilibrium of broth, meats, noodles, and vegetables (i.e., solid foods) in the bowl of soup. Excellent = equal/appropriate amounts of all solids in a moderate amount of broth; fair = either slightly more meats/vegetables/noodles than broth; or more broth than solid foods, poor = noticeably unequal amounts of solid foods and broth.

I now perform an MCA of these data to create a graphical display of the relationships among the soups. In MCA, the case relationships are based on similarities of categorical variable states. Cases (i.e., soups) with similar categorical variable states are close to each other in a low-dimensional space, while cases with different variable states are far apart from each other in this space.

Here, I pass the data through the MCA algorithm in IBM SPSS Statistics 20. The algorithm assigns numerical values to cases (called objects) and variables, and then iterates those values through an optimization function and scheme (see SPSS 20 Help > Algorithms > Multiple Correspondence algorithms for mathematical documentation). The purpose of the algorithm is to produce object scores that, when rendered in a low-dimensional space, place objects in similar categories as close to each other as possible. They should also place objects in different categories as far apart from each other as possible. Thus, in evaluating these soup data, I expect that the MCA will render very similar object scores for Soup 8 and Soup 10, because they have the same categorical variable states (see Table 4.1). I also expect that it will produce very similar scores for Soups 4 and 9.
The MCA produces the object scores presented in Table 4.2. Note that the algorithm calculated identical object scores for Soups 8 and 10 and for Soups 4 and 9. These scores represent coordinates that can be plotted on a two-dimensional space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soup</th>
<th>Dimension 1</th>
<th>Dimension 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-2.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>-0.505</td>
<td>-0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>-0.824</td>
<td>0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>-2.334</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>-0.505</td>
<td>-0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I then plot these scores in a two-dimensional coordinate system to create a visualization of the relationships among the soups (Figure 4.1). This plot is the primary vehicle for interpretation. Foremost, it permits identification of any soup groupings, or clusters, of soups. Furthermore, it permits examination of the variation among the soups. In other words, it allows us to explore why some soups are similar to other soups, and why they are different than the remaining soups.
Figure 4.1. Soup MCA object scores plotted in two-dimensional coordinate space.
The plot of soup MCA object scores suggests that there are no distinct, well-defined groupings or clusters of soups (This result can be attributed, in part, to a small sample size for the technique). Nevertheless, it does indicate that Soups 3, 8, 10 and possibly Soup 1 are similar; for purposes of this example, I refer to them as members of a loose group. They are clearly separate from Soups 5, 4, 9 and 2. Again, for purposes of this exercise, I label them as members of another diffuse group. Soup 7 is substantially different from all other soups.

MCA encourages interpretation of object score variation along both of the dimensions that it returns. More specifically, it permits identification of the variables that are responsible for separating the objects in space along Dimensions 1 and 2. The discrimination measures graph displays the contributions of soup variables to differentiation along each of the dimensions (Figure 4.2). It demonstrates that the variables “Broth Flavor” and “Soup Balance” produce variation of scores on both Dimensions 1 and 2 (with substantial variation on 2), and that the variables “vegetables”/(herbs) and “broth consistency” create variation of scores on Dimension 1. Thus, differences in the states of these variables are responsible for much of the similarities and differences among the soups.

Finally, I plot the position of variable states for both “Broth Flavor” and “Vegetables/Herbs” in the same coordinate space as the soup scores (Figure 4.3). The positions of these variable states relative to the objects scores display where these soup characteristics lie in the same space. They demonstrate that soups with full broth flavors and with many fresh (excellent) vegetables and herbs occur in the upper right portion of the graph. Soups with bland and salty broths and with fair amounts of vegetables and herbs occur in the lower center portion of the coordinate space. Finally, soups with oily broths and few fresh vegetables and herbs are in the right portion of the graph. I could also plot additional variables and variable states, such as broth consistency, to understand how those characteristics are distributed across the graph.
Figure 4.2. Variable contributions to distribution of object (i.e., case) scores.
Figure 4.3. Soup MCA object scores and variable centroid coordinates.
I can now interpret the results. I suggest that there are definable differences in phở quality among different phở restaurants in this local area, but there is insubstantial evidence for well-defined groups. However, there is one loosely defined group of soups – Soups 3, 8, 10 and possibly Soup 1 – that have full-flavored broths and many fresh vegetables and herbs. I also note that these soups tend to have light broths, high-quality meats, and well-cooked noodles (see Table 4.1). I argue this a group of high-quality phở. Furthermore, I contend that there are other soups, with different broth flavors and less vegetables and herbs, which are of variable quality. Additional data are necessary to understand their characteristics more fully. Based on these data, I suggest that there are soups with salty, light broths that are paired with moderate amounts of vegetables and herbs, and soups with oily, thick broths that are paired with few vegetables and herbs (see Table 4.1).

On Identifying the Social Identities for Spirits of the Dead

The purpose of this analytic procedure is to identify the spirits of the dead in the prehistoric mortuary record. I use the results from the analysis of each ritual element – body treatment, mortuary facilities, burial accompaniments, and mortuary space – to describe the full performance of mortuary ritual. Essentially, I compile the memories that each ritual element creates into a composite picture of the social memories that the full performance of mortuary shapes for the spirits of the dead. I use this composite set of social memories to interpret the identities for the spirits.

I appeal to Brown's (1995) concept of a symbolic budget to interpret the performance of mortuary ritual and resulting social memories. Brown proposed that each cultural tradition has a certain amount of available symbolism to incorporate in mortuary rituals. In other words, a mortuary program has a set quantity of symbolic capital (i.e., traditional stories, metaphors, ideas about life and death, and materializations of these ideas) that can be employed during the performance of specific rituals. People tend to reserve large amounts of this capital for special ritual events that create special, symbolically-charged mortuary deposits. They use large expenditures of symbolism to memorialize select individuals and/or to create unique spiritual beings (i.e., ancestors) from these individuals and associated paraphernalia. They use less
symbolic capital to memorialize common persons and/or to create common spiritual beings from persons and associated materials.

Sellato (2002) and other researchers have demonstrated that performances that create ancestors use large amounts of symbolic capital (see Chapter 3). These performances employ large amounts of available symbolism and ritual actions to instill an ancestor with agency and influence and to establish a safe relationship with the spirit. They are symbolically “expensive” in the following ways: they 1) are protracted, 2) use distinctive rites (i.e., symbolism) in addition to ordinary mortuary procedures, 3) highlight elect dead, and 4) maintain regular interactions with the spirits. Sellato (2002) explicitly argued that mortuary rituals beyond the regular funeral and any regular treatments of the dead are necessary to create ancestors (see also Fortes 1965, Morris 1991). He stated that a “distinctive type of ritualized passage must be held in order to turn …some spirits of the dead into ancestors” (Sellato 2002: 14). Finally, these special rites and symbols are used to highlight and transform only select dead.

Performances that create ancestral spirits use less amounts of symbolic capital than those that create ancestors. These performances use available symbolism and ritual actions to shape ancestral spirits that have moderate to little agency among the living, and that have only periodic interactions with people. They employ symbolic capital in the following ways: 1) to extend some ritual actions (e.g., body processing or handling of the remains), 2) to highlight former group membership of the spirit, and/or 3) to maintain basic, periodic interactions with the spirits.

Finally, performances that shape anonymous groups of the dead use little amounts of symbolic capital. They employ symbolism and ritual actions to distance the spirits of the dead from the living. They typically do not involve protracted or special rites, and do not highlight select dead. Rather, they employ uniform procedures to inter the deceased and emphasize the anonymity of groups of the dead.

The Analysis of Mortuary Ritual at Irene and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa

In the remainder of the study, I examine the performance of mortuary ritual in the Mississippian period community of Irene (Chapter 5) and the Ancestral Puebloan villages of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa (Chapter 6). I assess how mortuary ritual created social memories and
identities for the spirits of the dead in each of these communities. Moreover, I address how the spirits participated in local social and political affairs.

The Mortuary Data and Data Collection Methods

To conduct the comparative analysis, I constructed a mortuary database designed to capture information about the performance of mortuary ritual in different social environments. The database aggregates mortuary data from the Prehispanic American Southeast and Southwest. It currently includes mortuary data from the Mississippian site Irene Mounds, the Ancestral Puebloan sites Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, and the Hohokam sites Pueblo Grande, Casa Buena, Grand Canal Ruins, and Pueblo Viejo.

The database consists of multiple, related data sets (i.e., tables or sheets) that describe different aspects of mortuary ritual. Each of the data sets corresponds to one of the ritual elements discussed in the overview of the study’s analyses. The individual data tables store information on 1) individual demographics (age, sex) and burial type (inhumation and cremation), 2) inhumation body treatment or 3) cremation body treatment, and 4) mortuary facilities (i.e., features). The primary unit in the database is an individual set of human remains, while the secondary unit is an individual mortuary feature.

Each table in the database records a series of attributes (variables), with each attribute having multiple potential states (variable states). Most of the variables are multiple nominal (categorical). For example, the inhumation body treatment table includes 28 treatment variables. Many of the variables are categorical, and record one of several possible attribute states.

At present, I have not ingested information on 5) mortuary accompaniments into the database. I maintain the mortuary accompaniment information as separate data sets. Additional work is necessary to integrate these data into the relational database.

The database and associated metadata are available in the Digital Archaeological Record (tDAR) at the following persistent URL: https://core.tdar.org/dataset/380985. The mortuary accompaniment data are available at these other URLs: https://core.tdar.org/dataset/392822 and https://core.tdar.org/dataset/392820. Please refer to the digital database and to the associated metadata in tDAR for details about the mortuary data, such
as variable and variable attribute lists. I have used tDAR’s metadata tools to document the individual variables and their associated variable states. The database’s metadata include detailed information about data collection and coding schemes.

I now briefly discuss the sources of data for the Irene and Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary records. The purpose of the discussion is to provide transparency about data comparability. I present additional detail on these sources in the individual chapters that explore the Irene mortuary data (see Chapter 5) and the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa data (see Chapter 6).

To collect the Irene Mounds mortuary data, I referenced unpublished and published material on the Works Progress Administration’s (WPA) complete excavation of the site. The unpublished records are archived at the Smithsonian Institution’s National Anthropological Archives (NAA), while the published information is presented in Caldwell and McCann’s (1941) final report. The unpublished sources include the following records: a preliminary final report, five periodic reports (e.g., quarterly excavation reports and letter reports), two sets of primary data lists, a set of excavation notes and maps that document the mortuary structure uncovered at the site, and maps and photographs included in the reports and notes. The primary data lists record information about individual burials and individual sets of remains. I collected much of the data by referencing these lists, and then supplementing those data with descriptions from reports and with information from unpublished and published maps and photographs.

To gather the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary data, I used the well-developed digital data sets that previous researchers – Brenda Shears, Keith Kintigh, and Todd Howell – have constructed for the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition’s excavations at Hawikku and for Cambridge University’s excavations at Kechiba:wa (see Chapter 6 for details about these data). Brenda Shears (1989) led efforts at the Museum of the American Indian to synthesize and digitize the Hawikku mortuary data from original excavation notes. Todd Howell (1994a) then worked with and published much of the information in his dissertation research. At a later time, Keith Kintigh and Brenda Shears synthesized and digitized the Kechiba:wa mortuary data from excavation records curated at the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. They integrated the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa data sets (see Kintigh 2000). Presently, Keith Kintigh and
Brenda Shears maintain the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary data at Arizona State University, and they continue to enhance and clarify the information.

I ingested the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary data sets into the relational database that I built for this study. When necessary, I re-coded variables and variable states.5 Throughout this process, I carefully considered how to integrate and code these data to ensure that they are comparable to the Irene mortuary data.

To supplement the data, I referenced the final excavation report that Smith et al. (1966) completed for the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition work at Hawikku. I also referred to digitized excavation notes from the University of Cambridge’s excavations at Kechiba:wa. These records include a field notebook, a set of notes that details many of the individual burials, and a field diary. I used the burial notes to create a series of detailed data for individual body treatment and mortuary facilities for approximately 166 individuals at Kechiba:wa.

Although I have carefully collected and integrated the mortuary data from Irene and Hawikku and Kechiba:wa to make them comparable, there are important differences in the taphonomy of the two mortuary records that impact the data sets. In the American Southeast, high moisture levels and acidic soils can lead to poor preservation of the archaeological record. These conditions can damage delicate human remains (particularly soft tissues, hair, etc.). They typically destroy perishable items like textiles, fabrics, and wood objects. In general, skeletal preservation at Irene was fair, even among the remains of children and infants. However, very few perishable items were recovered from Irene’s archaeological record.

Preservation issues at Irene also include Historic period disturbance. A Moravian mission school house was built atop the principal mound at Irene in 1736 (Caldwell and McCann 1941). The WPA excavation of Irene documented the footprint of the school’s cellar. In addition, several Historic period burials were interred on the site. Despite this Historic era activity at Irene, excavations encountered few instances of intensive Historic period disturbance to the prehistoric mortuary record.

In the American Southwest, dry and stable conditions typically result in excellent preservation. These conditions can lead to the survival of delicate human remains, even some
soft tissues and hair in particular instances. Moreover, they can protect perishable items like
textiles and wood objects. At Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, skeletal remains were well-preserved.
Artifact assemblages included a wide variety of perishables from textiles and fabrics, to wood
objects, to botanicals and foodstuffs.

Hawikku and Kechiba:wa were continuously occupied into the Historic period. People
lived at Hawikku until the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. As a result, local populations continued to bury
the deceased in cemeteries and abandoned rooms of the pueblo for many generations. Later, in
the Historic period, some inhumation burial focused around the mission church constructed at the
edge of the village. Following the Historic period, there has been little cultural disturbance to the
Hawikku and Kechiba:wa cemeteries. Today, the sites are protected on Zuni tribal lands.

The Analysis of Mortuary Ritual at Irene and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa

The examination of mortuary ritual at Irene (Chapter 5) and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa
(Chapter 6) follows the analytic procedure described in the previous sections. Each chapter
divides mortuary ritual into the following elements: 1) treatment of the body, 2) construction of
mortuary facilities, 3) inclusion of mortuary accompaniments, and 4) the spaces and places of
mortuary ritual. Each presents the analysis of these elements, and then interprets the social
memories that they create for the spirits of the dead. At the close of each chapter, I synthesize
these memories into a social identity for the spirits of the dead. I then explore what roles those
spirits played in local communities.

In the conclusion (Chapter 7), I attempt to characterize the different ways in which these
spirits participated in Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan affairs. To understand the spirits’
roles, I directly compare and contrast the performance of mortuary ritual at Irene with mortuary
ritual at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I explore the different social identities for Mississippian and
Ancestral Puebloan spirits of the dead, and the distinct places that they occupied on
Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan cultural landscapes. Finally, I situate these spirits in
regional political histories.
Chapter 4 Notes

1 The symbolically expensive mortuary practices associated with ancestor traditions should be visible in the archaeological record. Foremost, generations of people perform these drawn-out rites on the types of time scales with which archaeologists work (Bradley 1998: 91, McAnany 1995: 8, Porter 2002). Secondly, they use elaborate, rare, and sometimes extraordinary actions and physical symbols that should be detectable in the material record (in the mortuary record and in other contexts). People often use extended body treatments to deliver the spirit of a select person to other ancestors safely, and to help the spirit mature into a powerful being. As remains are processed and/or moved, the living may build or keep special and/or elaborate facilities to house the bones. They also maintain places, which may or may not serve as the final resting place for the remains, to honor ancestors and to interact with the spiritual beings when summoned. People may also place symbolically rare and/or powerful items with the deceased’s remains to enhance the being’s position among the dead and increase its influence among the living. In some instances, the living use dress (clothing, ornaments, paints, etc.) and items placed in the grave to reference culture heroes or other spiritual beings who have supernatural powers. They may continue to offer material items and/or food and water to the spirit of the dead to honor and nourish it. In addition, people may fashion special crafts (e.g., figurines or other icons) to enhance remembrance of the ancestor and to facilitate continued interaction with the being.

2 In the database, most variables are associated with a lookup table that contains all potential variable states. Thus, variable coding schemes are embedded in the data structure.

3 I referenced Howell’s (1994a) description of the Hawikku digital data to integrate the information into the relational database. His descriptions of individual variables and data collection schemes were particularly useful when re-coding was necessary.
CHAPTER 5

Mississippian Landscapes of Memorialized Dead on the Georgia Coast: Irene Mounds Site

Located on the Georgia coast, the Irene Mounds site was a Mississippian period site (AD 1150 – 1450) that likely served as a civic and/or ritual center for surrounding populations on the Georgia and Carolina coastline (Figure 5.1). Irene was the principle town of a loosely integrated polity – a socio-political community – along the lower Savannah River near present-day Savannah (Pluckhahn and McKivergan 2002). It was likely a local center for a number of nearby secondary towns that included low burial mounds and scattered residential villages and hamlets.

I argue that the performance of mortuary ritual at the Irene Mounds site fashioned ancestors who were instrumental in socio-political affairs. I contend that these spirits were active and influential in local political factions that oversaw the polity. More specifically, I suggest that a select lineage or lineages shaped powerful spirits of the dead and then fostered continuing relationships with the beings. They maintained a place for the spirits in political and ritual organizations and likely interacted with them in these contexts. It is in these venues that potent spirits impacted socio-political decisions and bestowed social power.

In the first part of the chapter, I provide a regional background to situate the Irene Mound's site and its mortuary record. This background directly informs the analysis and interpretation of mortuary ritual at Irene. I describe the Mississippian period settlement history along the Savannah River and Irene’s place within it. This discussion indicates that Mississippian mound centers in the Savannah River basin, including Irene, were focal points for individual polity mortuary rituals. Thus, it is reasonable to treat the performance of mortuary ritual at Irene Mounds as that of a single socio-political group.
I also describe the occupational context and history of burial at the Irene Mounds site. This context demonstrates that mortuary ritual at Irene was intimately associated with particular architectural features during two different time periods. It indicates that the performance of mortuary ritual is separated into two phases that are associated with different moments in the site’s history. Moreover, it provides a way to distinguish burials chronologically and associate them with mortuary venues and important ceremonial spaces.

In the second portion of the chapter, I conduct an analysis of the performance of mortuary ritual at the Irene Mounds site. The analysis evaluates archaeological data from the prehistoric
mortuary record in a series of multivariate statistical procedures. I examine separate elements of
mortuary ritual – body treatment, mortuary facilities, burial accompaniments, and mortuary
spaces – to interpret the social memories surrounding the spirits of the dead. Through a
discussion of the entire performance, I then create a composite of these memories to
characterize the identities of the spirits at Irene and in its local polity.

Finally, to close the chapter, I place the performance of mortuary ritual and Irene’s spirits
of the dead in regional context. This discussion situates analysis results among additional
archaeological information and relevant ethnohistoric records to flesh out details about continued
interactions with the dead. I attempt to illustrate that the full performance of mortuary ritual
involved multiple venues (perhaps in more than one village) that were tied to socio-political
histories and decision making. It is this discussion that describes how Irene’s spirits participated
in polity affairs – as influential members and actors in political factions.

Middle and Late Mississippian Settlement on the Georgia\South Carolina Coastline

From approximately AD 1100 to 1450, towns with large mounds and nearby residential
villages dotted the Savannah River basin and neighboring river courses in Georgia and South
Carolina. Current consensus suggests that these mound centers and associated villages and
hamlets were arranged into polities, which were individual socio-political communities. A polity
consisted of a focal town with a platform mound or set of mounds and associated secondary
towns, often identified by the presence of a small burial mound (see Pluckhahn and McKivergan
2002). Polities also included other residential villages and dispersed hamlets. Mound centers and
their polities were separated from each other by sparsely settled, open-resource zones that are
often called buffer zones (e.g., Anderson 1994, Hally and Langford 1988, Hally et al. 1990).

Mississippian polities along the Savannah River were focused on monuments and visible
architectural features that were venues for mortuary ritual. Platform mounds that were the
hallmark of influential towns often supported structures that housed and displayed human
Rounded and/or conical burial mounds that were primary features of other villages served as
burial locations for generations of the dead. In addition, some towns maintained specialized structures or other features for processing the remains of the dead (see Anderson 1994).

In the discussion that follows, I present an overview of Mississippian period settlement and population history in the Savannah River basin to situate the Irene Mounds site. The purpose is to link the performance of mortuary ritual at a particular settlement scale to individual social groups. This overview demonstrates that large towns with platform mounds, typically called mound centers, were the nucleus of mortuary ritual for individual polities. They were the focus of ritual activities for communities that can be viewed as single (although loosely-integrated) social groups. Thus, the Irene Mounds site likely hosted mortuary rituals for a single socio-political group.

History of Mississippian period Polities along the Savannah River

Anderson (1994) documented the history of the 14 known mound centers and associated polities in the Savannah River basin (see also Anderson 1989, Anderson et al. 1986, Hally and Rudolph 1986). He argued that the emergence and eventual abandonment of the socio-political communities was a cyclical historical process. He suggested that it was tied to the fortunes of elite lineages who oversaw the communities and the political and ritual bodies that helped to administer them.

Throughout the Mississippian period, polities emerged in parts of the Savannah River basin, became more complex, and then waned as populations shifted to other areas over the course of a few generations. Researchers have divided the development and decline of political entities in the middle and lower reaches of the river into the Savannah phase (AD 1150 – 1300) and the Irene phase (AD 1300 – 1450). The archaeological record indicates that, during the Savannah phase, several large mound centers near present-day Augusta, GA governed much of the central and lower Savannah River area. However, Irene exerted influence over a substantial settlement system on the coast through much of the phase. After re-emerging from a hiatus in the Irene phase, the Irene Mounds site was likely the focal point of a sizeable polity along the lower Savannah and Ogeechee rivers (Caldwell and McCann 1941, Thompson 2009).
Anderson’s (1994) work demonstrated that simple chiefdom polities (i.e., polities with one mound center and presumably one level of hierarchical control) appeared at the upper and lower reaches of the Savannah River at approximately AD 1100 to 1150. The Irene Mounds site was one of several mound centers that emerged along the mouths of Georgia’s rivers at the beginning of the Middle Mississippian period Savannah phase (Anderson 1994, Anderson et al. 1986, Caldwell and McCann 1941, Pluckhahn and McKivergan 2002). The most prominent feature at Irene and other coastal mound sites was a low sand and shell burial mound.

Between AD 1200 and 1250, additional mound centers with recognizable platform mounds developed throughout the basin. By approximately AD 1250 several towns appear to have grown into complex polities, with associated secondary mound centers and villages. Irene was a well-developed Middle Mississippian center during this period. It was one of the largest mound centers on the coast, as it now included two mounds – a platform mound and a burial mound (Anderson et al. 1986, Anderson 1994, Caldwell and McCann 1941, Pluckhahn and McKivergan 2002). Moreover, Irene was one of only two coastal towns that had a proper Mississippian platform mound (Pluckhahn and McKivergan 2002).

Between AD 1250 and 1350, there was a rather dramatic change in the settlement system and political arrangements along the Savannah River. Two large, complex centers along the middle of the river’s course dominated the landscape. The archaeological record on the coast indicates that the influence of local centers decreased in the wake of these complex polities in the interior. Irene likely fell into disuse for one or two generations (Anderson 1994, Caldwell and McCann 1941, Thompson 2009).

Subsequently, as these complex polities waned and another large center developed in the upper reaches of the Savannah River, coastal communities re-gained their influence. Irene was revitalized at approximately AD 1350. Anderson (1994: 242) stated that “[b]y 1400, the Irene site … may have been dominating events in the lower basin and may have been a focus for ceremonial life…” The town’s platform mound was transformed into a conical burial mound, and a large rotunda and specialized mortuary structure were built (Caldwell and McCann 1941, Thompson 2009).
However, by AD 1450, the mound center appears to have fallen into disuse once again. In fact, Anderson (1994, 1996) demonstrated that all of the centers from the mouth of the Savannah River to the central Piedmont were no longer in use. Mound construction continued through the Protohistoric period only in the headwaters of the Savannah.

**Coastal Mississippian Polities and the Irene Mound Center**

Mississippian polities along the Georgia and South Carolina coast predominantly maintained influence over localized populations in circumscribed areas. They rarely extended their influence over broad areas, unlike some large polities in Georgia’s interior. Archaeological evidence indicates that coastal polities typically encompassed the settlement along the mouths of individual drainages, such as the Savannah and Ogeechee rivers and the Altamaha River. These polities were somewhat diffuse, as they consisted of populations living in dispersed villages and hamlets in the coastal plain.

Pluckhahn and McKivergan (2002) identified Middle Mississippian period (AD 1100/1150 – 1300/1350) polities on Georgia’s coast in their assessment of coastal plain settlement patterns (Table 5.1, Figure 5.2). They identified Irene as the political and ritual center of a polity that included settlements along the lower Savannah and the Ogeechee rivers. These authors also presented a list of potential secondary centers in the proposed political community (see Table 5.1). Although Pluckhahn and McKivergan’s work did not consider the Late Mississippian period (AD 1350 – 1450/1500), it is likely that Irene was the focal point of a similar-sized (or perhaps slightly larger) political community during the Irene phase (see Anderson 1994, Thompson 2009).

Researchers have described Irene as a chiefly compound (Williams 1995) and/or a ceremonial center for surrounding populations (Anderson 1994, Larson 1980, Thompson 2009). The town’s primary use likely changed from the Savannah to the Irene phases. Regardless, it served as a political seat and a civic and ritual gathering place for people who lived along the mouths of the Savannah and Ogeechee rivers. Based on ethnohistoric analogies and archaeological patterns throughout the Southeast, archaeologists have suggested that the village was home to one or several principle lineages and perhaps several secondary lineages. The
inclusion of additional attached lineages likely increased in the Irene phase, when leadership positions may have expanded (see Thompson 2009).

Table 5.1. Middle Mississippian period Ogeechee/Savannah polity (reproduced from Pluckhahn and McKivergan 2002: Tables 1 and 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irene (9CH1)</td>
<td>platform mound, burial mound, mortuary structure</td>
<td>Anderson 1991, Caldwell and McCann 1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Mound (9BN39)</td>
<td>conical mound</td>
<td>Miller et al. 1983, Pluckhahn 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Burial Mound (9CH2A)</td>
<td>conical mound</td>
<td>DePratter 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Home (9CH15)</td>
<td>conical mound</td>
<td>Anderson 1994, Waring 1968b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9CH18</td>
<td>conical mound</td>
<td>DePratter 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9CH19</td>
<td>conical mound</td>
<td>DePratter 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossabaw Island, Middle Settlement, Mound D (9CH27)</td>
<td>conical mound</td>
<td>Moore 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9CH160</td>
<td>conical mound</td>
<td>Moore 1897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the Savannah/Ogeechee settlement system and other coastal polities, people appear to have lived in permanent settlements while still maintaining a moderate degree of residential mobility. Recent archaeological research has resulted in important revisions to Larson’s (1980) and Crook’s (1986) Guale Annual Model, which suggested that Mississippian people on the coast moved among settlements in a seasonal subsistence cycle (see also Keene 2004: 672, Pluckhahn and McKivergan 2002 for summaries). Keene (2004) demonstrated that Savannah and Irene phase populations of the Georgia coast occupied year-round settlements, which were arranged in dispersed patterns around areas suitable for agriculture. The settlements that she examined “relied on a mix of cultivation, hunting, fishing, and gathering” through the seasons (Keene 2004: 686). In addition, residents also made short trips to acquire rare resources and maintained some special-purpose, resource extraction sites on the landscape.
The Occupational History and Context of Burial at the Irene Mounds Site

Whether Irene was a chiefly compound or it was a ceremonial center, the town was an epicenter for political and ritual activities near the mouth of the Savannah River. The village was home to several prominent architectural features that likely hosted political and/or ritual gatherings. These features were also primary venues for mortuary ritual. They memorialized the central importance of mortuary ritual to the town and its polity.

In the Savannah phase, the site included a low, round burial mound, a platform mound, and likely a fenced plaza (Figure 5.3). It could have held substantial numbers of local people attending mortuary rites, seasonal ceremonies, feasts, and games such as chunkey. Later, in the
Irene phase, the village included a mortuary structure surrounded by two post rings, a conical burial mound, and a massive council house at one end of a rectangular plaza. The council house, which was large enough to hold hundreds, likely hosted ceremonial festivities that drew people from surrounding villages and housed events that drew attendance of secondary leaders from other villages and their attendants.

Figure 5.3. Identified architectural features at the Irene Mounds site (reproduced from Thompson 2009: Figure 1; originally adapted from Caldwell and McCann 1941: Figure 13).
Here, I discuss the occupational history of the Irene Mounds site to describe the context of ritual activities and burial. This overview demonstrates that the performance of mortuary ritual was intimately associated with prominent architectural features that defined the site at different points in its history. It suggests that mortuary rituals can, and likely should, be divided among architectural features that date to the Savannah and Irene phases respectively. I use this division to structure the analysis of mortuary ritual at Irene.

The occupational history that follows is based on the Works Progress Administration (WPA) excavations of Irene. Between 1937 and 1939, WPA archaeologists and field crews excavated nearly the entire remnants of the site (Caldwell and McCann 1941). The WPA records and maps are the primary data for this analysis of mortuary ritual (see below).

_Savannah Phase (AD 1150 – 1300) Architecture and Burial_

Since its initial occupation in the late Woodland period or early Savannah phase (circa AD 1150), the Irene Mounds site was a focal point for the performance of mortuary ritual. It served as a central civic and ritual gathering place during the Savannah I, II, and III phases (Anderson 1994, Caldwell and McCann 1941, Thompson 2009). Prehistoric residents constructed and used prominent architectural features that were venues for mortuary ritual or that were associated with related ceremonials. The primary architectural features during the Savannah phase were a burial mound, platform mound, and a series of palisade and fence lines (Caldwell and McCann 1941, Thompson 2009: 452 - 455) (Figure 5.4).
Throughout the Savannah phase, Irene’s conical burial mound was the focus of mortuary ritual at the site and perhaps even for most of the surrounding area (Anderson 1994: 180, Caldwell and McCann 1941, Thompson 2009). The WPA excavations recorded the burials of 106 individuals in the mound (Caldwell and McCann 1941: 22 - 24) (Figure 5.5). Like many other burial mounds on the Georgia coast, initial mortuary activities involved the burial of several secondary cremations below a concentrated shell deposit. A few other cremations were placed in the shell deposit. Subsequently, periodic mortuary activities resulted in the episodic burial of approximately 99 inhumations below and in accretional mound fill (Caldwell and McCann 1941). Groups of burials appear to be associated with particular discrete layers of sand and shell fill. These groups predominantly consisted of complete individuals, but they also included disarticulated, fragmentary sets of remains and isolated skeletal elements. Finally, some Irene
phase mortuary activities led to the burial of a few sets of remains in the eastern margins of the burial mound.

Figure 5.5. Savannah phase burial mound (burials in SE flank may date to Irene phase) (reproduced from Caldwell and McCann 1941: Figure 11).

Although Irene's platform mound and associated structures were not directly associated with mortuary ritual (e.g., burial), they were likely venues for ceremonialism that emphasized the mortuary realm and human remains. It is important to recognize that structures that stood atop the platform mound were likely the focal point for civic and ceremonial activities. Ethnohistoric
accounts of Contact period mound structures in Georgia and South Carolina describe many as ceremonial buildings that housed important ritual paraphernalia and others as elite residences (Shelby 1993, Varner and Varner 1951, see also Dye and King 2007).

The platform mound’s construction sequence indicates that the mound itself was intended to elevate and emphasize the central structures and the activities that they likely accommodated (see Anderson 1994: 175 – 180 and Caldwell and McCann 1941 for detailed mound stage descriptions). The mound’s first three stages were earthen embanked structures with a central fire basin. In the fourth stage, the mound was raised and a structure likely placed atop it. Through stages 5, 6, and 7, it grew into a formal platform mound with sets of summit structures and encircling fences that likely shielded the buildings from view (Anderson 1994: 177 - 180). The summit structure associated with stage 5 contained a large fire basin surrounded by a teardrop-shaped gutter that extended to the edge of the mound. One of two buildings associated with stage 6 also housed a central fire-basin and an elaborately shaped gutter that resembled fork-and-eye motifs engraved on shell masks (Anderson 1994: 177). Ramps led from the base of the platform mound to these summit structures.

I suggest that at least a few of the summit structures served as ceremonial houses, liminal places for curating sacred paraphernalia and interacting with supernatural forces. Ethnohistoric documents often describe mound summit structures as square to rectangular buildings with large central hearths that burned continuously (e.g., Swanton 1911, see also Brown 1990, 1997, Knight 1986: 681, Dye and King 2007) Several accounts reported that these structures contained venerated icons and the processed remains of past leaders (see Brown 2001, Smith and Miller 2009). Oviedo (1959, L. XXXVII, C. iii, p. 328) wrote that the remains “of principal men are kept apart in a chapel or a temple separated from the other community, and also on small islands…”

Irene phase (AD 1300 – 1450) Architecture and Burial

In the Irene phase, after a brief hiatus, the Irene Mounds site was again the focus of civic and ceremonial activity in the lower reaches of the Savannah River and along the northern portion of the Georgia coast (Anderson 1994: 242). The town was a center for the performance of
mortuary ritual among local settlements. Although residents shifted the focus of civic and ceremonial activities to new architectural features, they continued to construct and use prominent features that were venues for mortuary ceremonialism. The site’s primary features were a mortuary structure, a large conical mound, and a council house called the rotunda (Figure 5.6).

During the Irene phase, a mortuary structure was the epicenter of local mortuary ritual. Mortuary houses in the American Southeast were locales for processing the bodies of the recently deceased, curating some of the remains, and even displaying them. Ethnohistoric accounts and the archaeological record indicate that the deceased were often buried beneath the structure’s floor or directly outside the walls of the structure to await defleshing and other processing treatments (see Brown 1990). After processing of the body, the treated remains were curated and/or put on display in the structure or in other ceremonial contexts (Brown 1997, 2001, Dye and King 2007, Knight 1986). Eventually, the remains were buried in special spaces, in accordance with the social position of the processed individual and/or the positions of their living family members.

The Irene mortuary structure was a semi-subterranean, square building with a pronounced wall-trench entranceway that faced east (Figure 5.7). There was no identifiable central hearth. The WPA excavations found four burials in association with the structure’s floor. Three of the burials were flexed inhumations, and the fourth was an isolated skull. One of the flexed inhumations was partially disarticulated and charred. Anderson (1994: 181) suggested that this individual may have been undergoing a defleshing process. In addition to the burials, five Irene vessels and a cluster of food remains were found on the floor.
After an unknown period of use, the structure was destroyed by fire (Anderson 1994: 181; Caldwell and McCann 1941: 27). Relatively soon after the fire, a low sand mound was erected over the burned remnants of the building and marked an unusual deposit. The WPA excavations uncovered 34 burials in the sand fill (Caldwell and McCann 1941: 27). The burials included complete individuals, partially disarticulated individuals, several isolated skulls, the incomplete and fragmentary remains of infants and children placed in upright vessels, and “many single fragments of human bone” (Caldwell and McCann 1941: 27) “… At the center of this sand mound, there was a flexed, articulated adult male (Burial 32) buried with more accompaniments than any other individual at Irene. This individual was placed near to another complete individual who was partially flexed in a very unusual, open position.
Figure 5.7. Irene phase mortuary structure (reproduced from Caldwell and McCann 1941: Figure 12). I have outlined with red lines a possible earlier structure on the original map.

Two circular post lines – an inner and an outer enclosure – encircled the immediate area around the mortuary structure. These post enclosures also shaped two concentric rings of burials. The WPA excavations of the enclosures documented approximately 48 burials in the inner enclosure and 23 in the outer enclosure. Many burials contained mostly complete, articulated to partially articulated individuals. However, some included disarticulated, bundled remains; incomplete sets of remains; the incomplete remains of children placed in urns; and isolated
skeletal elements. Interestingly, a number of the interments were well-defined pits sealed with a clay cap, a facility type exclusively associated with the mortuary enclosures.

Unfortunately, available data do not permit a precise determination of the construction of the rings and the placement of the burials in relation to the mortuary structure. Many researchers that have studied Irene have suggested that the enclosures were built after the mortuary structure was destroyed. They have assumed that they were used as an Irene phase burial facility (Anderson 1994, Caldwell and McCann 1941, Thompson 2009). I argue that any conclusions about the chronology of the mortuary structure and the enclosures should include a more nuanced consideration of the possible multi-staged mortuary program performed inside and outside the mortuary structure. I propose that one or both of the post lines screened the mortuary structure and related ritual activities from view while it was in use. Some individuals buried within the enclosures may have been curated there while awaiting processing in the structure. It is also possible that some or all of the individuals had already been processed in the building or elsewhere. They may have been defleshed, tightly flexed and/or bundled, and then buried in the enclosures in close association with the mortuary structure and related deposits.

During the Irene phase, the platform mound was transformed into a large conical mound (Mound Stage 8) that was used as an exclusive burial monument. Caldwell and McCann (1941: 20) reported that seven burials were placed in the mound fill. The remains of three adults were placed in a flexed position atop a thin shell apron in the western end of the mound. In the preliminary site report, Schaeffer et al. (1939) noted that a stingray spine was likely associated with these individuals. In addition to the seven individuals in the mound fill, excavations documented five additional Irene phase burials in a sand apron that bridged the conical mound and the southeastern margin of the burial mound. Interestingly, many of these burials were disarticulated and incomplete or were simply isolated remains.

The largest, publicly-visible architectural feature in the Irene phase was the rotunda, a council house at the southeastern end of the site (Anderson 1994, Caldwell and McCann 1941, Thompson 2009). It sat at one end of a large rectangular enclosure, which likely defined a large
plaza area just south of the conical mound. Thompson (2009) has argued convincingly that the building primarily served as a council house similar to other ethnohistorically documented councils throughout the Southeast. In fact, he (2009: 457 - 458) noted that the Irene rotunda "matches in size the largest of the ethnohistorical known council houses" (Shapiro and Hann 1990: 520).

Although it was not devoted to mortuary ceremonialism, the structure either occasionally hosted or was associated with mortuary activities. The placement of several heavily processed individuals near the center of the structure suggests a formidable association with mortuary ritual. WPA excavations recorded at least eight burials in shallow features either just beneath or on floor of the rotunda. Caldwell and McCann (1941: 31) stated that four were flexed inhumations, and that one of these four was partially burned. A fifth flexed inhumation was missing its skull, a sixth inhumation was too fragmentary to record, and a seventh burial was a secondary cremation. The excavations also uncovered 15 upright Irene Complicated Stamped urns; one held the remains of an infant.

Savannah and Irene Phase Burials in Other Spaces

During both the Savannah and Irene phases, some mortuary ritual and burial occurred in spaces outside of prominent architectural features. Much of this activity appeared to represent simple burial in open spaces within the town, although it is possible that some were associated with houses or other small structures. It is also possible that a few burials were associated with more elaborate activities tied to nearby architectural features, but they have not been properly identified yet.

In total, the WPA excavations uncovered 38 inhumed individuals that were seemingly placed within open spaces away from prominent architecture. Although it is difficult to determine whether the burials were Savannah or Irene phase interments, contexts suggest that they date to both phases, with perhaps slightly more of these burials dating the Irene phase (see Caldwell and McCann 1941: 38). Nearly all of these burials were complete, articulated individuals placed in simple burial pits or trenches. Caldwell and McCann (1941: 38) did document two unusual
extended inhumations of articulated, well-preserved individuals who were buried near the southern flank of the primary mound. The skulls of both individuals were crushed.

The Irene Mortuary Record

In the remainder of the chapter, I examine the performance of mortuary ritual at Irene to characterize the identities of the spirits of the dead. First, I describe the primary data that I use in this examination of mortuary ritual at Irene. Then, I present the analysis itself.

Excavations at Irene

In 1897, C.B. Moore (1899a: 168) conducted limited excavations at the Irene Mounds site (see Figure 5.2). He reported that the largest mound was a “truncated cone in shape.” Moore and his crew examined a large exposure that previous looters had cut into this mound, and they also conducted some excavation of their own. They tested the south end of the burial mound. Moore’s excavation reportedly encountered 18 burials, each flexed and a few with a small number of accompaniments.

In 1907, the Chatham County Engineering Department dug into the large conical mound. The engineering department removed most of the northern portion of the mound as fill for the construction of floodgates in Pipemaker’s Creek. Excavators did not document archaeological deposits.

Extensive, professional excavation of the Irene Mounds site occurred between September 1937 and December 1939. Works Progress Administration (WPA) archaeologists conducted prolonged work that resulted in the nearly complete excavation of the site (Caldwell and McCann 1941, Depratter 1991, Schaeffer 1939, see Lyon 1996 for historical overview). This work and its records are the basis of most knowledge about Irene.

Preston Holder selected the Irene Mounds site to serve as the focus of the WPA’s Chatham County project in Georgia. Holder (1938a), Vladimir Fewkes (1938), Claude Schaeffer (1939), and Joseph Caldwell (1939a, 1941) directed the massive excavations that ran continuously for over two years. They oversaw the excavation and documentation of the burial mound, the large conical/platform mound, the mortuary structure, the rotunda, and all other
features and palisade lines identified at the site. African—American women conducted most of the actual field work (Classen 1999).

Throughout the excavation of Irene, the directors filed quarterly and semi-annual reports with the WPA. They also kept personal notes and records that eventually became part of the excavation collections (Caldwell and McCann 1939, Caldwell 1939b, 1940a, 1940b, 1940c, Hulse 1939, no date, Schaeffer 1938a, 1938b, 1938c, Schaeffer et al. 1939). Finally, Caldwell and McCann (1941) authored and published the final site report.

In addition to their work at Irene, WPA crews investigated a number of other prehistoric sites in Chatham County. The beginning of World War II abruptly ended this work, and most of this research was left unpublished. Fortunately, DePratter (1991) re-examined available field notes and re-analyzed existing collections recovered from many of these sites. He synthesized and published much of the WPA work conducted at these other mounds in the vicinity of Irene.

Irene Mortuary Data

To examine the performance of mortuary ritual at Irene, I use the mortuary data from the 1937 to 1939 WPA excavations. I collected detailed data on nearly all of the interments identified during this work. I assembled body treatment, burial facility, and mortuary accompaniment data for the Irene burials from excavation notes, analysis records, and reports curated at the National Anthropological Archives (NAA) (Caldwell and McCann 1939, Caldwell 1939b, 1940b, 1940c, Holder 1938b, Schaeffer 1938a, 1938b, 1938c, Schaeffer et al. 1939, Waring 1938).

WPA archaeologists originally submitted most of these mortuary data in the form of letter reports, quarterly reports, and preliminary reports. They also kept some correspondence and excavation and analysis records in their personal research collections, which were eventually curated with the NAA. I primarily gathered data from a set of analysis sheets detailing burial information, from excavation descriptions in quarterly reports and in the preliminary final report, from a set of notes detailing excavation of the mortuary, and from sets of published and unpublished maps (see the references listed above for source materials).

I constructed an aggregated data set for the mortuary record at Irene (see https://core.tdar.org/dataset/380985 for data used in this study). The data set includes information
on 267 individuals buried in 250 burial facilities. In a later study of the skeletal assemblage, Powell (1990: 26) reported a population of 280 individuals in 265 burial features. However, the number of individuals in this data set matches the 267 burials that Caldwell and McCann (1941) described in their narrative of the excavations. It is likely that most of the discrepancy is the result of fragmentary urn burials and isolated human remains that were identified in Powell’s laboratory analysis.

The data set that I use here contains demographic data for a total of 181 individuals. It includes 53 males, 71 females, and 56 individuals of indeterminate sex. Furthermore, it includes 8 infants, 32 children, 15 adolescents, 115 adults, and 8 elderly adults. These demographic data are a combination of Hulse’s estimations culled from his analysis notes/cards, Griffin’s (1993) estimates from dental data, and Stojanowski’s (2001, see also 2005) estimates. In a comparison of these researchers’ age and sex estimates, there was no statistical difference among Hulse’s determinations from the analysis notes and Griffin’s and Stojanowski’s estimations. In most instances, the determinations matched. Thus, I combined all the determinations in a simplified format in order to maximize available demographic data.

It is important to note that Hulse (1941, see also Powell 1990) reported more complete demographic data than I use in this analysis. In the final site report, he recorded the following demographic data for the Irene mortuary population: 38 infants and children, 16 adolescents, 74 adult males, and 75 adult females (149 adults). He also noted 62 individuals of indeterminate age and sex. The discrepancy between the demographic data I have compiled and Hulse’s original data is primarily due to missing data for adult males. Future work should integrate the available demographic data with these missing data to ensure that a complete cross-section of the Irene population is represented in the demographic profile. Although some age and sex data for potentially important persons (mostly men) are missing, their absence does not necessarily impact the overall results of this analysis.

Finally, this data set does not include chronologic assessments for any of the burial features. Excavation records indicate that few chronologically diagnostic artifacts were placed in
mortuary features, in clear association with burial facilities and/or remains. Moreover, the excavation notes and records that I referenced rarely describe accompaniments in detail.

For this analysis, I use a relative chronologic estimate to date the burials to either the Savannah or Irene phase. I refer to the relative chronology of the site’s architectural features to date the burials (i.e., I refer to a burial’s context to date it.) (see discussion of Savannah and Irene phase architecture above). In general, I assume that nearly all burials placed in the Irene burial mound date to the Savannah phase. I assume that most burials placed in the rotunda, in the upper stages of the platform/conical mound, and in and around the mortuary date to the Irene phase.

The Performance of Mortuary Ritual at the Irene Mounds Site, from the Savannah Phase to the Irene Phase

I now assess the performance of mortuary ritual at Irene during both the Savannah and Irene phases. Below, I examine several ritual elements to describe the social memories that they shaped for the spirits of the dead. I evaluate 1) body treatment, 2) mortuary facilities, and 3) mortuary accompaniments in separate statistical analyses. In addition, I consider 4) mortuary spaces and placements during the evaluation of each element.

In the analysis of each ritual element, I assess whether that procedure differentially memorialized select dead, or it uniformly memorialized the dead. For example, in the analysis of body treatment, I assess whether there is evidence for multiple different body treatments or a single treatment. If there is evidence for multiple treatments, then I determine if they were part of a multi-staged program that reserved extended treatments for a small number of individuals.

After these separate analyses, I synthesize the results to describe the social identities for the spirits of the dead. I summarize the performance of mortuary ritual and its social memories to bring the identities of the spirits into focus. This synthesis permits an exploration of the roles that these spirits played in Irene’s social and political affairs.
Body Treatment at the Irene Mounds Site

Foremost, a basic summary of the treatment of the dead during the Savannah and Irene phases reveals an interesting diversity in the handling of individuals at the time of death and likely well-beyond (see https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391946 for Irene inhumation body treatment data and associated analysis/results data). The WPA’s near-complete excavation of the site exposed 259 inhumations and 8 cremations (Table 5.2). The majority of the inhumations were primary interments \( (n = 142) \). However, a substantial number of inhumations were recognizable secondary interments \( (n = 36) \). Moreover, there were likely more inhumations that were the result of secondary interment but that could not be positively identified to a burial type. The indeterminate burial type category contains a number of partially articulated and articulated individuals (and/or remains) that may have been secondary interments. Finally, excavation and burial notes identified at least four bundle burials. It is likely that the bundle burials were also secondary interments.

Primary interment at the Irene site was practiced in a relatively consistent manner. Nearly all of the primary inhumations were placed in facilities in a flexed or partially flexed position, either supine or on the left or right side \( (n = 133) \) (Table 5.3, Table 5.4). A few primary inhumations, however, were positioned in unique positions and/or postures, which may be considered “active” postures. Three individuals in the mortuary were buried supine with legs flexed open and apart from each other, and with the arms partly flexed up and out from the body. One of these individuals (Burial 48) lay on the floor of the mortuary structure, the second individual (Burial 29) was placed in the fill just above the floor of the structure, and a third person (Burial 97) was buried in the inner enclosure of the mortuary.

Despite a general lack of diversity in treatment, two primary interments displayed evidence for continued interaction with human remains. One inhumation (Burial 23), buried at the southeastern corner of the mortuary in the inner enclosure, was interred with an additional human radius. Another inhumation (Burial 90), placed in the southeastern corner of the burial mound, was buried with a skull. Interestingly, a nearby burial (Burial 243) in the southeastern flank of the burial mound lay in close association with an isolated skull and an articulated, flexed leg.
Table 5.2. Number of Irene inhumations in each burial type category and with an identified degree of articulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully Articulated</th>
<th>Partially Articulated</th>
<th>Disarticulated**</th>
<th>Cremation</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
<th>ind**</th>
<th>no data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary (?)*</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (?)*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I combined the inhumation categories Primary and Primary?, and the categories Secondary and Secondary? The category Primary? denotes a burial that is likely but not certainly a primary deposit. Similarly, the category Secondary? denotes a burial that is likely or perhaps a secondary interment.

** “ind” represents “indeterminate” (e.g., indeterminate burial type or indeterminate degree of articulation)

Table 5.3. Number of Irene inhumations in each burial type category and in designated categories that describe the remains present in the feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete Body</th>
<th>Body Missing Limb(s)</th>
<th>Postcrani al Body</th>
<th>Upper Body</th>
<th>Leg(s)</th>
<th>Skull + Postcrani al Remains</th>
<th>Skull</th>
<th>Mandible</th>
<th>ind**</th>
<th>no data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary (?)*</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (?)*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind**</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I combined the inhumation categories Primary and Primary?, and the categories Secondary and Secondary? The category Primary? denotes a burial that is likely but not certainly a primary deposit. Similarly, the category Secondary? denotes a burial that is likely or perhaps a secondary interment.

** “ind” represents “indeterminate”
Secondary burials across the site account for most of the diversity in body treatment, and for most of the compelling evidence for the continued processing and/or handling of human remains. Secondary inhumations primarily vary in the portions of the body represented (see Table 5.3). Excavators encountered at least four disarticulated bundle burials and a number of incomplete sets of remains: a nearly complete torso, isolated, partially articulated legs (n =5), skulls with isolated postcranial remains (n = 4) (including one skull with a set of feet), isolated skulls (n = 8), and one skull with an additional mandible. It is possible that some of these isolated remains represent trophies or other offerings, or that some represent additional elements left in a primary context after exhumation of an individual. In addition to these possible secondary inhumations, WPA archaeologists also encountered eight secondary cremation deposits. They uncovered seven cremations placed in and beneath a shell deposit at the center of the burial mound, and one buried in the center of the council house.

A multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) of inhumation body treatment can determine if the observed differentiation in inhumation body treatment practices is patterned into distinctive body treatment types. Unfortunately, this analysis cannot include both inhumations and secondary cremations, as the variables that describe body treatment for inhumation and secondary cremations are not identical. The table below shows the number of Irene inhumations in identified body position categories and in identified body posture categories.

Table 5.4. Number of Irene inhumations in identified body position categories and in identified body posture categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supine</th>
<th>Right Side</th>
<th>Left Side</th>
<th>Stomach or Bundles</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
<th>ind*</th>
<th>no data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Flexed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexed</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Piles or Bundles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no data</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “ind” represents “indeterminate”
cremation are different. However, the qualitative difference between inhumation and cremation clearly separates the two as distinctive body treatment types.

In the MCA, I included all inhumation burials that had sufficient data for selected body treatment practices (n = 225) (see https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391946 for data used in the Irene inhumation body treatment MCA and for MCA procedure data). This sample likely represents a coherent segment, or socio-political cross-section, of the prehistoric Irene community, as it contains burials from all identified contexts (e.g., village area, burial mound, mortuary structure and enclosure, rotunda, and platform mound). I culled a small set (n =34) of burials from the analysis, because these inhumations did not have informative variable states for the selected categorical variables. In particular, I removed several burials that C.B. Moore disturbed in the 1890’s in his excavations of the burial mound. These burials lack detailed, reliable data on original treatment of the body at the time of their burial in the mound.

An MCA places the burial cases in a two-dimensional space based on categorical divisions among the different body treatment variables. To calculate the positions of the 225 Irene inhumations relative to each other, I used 19 different body treatment variables (Table 5.5). Each of the 19 variables represents one body treatment practice with several different possible states (i.e., each variable is a multiple nominal categorical variable).

The MCA of inhumation body treatment at Irene suggests that the performance of mortuary ritual did involve distinctive body treatment types (Figure 5.8). Results of a k-means pure locational clustering procedure indicate that an eight cluster solution best explains the distribution of object scores across the plot. Between five and six of these eight clusters likely represent distinct body treatment types. Although not included in the MCA analysis, cremation is an additional body treatment type practiced at Irene. Finally, some of the extreme outliers in the MCA object score plot represent aberrant burial practices that are not distinct treatment types but are likely unique practices that may be associated with deviant burial.
Figure 5.8. Scatterplot of Irene inhumation body treatment MCA object scores. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. The cases are color-coded by cluster assignment (through a k-means pure locational clustering procedure). The colored ovals represent confidence ellipses that outline the range of each identified cluster. Refer to the graph key above to match cluster colors to a cluster number. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391946.
Table 5.5. Body treatment variables and variable states used in the Irene body treatment MCA (see Figure 5.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body Treatment Variable</th>
<th>Variable States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inhumation Type</td>
<td>primary, primary ?, secondary, secondary ?, bundle, indeterminate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remains Present</td>
<td>near complete body, near complete body missing limbs, postcranial body, upper body, skull and isolated postcranial remains, skull, legs, mandible, indeterminate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Elements</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation*</td>
<td>fully articulated, partially articulated, disarticulated clustered, disarticulated dispersed, indeterminate, not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Posture</td>
<td>extended, flexed, partially flexed, in piles or bundles, indeterminate, not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Position</td>
<td>supine, stomach, left side, right side, in piles or bundles, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranium Location</td>
<td>north section, northeast section, east section, southeast section, south section, southwest section, west section, skull absent, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranial Orientation</td>
<td>from north to south, from northeast to southwest, from east to west, from southeast to northwest, from south to north, from southwest to northeast, from west to east, from northwest to southeast, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Facing</td>
<td>north, northeast, east, southeast, south, southwest, west, northwest, upward, downward, backward (skull inverted), not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Arm Position</td>
<td>extended parallel, flexed into body, bent/slightly flexed in to body, flexed out from body/spread apart, bent/slightly flexed and spread open, crossed over midsection, drawn to face, pinned under body, stretched away from body/sprawled, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Arm Position</td>
<td>extended parallel, flexed into body, bent/slightly flexed in to body, flexed out from body/spread apart, bent/slightly flexed and spread open, crossed over midsection, drawn to face, pinned under body, stretched away from body/sprawled, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Leg Position</td>
<td>extended parallel, flexed in to body, bent/slightly flexed in to body, flexed out from body/spread apart, bent/slightly flexed and spread open, crossed under right, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Leg Position</td>
<td>extended parallel, flexed atop body, flexed in to body, bent/slightly flexed in to body, bent/slightly flexed and spread open, crossed over left, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning*</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral/Pigment*</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapped</td>
<td>yes, no, possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound</td>
<td>yes, no, possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothed</td>
<td>yes, no, possible (partially)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed in Urn</td>
<td>yes, no, possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Supplementary variables. These variables did not have enough variable states to use as active variables in the analysis.
Foremost, a dense and tight cluster of inhumation cases (in light blue) near the center of the graph represents the most common body treatment type, primary inhumations that are flexed or partially flexed either on the back or on a side. Second, a small cluster of cases (in blue) just below the central cluster is a set of primary/possibly primary interments placed in somewhat unusual body positions and/or postures. This cluster includes several individuals who were placed in a prone position.

Next, a diffuse cloud of inhumation cases (in orange and in green) fanning outward from the central cluster represents a group of remains that were partially disarticulated to disarticulated and dispersed. Those cases that are farther from the origin of the plot than other cases represent individuals who were more disarticulated and more incomplete than those cases closer to the origin. This cluster includes a number of urn burials of children and infants. The limited information available for many of the urn burials makes it difficult to determine if they were primary burials of subadults whose remains were poorly preserved, or if they were secondary burials in a staged mortuary process (see additional discussion below). A small cluster (in red) below this diffuse cloud contains individuals represented by articulated to partially articulated postcranial remains. It is interesting that most of the individuals represented by postcranial remains were mostly complete (except for absence of the skull).

The remaining clusters are body treatment types that most likely involved secondary or successively staged burial. A concentration of cases (in purple) to the far left of the central cluster is a group that consists of isolated skulls recovered throughout the site. A dispersed array of cases (in light blue-green) above the group of skulls is the set of urn and bundle burials, which were disarticulated and generally incomplete. It is important to recognize that the number of cases in this treatment type is under-represented. Although Caldwell and McCann (1941) reported many potential urn burials in the fill above the mortuary structure, several in the rotunda, and a few scattered throughout the site, Hulse documented only a few urn burials in his analysis cards and notes. It is likely that he reported cases that were almost certainly burials, and did not record those cases in which fragmentary, isolated remains were found in association with urns.
With limited available data, it is difficult to assess if nearly all of the urn burials represent the poorly preserved, primary interments of infants and children (which is an accurate interpretation for some urn burials), or if some represent secondary interments of bundles and/or isolated, fragmentary remains. Hulse’s identification of at least one bundle burial placed in an urn and another set of disarticulated, piled remains in an urn does suggest that some of the urn burials may have been interred as part of a staged process. Moreover, Caldwell and McCann’s (1941) repeated observations of upright vessels that either contained traces of fragmentary bone or, curiously, no identifiable traces of human remains in both the mortuary structure and in the rotunda provide further evidence that the vessels were involved in some extended stage of burial. Finally, an isolated cluster (in yellow) of inhumation cases at the lower left portion of the plot is a group of isolated postcranial remains, predominantly disarticulated legs.

The differentiation among these body treatment types is primarily the result of variation in skeletal articulation and remains present/skeletal completeness. A plot of the discrimination measures for the body treatment variables (i.e., practices) provides a visual representation of this result (Figure 5.9). Essentially, the plot displays each variable’s contribution to case differentiation along Dimension 1 (x-axis) and Dimension 2 (y-axis). In this plot, note that Inhumation Type and Articulation contribute significantly to differentiation of inhumation cases along Dimension 1. Next, notice that Cranium Location in the grave, Facing, and Cranial Orientation contribute substantially to differentiation on the y-axis. The variable state “skull absent” explains most of the variation in each of these three variables. Finally, note that Remains Present (which records the portions of the body found in the burial facility) contributes greatly to differentiation of burial cases along both dimensions.
Body Treatment of Different Sex and Age Groups

An association of sex and/or age groups with these cluster types might explain, in part, some of the differences among these body treatment types. For example, a strong association between a particular sex and certain treatment types would suggest that these identities partially determined body treatment and perhaps even burial. In other words, sex of the deceased might have structured acceptable treatments. In addition, perhaps age of the deceased played a role in determining the treatment a person received in death.

There is little to no association between sex and body treatment type (Figure 5.10; Table 5.6). The distribution of males and females among the MCA cluster groups demonstrates
that both sexes are represented in most body treatment types. A contingency analysis of the identified males (n = 46) and females (n = 65) in the MCA treatment clusters indicates that the sex of an individual is not related to membership in a body treatment type. A Fisher’s Exact test statistic fails to reject the null hypothesis that sex is independent of body treatment (see Table 5.6).

However, these results are tentative. A more detailed examination of the distribution of sex assignments among the MCA body treatment clusters reveals that the sex estimate was indeterminate for many of the individuals who were only partially articulated and/or incomplete (see Table 5.6). Therefore, it is difficult to conclude that there is no association of sex with these treatment types.

There is some association between age and body treatment type (Figure 5.11; Table 5.7). The distribution of age groups demonstrates that some age groups occur frequently in particular MCA treatment type clusters. Foremost, children and infants are nearly the only identified age groups in two clusters that represent partially articulated, incomplete burials and urn burials (see Table 5.7). In part, the poor preservation of children’s and infant’s remains explains the age group’s over-representation in these two categories. However, it does not explain the association with urn burial and bundle burial. Rather, children and infants frequently received a body treatment that involved burial in an urn. Second, this distribution also reveals that adults are nearly the only age group represented in the isolated skull cluster (see Table 5.7).
Figure 5.10. Scatterplot of Irene inhumation body treatment MCA object scores. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. The cases are labeled by identified sex assignment. F = female, M = male, u = unidentified assignment, ● = no data. The cases are colored by cluster assignment. The colored ovals represent confidence ellipses that outline the range of each identified cluster. Refer to the graph key above to match cluster colors to a cluster number. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391946.
Table 5.6. The number of males, females, and persons of unidentified sex in each body treatment cluster at Irene. Refer to the key in Figure 5.10 and the depiction of clusters in Figure 5.10 for a list and display of cluster designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (F)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified (U)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test of independence between sex (males, females) (unidentified sex removed from test) and cluster assignment: N = 111, Degrees of Freedom = 4, Pearson ChiSq = 1.508, Prob ≥ ChiSq = .8252, Fisher’s Exact Test Prob = .0167, Two-sided Prob ≤ P = .9393

A contingency analysis of the age groups represented in each of the MCA body treatment clusters supports the association of particular age groups with treatment type. A Fisher’s Exact test statistic rejects the null hypothesis that age is independent of membership in a treatment type (see Table 5.7). The contingency table indicates that children and infants are over-represented in those clusters that contain partially articulated to disarticulated remains and urn burial (see Table 5.7). In addition, the table demonstrates that adults are over-represented in the isolated remains treatment type.

Thus, the performance of mortuary ritual in both the Savannah and Irene phases involved differential body treatment types, based primarily on the degree of body processing and articulation. Moreover, this mortuary program likely included some separate treatments for adults and children. The bodies of adults were interred as articulated, primary inhumations, occasionally as disarticulated, incomplete remains and/or bundles, and as isolated remains. Those of children and infants were interred occasionally as primary inhumations, but more often in urns and as partially articulated, incomplete remains (which may be the result of poor preservation).
Figure 5.11. Scatterplot of Irene inhumation body treatment MCA object scores. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. The cases are labeled by identified age assignment. \textit{i} = newborn/infant, \textit{c} = child, \textit{a} = adolescent, \textit{A} = adult, \textit{E} = elderly, \(\bullet\) = no data (see graph key above). The cases are colored by cluster assignment. The colored ovals represent confidence ellipses that outline the range of each identified cluster. Refer to the graph key above to match cluster colors to a cluster number. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391946.
Table 5.7. The number of persons in identified age categories and in each body treatment cluster at Irene. Refer to the key in Figure 5.11 and the depiction of clusters in Figure 5.11 for a list and display of cluster designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infant/newborn (i)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child (c)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent (a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom = 24, Pearson ChiSq = 52.814, Prob > ChiSq = .0006, Fisher’s Exact Prob = .00, Two-sided Prob ≤ .0003

Summary of Body Treatments through the Savannah and Irene Phases of Occupation

The performance of mortuary ritual at Irene involved differential body treatments in both the Savannah and Irene phases. Individuals that received extended treatments or whose remains were handled more than others' were placed at the center of architectural features devoted to mortuary ritual in both phases (Figure 5.12; Table 5.8). Notably, association of different body treatment types with unique architecture increases from the Savannah to the Irene phase. The expanded association likely reflects an escalation or broadening in relationships with the non-living beings who the dead became.

Early Savannah phase residents of Irene interred individuals who received unique, extended body treatments in a pre-mound cultural fill and a thick shell deposit that formed the center of the Savannah period burial mound. They buried seven cremations beneath and in this central shell deposit.
Figure 5.12. Scatterplot of Irene inhumation body treatment MCA object scores. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. The cases are labeled by identified burial context (location in or associated with an architectural feature), = burial mound, = mortuary enclosure, = mortuary structure, = platform mound, = rotunda, = site (general cultural fill) (see graph key above). The cases are colored by cluster assignment. The colored ovals represent confidence ellipses that outline the range of each identified cluster. Refer to the graph key above to match cluster colors to a cluster number.
Table 5.8. The number of persons associated with identified burial contexts (architectural features) and in each body treatment cluster at Irene. Refer to the key in Figure 5.12 and the depiction of clusters in Figure 5.12 for a list and display of cluster designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burial Mound (Savannah phase)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortuary Structure (Irene phase)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortuary Enclosure (Irene phase)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Mound (Irene phase burials)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotunda (Irene phase)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site (Savannah and Irene phase burials)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom = 35, Pearson ChiSq = 118.23, Prob > ChiSq = .0001*
* Chi-square suspect, because 20 percent of cells have count less than 5. Fisher’s Exact (Monte Carlo approximation of Exact Test) times out with available computing/processing resources.

It is important to recognize that these secondary cremations represent the only cremations uncovered at Irene, with the exception of a cremation near the center of the rotunda. Moreover, one of the two cremations at the center of the shell deposit was inside a narrow-mouthed, conical Savannah Burnished plain vessel. Many of the cremations were associated with material offerings, including a conch shell cup and several pottery vessels. Caldwell and McCann (1941: 22) state that “such frequency of associated artifacts was without parallel on the site.” In addition to these cremations, excavation records indicate that three inhumations were placed in the central shell deposit. The field notes and feature map suggest that two of these burials may have been incomplete and/or partially disarticulated.

Later Savannah phase residents of Irene then placed predominantly primary, flexed inhumations in successive fill layers surrounding the central shell deposit. At least 52 percent of the burials in the outer sand and shell fill layers of the mound were primary interments. Moreover, 47 percent of the burials were fully articulated, and only 8 percent were disarticulated. It is important to note that some of the disarticulated and/or incomplete remains in the burial mound lay in shell and sand layers (shell layers D and E and the sand “plug” between the mounds) that
connect the burial mound to the Irene phase conical mound (Mound Stage 8). Thus, some of the isolated remains are not Savannah phase burials, but rather Irene phase burials. Only a few of the individuals in the outer shell and sand layers were buried with associated material culture. However, one individual was buried with a conch shell container, presumably similar to the one found at the center of the mound.

After a possible hiatus in site use between the Savannah and Irene phases, the Irene phase residents shifted the focus of the mortuary program to activities surrounding the mortuary structure. The living interred individuals who received extended body processing and/or remains that represented trophies in association with the structure floor and with the burned remains above the floor.

In the remnants of the mortuary structure, approximately 42 percent of the interred remains were disarticulated and 21 percent were partially articulated. Three inhumations, in various states of disarticulation and somewhat scattered, and an isolated skull were on the structure’s floor. One set of remains displayed some evidence of burning. In addition to the human remains, there were at least five empty pottery vessels, including a rare bottle form. These individuals on the structure floor lay under architectural debris and an intentional sand fill, which was mounded over the building after it burned.

In the fill, Irene phase residents buried 10 additional inhumations, 3 isolated skulls, and at least 21 urn burials. Many inhumations were only partially articulated and/or disarticulated. Moreover, the remains of identified children and infants who were placed in the urns were incomplete, although the incomplete nature of these remains may be the result of poor preservation and field recovery methods. One incomplete individual who was buried at the center of the fill was accompanied by five stone celts, four stone discs, two polished stones, and an unusual incised stone object.

The living continued to bury inhumed individuals in association with the mortuary after its closure. They placed inhumations within two post-demarcated enclosures that circled the remnants of the building. It is difficult to determine if all the inhumations buried outside the structure and both the inner and outer enclosures post-date the use of the mortuary building.
Caldwell and McCann (1941) and others (e.g., Anderson 1996, Thompson 2009) have suggested that the enclosures were built after the mortuary burned, and that most of the associated burials were placed in the enclosures after their construction. These authors argued that the inner enclosure's posts would have blocked the mortuary structure's entrance. However, inspection of the feature map in the final report indicates that only one post hole was placed in the entranceway. Moreover, it is interesting to note that none of the burials overlap the posthole outline of the mortuary structure's walls, and several are lined up against the walls.

I suggest that it is possible that one or both enclosures were in place during perhaps some part of the structure's use. At the very least, it is entirely plausible that the living placed remains just outside the walls of the structure in association with mortuary ritual activities that were occurring inside the building. They may have buried individuals near the time of death immediately outside the structure. At some later time, the living may have exhumed the remains for additional processing, handling, and/or display in the mortuary structure. Alternatively, the living may have buried some of the remains of individuals processed and/or displayed/kept in the structure just outside the building.

Regardless of the relative chronologic sequence of these features, the majority of the individuals interred in both the inner and outer enclosures of the mortuary were fully-articulated burials of near complete skeletons. Approximately 56 percent of persons interred in the enclosures were fully-articulated, and 84 percent of the individuals were nearly complete. It is important to note that many of these articulated individuals were placed in well-defined pits that were sealed with a distinctive clay cap.

Irene phase residents placed some individuals who received extended treatments and/or remains that represent trophies in additional important places on the site. They buried these remains in in the rotunda and in the flanks of the burial mound. Irene residents buried six inhumations, multiple urn burials\(^6\), and a cremation at the center of the rotunda. Several of the inhumations were partially articulated to disarticulated, and one had been slightly burned. One individual was missing a skull. Although it is not possible to date any of the burials in the mound fill directly to the Irene phase, several incomplete, partially disarticulated individuals and some
isolated skeletal elements lay in fill that was deposited in the Irene phase. These remains were buried in a sand and shell deposit that covered the southeast margin of the mound and that connected the burial mound to the Irene phase conical mound (Mound Stage 8).

Finally, six inhumations were found in the fill of Mound Stage 8. The body treatment of these individuals is not well-documented, though. Available data indicate that a group of three inhumations were placed atop a thin shell apron in the mound fill adjacent to the sand fill connecting the large mound and the burial mound. These individuals were spaced approximately 3 to 4 m (10 to 12 ft) apart. The remains were those of an adult male, a possible adult female without a skull, and an indeterminate adult. Furthermore, the data suggest another group of three individuals was buried elsewhere in the conical mound fill. The exact placement and spacing of the burials was not described. Moreover, the age and sex of the individuals is not known. Interestingly, though, the group likely consists of at least two nearly complete, partially flexed inhumations, and one inhumation missing a skull.

**Burial Facilities at the Irene Mounds Site**

An assessment of the burial facilities in the Savannah and Irene phases at the Irene Mounds site suggests that the living constructed distinctive facility types that differentiated the dead. Facility types were directly associated with the site’s built environment. The living signaled differentiation in burial through association with prominent, visible architectural features and memorials presumably dedicated to the dead.

Moreover, an analysis of burial facilities demonstrates that facility differentiation increased from the Savannah phase to the Irene period. The increase in differentiation was the result of an escalation in distinctive mortuary contexts. In the Irene phase, the living buried the deceased in facilities that were similar to Savannah phase contexts and in facilities associated with unique contexts at the center of the mortuary structure, the center of the rotunda, and on the Irene phase conical mound (Mound Stage 8).

An MCA of individual burial feature cases demonstrates that there is patterned burial facility differentiation related to the built environment (Figure 5.13). In the MCA, I included all inhumation burials that had nearly complete data for selected burial facility attributes (n = 191)
(see https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391947 for data used in the Irene burial facility MCA and for MCA procedure data). I culled a set of burials (n= 52) from the analysis, because these inhumations did not have informative variable states for the selected categorical variables. To calculate the positions of the 191 Irene inhumation facilities relative to each other, I used 7 different burial facility variables (Table 5.9). Each of the variables represents one facility attribute with several different possible states (i.e., each variable is a multiple nominal categorical variable).

A graphical plot of the MCA burial feature scores displays facility differentiation visually (see Figure 5.13). The results of a k-means pure locational clustering procedure on the individual feature case scores indicate that the four cluster solution matches the distribution of object scores well. Moreover, archaeological interpretation of the four cluster solution is rather straightforward. Thus, the plot identifies between three and four burial feature types, and suggests an under-represented additional feature type among the outliers.

Foremost, a diffuse cloud of features centered on the origin of the graph represents burial features in the general fill across the site, in the burial mound, in the mortuary enclosures, and in the rotunda. This dispersed concentration is divided into two separate clusters. One cluster (in green), which sits above the origin, is a set of Savannah and Irene phase burial pits that were rather well-defined. In general, these features were oval-shaped or irregularly shaped pits and/or trenches excavated into general cultural fill or into feature fill. The cluster includes the sharply defined, clay-sealed pits found in the mortuary enclosures and a few others exposed across the site. It also includes amorphous, shallow pits uncovered in the margins and flanks of the burial mound. The second cluster (in red), below the origin, is a group of Savannah and Irene burial features that were poorly defined or were unidentifiable. These features were informal, shallow pits placed in the margins of the burial mound and in the mortuary enclosures. This cluster also includes the shallow burial pits dug into the rotunda, for which there is little data.
Figure 5.13. Scatterplot of Irene burial facility MCA object scores. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. The cases are color-coded by cluster assignment (through a k-means pure locational clustering procedure). The colored ovals represent confidence ellipses that outline the range of each identified cluster. Refer to the graph key above to match cluster colors to a cluster number. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391947.
Table 5.9. Mortuary facility variables and variable states used in MCA of Irene burial features (see Figure 5.13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mortuary Facility Variables</th>
<th>Variable States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>mound fill, intentional structural deposit, structure surface/covered by debris, trench, pit, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Shape</td>
<td>rectangular, subrectangular, oval, circular, triangular, composite/irregular, amorphous, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-axis Orientation</td>
<td>north to south, northeast to southwest, northwest to southeast, east to west, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker</td>
<td>yes, no, possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remains Capped</td>
<td>yes, no, possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>pre-mound deposit, in burial mound fill, mound flank deposit, mound stage surface/under fill, structural/mortuary facility fill, midden, general cultural fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Burial</td>
<td>yes, no, possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third cluster (in orange), to the right of the origin, is a set of burial features directly associated with the Savannah phase burial mound and the Irene phase mortuary structure. It consists of those burials that were either placed in direct association with feature fill or that were placed atop a prepared surface and covered with intentional fill. A few burials in the Savannah phase burial mound were not placed in pits but were simply covered with mound fill.

The fourth cluster (in blue), in the bottom right portion of the plot, consists of burial features placed in the Irene phase conical mound (Mound Stage 8). Each of these burials was placed atop a prepared apron of shell and sand and covered directly with mound fill.

Finally, the outliers visible in the graph are urn burials that were covered with an inverted vessel. It is possible that the inverted vessel served as a visible marker at or just above the prehistoric ground surface. Although the urn burials do not constitute a formal cluster (i.e., treatment type) in this analysis, the excavation reports and records suggest that there were many more similar urn burials uncovered in the fill above the mortuary structure and in the rotunda. Thus, urn burial with and without an inverted vessel was likely a separate facility type in the Irene phase.
The observable differentiation among burial feature cases in the MCA plot is primarily due to associations with both Savannah phase and Irene phase architecture. A plot of the discrimination measures for each of the facility variables used in this analysis provides a visual representation of this result (Figure 5.14). Note that the variable Facility Type, which documents variable states such as “pit”, “intentional structural deposit/debris”, “structure surface”, “mound surface and fill”, and the variable Surrounding Matrix contribute strongly to variation on both Dimensions 1 and 2. In fact, these two variables account for most of the interpretable differentiation in the graph. At Irene, both of these variables have particular states that are closely associated with the site’s built features. For example, Facility Type states “intentional structural deposit/debris” and “structure surface” are directly associated with unique burial conditions in the mortuary structure; the variable state “mound surface and fill” is directly related to unique burial conditions in the platform mound.

Figure 5.14. Plot displaying variable contributions to the MCA of Irene inhumation burial facilities.
Data patterning suggests that this association of burial features with unique architectural and mortuary contexts increases from the Savannah phase to the Irene phase (Figure 5.15; Table 5.10). The pattern among burial features is consistent with the increased association of different body treatment types and architectural contexts (see previous discussion of Irene body treatment).

During the Savannah phase, the living placed burials either in burial mound fill or in general cultural fill in other areas of the site (see Table 5.10). The primary differentiation of burial facilities within the burial mound is the placement of secondary cremations and a few flexed inhumations in pits in the central shell deposit, and the interment of inhumations in informal, poorly-defined pits in the margins and flanks of the mound. The individuals in the burial mound and those in general cultural fill were most commonly buried in rather shallow, informal trenches and/or pits.

During the Irene phase, the living interred human remains in the mortuary structure, in the two enclosures encircling the mortuary, in the rotunda, on the platform mound, and in general cultural fill (see Table 5.10). They placed some individuals on feature surfaces in the mortuary structure and on the platform mound. In addition, prehistoric residents deposited remains in intentional fill at the center of the mortuary structure and in the southeastern margins of the burial mound directly adjacent to the conical mound. People buried other individuals in clay-sealed, well-defined pits in the inner and outer enclosures that surrounded the mortuary structure. Local residents also placed remains in pits beneath the floor of the rotunda. It is important to note that most urn burials, which were placed either in the fill of the mortuary structure or in the floor of the rotunda, date to the Irene phase. Finally, the living also buried some individuals in pits, some sealed with clay-plugs, in general cultural fill across the site.
Figure 5.15. Scatterplot of Irene inhumation burial facility MCA object scores. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. The cases are labeled by identified burial context (location in or associated with an architectural feature): o = burial mound, + = mortuary enclosure, ◊ = mortuary structure, X = platform mound, △ = rotunda, Y = site (general cultural fill) (see graph key above). The cases are colored by cluster assignment. The colored ovals represent confidence ellipses that outline the range of each identified cluster. Refer to the graph key above to match cluster colors to a cluster number. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391947.
Table 5.10. The number of persons associated with identified burial contexts (architectural features) in each mortuary facility cluster at Irene. Refer to the key in Figure 5.12 and the depiction of clusters in Figure 5.11 for a list and display of cluster designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial Context</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burial Mound (Savannah phase)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortuary Enclosure (Irene phase)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortuary Structure (Irene phase)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Mound (Irene phase burials)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotunda (Irene phase)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site (Savannah and Irene phase burials)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom = 15; Pearson ChiSq = 416.07, Prob > ChiSq = < .001*

* Chi-square suspect, because 20 percent of cells have count less than 5. Fisher’s Exact (Monte Carlo approximation of Exact Test) times out with available computing/processing resources.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to characterize the facilities of burials placed in the Irene phase rotunda. Excavation notes, analysis cards, and reports do not describe the burial facilities in the rotunda in detail. Nevertheless, available records suggest that most of the burial facilities were shallow, likely informal pits excavated beneath the council house floor, all at the center of the structure. Six inhumations and one cremation were placed, likely in pits, at the center of the rotunda. At least one urn containing the remains of an infant was buried in the floor of the structure. In addition, 14 other upright urns, 10 of which had cover vessels, were uncovered on or beneath the floor in close proximity to the burials. Caldwell and McCann (1940: 31) suggested that many of the upright vessels were urn burials of some kind, and noted that many contained isolated pieces of fragmentary human remains.

**Material Accompaniments in Irene Mortuary Contexts**

An examination of mortuary accompaniments at Irene suggests that the performance of mortuary ritual did involve the differential placement of artifacts in unique mortuary deposits. Interestingly, the assessment indicates that inclusion of artifacts did not necessarily differentiate some members of the dead from others, as material accompaniments were rarely included in
burial contexts. Instead, rare artifacts were placed in distinct mortuary deposits at the center of prominent architectural features. The use of material accompaniments to distinguish unique mortuary deposits occurred in both the Savannah and Irene phases.

The majority of burials (80 percent) at Irene were interred without material accompaniments (see https://core.tdar.org/dataset/392822 for Irene material accompaniment data). Only 51 burials (19 percent) uncovered at Irene were interred with at least one item. Moreover, 38 of these 51 burials were associated with only a single object. The burials with a single object contained relatively common items: a bone awl, a shell pin, a shell bead strand, a piece of a clay pipe, a projectile point, a piece of carved stone, or a piece of mineral.

In the Irene mortuary population, there are no apparent associations among material accompaniments and different age and sex groups (Table 5.11, Table 5.12). An examination of several contingency tables summarizing the distribution of artifacts among identified males and females indicates that the inclusion of artifacts is independent of sex (see test statistics reported with Tables 5.11, .12). A similar examination of contingency tables of artifacts among different identified age groups also suggests that inclusion of artifacts was independent of age. Nevertheless, it is interesting that adults were interred with most of the material accompaniments. Few children and adolescents were interred with material objects; those children that were buried with an object were most often associated only with the vessel in which they were interred.

Moreover, there is no statistical association between the inclusion of material accompaniments and architectural features at the site (Table 5.13). A contingency table of the distribution of grave goods among the different architectural features at Irene suggests that the presence of mortuary accompaniments and burial context are independent (see test statistics reported with Table 5.13). This analysis, however, only assesses the distribution of accompaniments among separate features, such as the burial mound, platform mound, mortuary structure, etc.
Table 5.11. The number of Irene burials that were members of each sex category and that included associated mortuary accompaniments, in comparison to the number of burials in each sex category and that *did not* include accompaniments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Accompaniment(s)</th>
<th>No Accompaniment(s)</th>
<th>no data*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom = 4, Pearson ChiSq = 1.82; Prob > ChiSq = .77

* When “unidentified” and “no data” are removed from table, Degrees of Freedom = 1, Pearson ChiSq = .006, Prob > ChiSq = .94

Table 5.12. The number of Irene burials that were members of each age category and that included associated mortuary accompaniments, in comparison to the number of burials in each age category that *did not* include accompaniments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Accompaniment(s)</th>
<th>No Accompaniments</th>
<th>no data*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newborn/infant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom = 8, Pearson ChiSq = 10.57, Prob > ChiSq = .22

* With “no data” removed from table, Degrees of Freedom = 4, Pearson ChiSq = 8.139, Prob > ChiSq = .09

Table 5.13. The number of Irene burials that were placed in each burial context and that included associated mortuary accompaniments, in comparison to the number of burials placed in each context and that *did not* include accompaniments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial Context*</th>
<th>Accompaniment(s)</th>
<th>No Accompaniment(s)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burial Mound</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortuary Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortuary Enclosures</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Mound</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotunda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom = 5, Pearson ChiSq = 7.55, Prob > ChiSq = .18

* Burials that had no burial context data also had no identifiable artifact data. Those burials are excluded from this summary table.
There is qualitative evidence for the differential distribution of material accompaniments among mortuary deposits within particular architectural features. WPA excavations encountered unusual frequencies of items in deposits near the center of two prominent architectural features that date to the Savannah and Irene phases respectively. Some of these artifacts were rather unique. In addition, excavations documented two of the “richest” burials at the site at the center of two prominent features that date to the Irene phase: the mortuary structure and the rotunda.

The material accompaniments at the center of the burial mound likely served as part of a unique dedicatory deposit founding this monument to the dead in the early part of the Savannah phase. Caldwell and McCann (1941) noted the occurrence of artifacts in association with the secondary cremations buried in the pre-mound fill. They reported that four of the five cremations in the subsoil were associated with an object, and that most were associated with a pottery vessel (i.e., Some of these cremations were probably curated in the vessels.). In addition, the map of the burial mound depicts a number of upright vessels at the center of the mound; it appears that some of these vessels are upright vessels not associated with any one burial but with the deposit at large. One cremation burial contained a clay pipe and another included a conch shell cup, a ritualized object that was often used in the consumption of black drink (Merrill 2004: 47 - 49, Milanich 2004).

The material accompaniments in the mortuary structure were likely associated with the ritual activities that closed the structure and memorialized it to the spirits of the dead. Some objects, such as vessels set into the structure’s floor, were likely related to particular stages of body processing or interment associated with the structure’s final use. At the center of the mortuary, Caldwell and McCann (1941) reported five mostly intact vessels on the structure’s floor. In addition, there were numerous upright vessels in the intentional sand fill placed over the fill. Excavators also documented several other unique artifacts, including two celts, a turtle carapace, ocher, and graphite, in the mortuary fill. These vessels and other unique artifacts appeared to be part of the unique deposit that filled the center of the structure, and not associated with any one burial placed in the deposit’s fill.
In addition, a survey of burials that contain multiple objects and/or rare objects reveals an association among “richer” burials and important architectural contexts in the Irene phase. In fact, the two “richest” burials at Irene were placed near the center of prominent features. The context indicates that these burials were part of other significant ritual actions, and that the material accompaniments may not be simple grave goods directly associated with an individual.

One burial with many material accompaniments was placed in the mortuary structure fill, while another was interred in the center of the rotunda. Burial 32 was an adult male interred with more material objects than any other burial at Irene. He lay flexed at the center of the mortuary structure fill, and directly adjacent to Burial 53, who was placed in a mirrored position. This individual was buried with 5 celts, 4 stone discs, two polished pebbles, and a piece of engraved schist. Burial 217 was an individual of unknown age and sex who was missing his or her skull. The individual was placed flexed in the rotunda with nine projectile points, a net sinker, and an unusual piece of carved stone.

Finally, in the preliminary final report, Schaeffer et al (1939) reported a very unique mortuary accompaniment associated with a mortuary deposit in the Irene phase conical mound. He noted that an unworked stingray spine was found near to three burials placed in the final stage of Irene’s primary mound. Unfortunately, the details about this accompaniment and its association with mortuary contexts in the mound are not known. The final report does not list any accompaniments with this group of individuals interred in the conical mound.

Discussion

In the following discussion, I review the performance of mortuary ritual at the Irene Mounds site. I summarize the performances ritual actions to construct a complete picture of the multi-staged body processing and interment program. I use this interpretation of the multi-staged procedures to describe the social memories that surrounded the spirits of the dead.

Here, I synthesize the results of the statistical analyses on the archaeological data. I also attempt to situate the review in a broader regional context. The discussion considers additional archaeological data from other Mississippian period sites on the Georgia and South Carolina
coast. In addition, it supplements the archaeological interpretations with relevant ethnohistoric information about mortuary customs in the area.

I argue that the performance of mortuary ritual at Irene shaped ancestors. More specifically, I suggest that mortuary rituals created social memories about the continued presence and influence of select spirits in socio-political affairs. I demonstrate that mortuary rites included the protracted and specialized actions necessary to install an active spirit and continued interaction to maintain these spirits’ agency and influence.

The sections below describe the performance of a multi-staged body processing and burial program at Irene and other Mississippian polities along the Georgia and South Carolina coast. I consider 1) dedication of mortuary spaces, 2) extended body processing, 3) curation and display of remains, and 4) final interment and continued interactions. In the course of the description, I identify those stages that separate and install active spirits and that promote persistent interaction with these beings.

*Dedication of Spaces to Memorialize the Spirits of the Dead*

Residents of Mississippian period polities along the Georgia and South Carolina coast conducted mortuary rites that dedicated monuments and other features to the spirits of the dead. In essence, they created unique mortuary deposits that designated spaces for interaction with the dead and for interment of their remains. It is compelling that the creation of these deposits often involved fire.

In the early portion of the Savannah phase, people who occupied Irene fashioned a mortuary deposit to found the sand burial mound. They centered the deposit on secondary cremations, a relatively rare treatment type. They placed the cremains beneath and in a pre-mound cultural fill and a shell lens that formed the heart of the mound. In addition, several incomplete and/or partially disarticulated inhumations were interred in the central shell deposit. These remains, particularly the group of cremations, were associated with an unusual frequency of material accompaniments, including a rare conch shell cup (Caldwell and McCann 1941: 22).

Later, in the Irene phase, residents constructed a mortuary structure for processing and perhaps curating the remains of certain individuals (see below). After the structure’s use and
destruction in a fire, it was transformed into an active memorial for the spirits of the dead. It is possible that the fire that destroyed the structure was an intentional action to re-dedicate the space – to create and “activate” a memorial. Following the fire, a unique mortuary deposit formed in a low mound that covered the burned remnants of the structure. The deposit included complete, articulated individuals; incomplete, disarticulated sets of remains; isolated elements; and urns holding the fragmentary remains of infants and children.

Finally, the living may have placed a dedicatory mortuary deposit in the council house. A single cremation was interred in a shallow deposit at the center of the rotunda. Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine if this cremation was interred in the rotunda prior to the placement of other processed remains in the building.

The residents of other Mississippian towns in the Savannah/Ogeechee polity also created similar dedicatory deposits. Pluckhahn and McKivergan (2002: Table 1) argued that the polity included the Haven Home (9CH15) site and another site known as Middle Settlement. At the Haven Home (9CH15) site, Waring (1968b) documented a St. Catherine’s or Savannah I/II phase conical burial mound that resembled Irene’s burial mound. He reported a large secondary cremation deposit at the center of the mound. He (1968a: 212) suggested the cremations were the remains of multiple individuals who had been heavily processed – defleshed, and “saved either in a special mortuary house or in houses of individuals until the mound was ready to be started.” At Middle Settlement, located on the western end of Ossabaw Island, Moore (1897: 127) excavated a burial mound (Mound D) that was likely contemporaneous with Irene. He reported two thick layers of calcined bones at the heart of the mound. Both deposits were associated with a few unusual artifacts.

Extended Body Processing and Mortuary Structures

Residents living around Irene and in other coastal settlements conducted protracted ritual actions that transformed a small subset of the dead into active, influential spirits. The living likely exhumed some previously buried individuals; smoked and/or defleshed their remains; and then bundled or otherwise stored them in association with mortuary structures. It is possible that cremation represented an ultimate, complete stage of processing. In addition, people engaged in
some actions that continued interaction with these spirits beyond body processing. They also occasionally offered food and other votives to the resident spirits and sometimes displayed the processed remains of these dead.

In the Savannah phase, people subjected the remains of a small number of individuals to extended processing. WPA excavations did not identify a Savannah phase facility for processing remains, but it is likely that a facility or other processing features were in use. This facility would have been used to process and perhaps curate the limited number of bundled remains and other incomplete, disarticulated sets of remains that were eventually interred in the flanks of the burial mound. As Waring argued (1968b), mortuary architecture may have also been involved in the processing and curation of the cremations interred at the center of the mound.

In the Irene phase, the living continued this processing, and may have broadened or otherwise intensified it. The Irene mortuary structure was used to smoke, deflesh, and/or disarticulate and bundle select sets of remains. The disarticulated and partially burned remains on the floor of the structure likely represent an individual undergoing a smoking/defleshing process. It is possible that some of the individuals interred outside the structure, in association with the wood post rings, were awaiting exhumation and processing in the structure.

Wallace (1975) identified similar body processing activities in association with a mortuary structure at the Couper Field’s site, on the northern end of Saint Simon’s Island. His description of the structure can enhance interpretation of body processing at the Irene mortuary. Wallace identified 16 primary inhumations, articulated to partially articulated and tightly flexed, around the perimeter of the Couper Field’s structure. He suggested that shell deposits placed over a number of the burial features served as markers, possibly to assist exhumation of remains for processing and/or display, and as provisions for the deceased. Wallace also identified four empty features that contained only isolated fragments of bone. He proposed that the corpses had been exhumed. Finally, Wallace documented a concentration of shellfish and faunal bone at the northwest corner of the structure. He suggested that the concentration was evidence for feeding the dead in the structure. In fact, several ethnohistoric accounts note the placement of food and
drink in a house for the dead to ensure that the spirits had a daily meal (see Wallace 1975: 125-126).

Early Contact period narratives indicate that people also curated and displayed processed remains in mortuary structures along the Georgia and South Carolina coastline. Oviedo, who recorded portions of Lucas Vásquez de Ayllon’s expedition to the Savannah River area in 1526, described Historic period Guale mortuary architecture as “ceremonial mosques or temples”. There, ritual specialists kept

many bones of the deceased, those of children and infants separated from those of the adults; and these are as ossuaries or burying places of the common people, for those of the principal men are kept apart in a chapel or temple separated from the other community, and also on small islands. And those houses or temples have walls of lime and stone (the lime being made of sea oyster shells); and these are as much as an estado and a half high about 3 meters; and above this estado and a half is made of the wood of pines, which are plentiful (Oviedo y Valdés, Gonzalo Fernández de 1959, L. XXXVII, C. iii, p. 328, in Jones 1978: 199).

In 1597, after he returned from capture, Father Arias de Avila reported another mortuary structure on the Altamaha River in a Salchchihes village named Tulufina. He recounted that “they tried to make me serve in cleaning the house of the demon, for such we call it. They, however, call it a tomb. There they place food and drink for the dead which the dead are supposed to find at the morning meal. The Indians believe that the dead eat this food” (Father Avila's relation in Oře 1936: 91).

Curation and Display of Heavily Processed Remains in Lived Spaces

Residents of coastal Mississippian polities engaged in ritual actions that promoted persistent interactions with active spirits in important places where people gathered. Although it is difficult to determine if these kinds of interactions occurred in the Savannah phase, there is mounting archaeological evidence that these ritual acts took place in the later Irene phase. People likely curated, displayed, and/or handled processed remains in council houses at politically important towns.

At Irene, WPA excavations documented several burials near the center of the council house. Most of the remains had been heavily processed. The burials included a secondary
cremation, one inhumation that was partially burned, and several others that were incomplete and disarticulated.

Wallace (1975: 143 and 162) reported a similar pattern at the Indian Fields site. He described “burials [that] are indicative of temporary interment in a mortuary followed by subsequent reburial at a site of the living,” or a council house. He documented a few primary, extended inhumations and several secondary burials in association with a moderate-sized, curvilinear structure that he called a pavilion. One burial feature contained the remains of at least 13 individuals, some of which were only partially represented. Although historic plowing had disturbed this feature, it is likely that this communal deposit consisted of partially complete persons interred in secondary contexts. At least two of the bundle burials found in the structure bore evidence of cut-marks consistent with defleshing.

Final Interment and Burial Mounds

Residents living around Irene conducted many final interments in conical burial mounds and in other non-mound contexts. They placed remains that represented the full range of multi-staged processing program in mounds – from those that had been heavily processed, to those that were lightly prepared just prior to burial. There is some evidence that remains which received extended processing were interred in separate places within the mound than those that did not receive these treatments.

In both the Savannah and Irene phases, people buried a small number of heavily processed remains and a relatively large number of moderately to lightly treated remains in the burial mound. In general, excavations encountered several incomplete, disarticulated and/or bundled sets of remains in the flanks of the mound layers. The majority of the burials that were placed in the body of the mound were complete, articulated remains, often arranged in flexed positions.

In the Irene phase, the living placed a substantial number of burials that may have represented final interments in two concentric rings around the mortuary structure. Many of these burials held complete, articulated individuals, and were sealed with an unusual clay cap.
However, it is possible that at least some of these burials were actually curated. In other words, they may have been awaiting additional processing in the mortuary.

Finally, the WPA excavations at Irene found a number of final interments in non-mound, extramural contexts throughout the site. Although excavation records did not often document these burials thoroughly, available evidence suggests that they were simple final interments. Most contained the remains of relatively complete, articulated individuals.

Residents in other towns within the Savannah/Ogeechee polity, and in many other Mississippian villages on the Georgia and Carolina coast, performed final interments in local burial mounds as well. At the Haven Home (9CH15) site, Waring (1968a) documented the excavation of 44 burials in the St. Catherine’s or Savannah I/II phase conical burial mound discussed above. Flexed inhumations, both articulated and partially disarticulated, were placed in a sand fill that surrounded and covered a central shell deposit. A cremation deposit was interred beneath the central shell layer. Approximately one-third of the flexed individuals were associated with material accompaniments. Similar to Irene, one individual was interred with a conch shell cup in the northern flank of the mound. Moreover, Anderson (1994: 171) reported that a number of the inhumations were covered with hematite.

At Middle Settlement, Mound D, Moore (1897: 89 - 130) described the interment of individuals who had received a wide diversity of body treatments. He referred to the treatments as “the curious forms of burial prevalent on the Georgia coast.” He recorded articulated, extended inhumations; articulated and partially articulated, flexed inhumations; bundled remains; isolated skulls and postcranial remains; “layers of calcined human bones; uncremated infant skeletons buried in jars; incinerated remains of single infants in urns; and jars filled with incinerated remains, the results of a general cremation” (Moore 1897: 127). In addition to the burial of human remains, Moore reported a substantial number of dogs buried in the mound in separate, individual deposits.

Finally, Wallace (1975) reported primary, flexed burials in a late prehistoric/Protohistoric period mound at the Taylor Mound site. The mound was a low feature that consisted of a shaped shell core surrounded by layers of sand fill. He noted that the burial treatment was rather
homogenous. Wallace (1975) presented additional evidence that prehistoric peoples performed repeated ceremonies at mounds like the Taylor Mound during multiple times of the year.

Ethnohistoric evidence suggests that people performed additional ritual activities that involved continued interaction with remains at burial mounds. They likely held repeated memorial ceremonies at the mounds, perhaps during multiple times of the year. The Spanish archivist Peter Martyr D’Anghera (in Swanton 1922: 44 - 54) described a ceremonial event that involved exhumation of a burial and re-interment in a burial mound. He wrote that

[t]he natives celebrate a [third] festival, during which, after exhuming a long buried skeleton, they erect a black tent out in the country, leaving one end open so that the sky is visible; upon a blanket placed in the center of the tent they then spread out the bones. Only women surround the tent, all of them weeping, and each of them offers such gifts as she can afford. The following day the bones are carried to the tomb and are henceforth considered sacred. As soon as they are buried, or everything is ready for their burial, the chief priest addresses the surrounding people from the summit of a mound, upon which he fulfills the functions of orator. Ordinarily, he pronounces a eulogy on the deceased, or on the immortality of the soul or the future life. He says that souls originally came from the icy regions of the north, where perpetual snow prevails. They, therefore, expiate their sins under the master of that region who is called Maleczungua, but they return to the southern regions, where another great sovereign, Quexuga, governs. Quexuga is lame and is of a sweet and generous disposition. He surrounds the newly arrived souls with numberless attentions, and with him they enjoy a thousand delights; young girls sing and dance, parents are reunited to children, and everything one formerly loved is enjoyed. The old grow young and everybody is of the same age, occupied only in giving himself up to joy and pleasure.

Conclusions

I contend that the performance of mortuary ritual at the Irene Mounds site crafted ancestors. People that lived in or near Irene conducted a multi-staged body processing and burial program that shaped social memories of active, influential spirits of the dead. Select lineages reserved protracted treatments for the elect members of the dead, whose remains were likely curated, displayed, and even handled. They memorialized and continued interactions with the spirits at prominent monuments and venues constructed on the site.

In this final section, I argue that ancestors were influential in local political factions throughout Irene's history. I contend that they served as powerful allies to leading lineages competing for power and influence in the Savannah phase. The spirits then became influential in decision-making bodies in the Irene phase.
Foremost, I situate the spirits of the dead and interaction with them within a political history of Irene. I use Thompson’s (2009) recent interpretations of Irene’s political developments. This discussion suggests that elite lineages maintained highly restricted relationships with ancestors in the Savannah phase. A leader’s and/or lineage’s access to these beings influenced them with powerful supernatural allies at this highly competitive time. Later, select lineage’s relations with ancestors appear to have formalized, even broadened in the Irene phase. This broadening of interactions likely reflected the expansion of leadership positions and the emergence of formal group decision-making in councils within coastal polities. The spirits’ took influential positions in these decision-making bodies as well.

Second, I propose that the ancestors’ formal positions and roles in political decision-making bodies were materialized in an active mortuary deposit. The living may have created a council-house of the dead at some time during the Irene phase. This scene forever memorialized the influence that the spirits wielded in socio-political affairs.

*The Ancestors Place in Irene’s Political History*

Beginning in the Savannah phase (AD 1150 – 1300), Irene served as a civic/ritual center of a loosely integrated polity on the north Georgia coastline. Current archaeological data suggest that the site was a chiefly compound and/or a civic ceremonial center for surrounding populations, predominantly those who participated in polity affairs and events (Anderson 1994, Depratter 1991, Larson 1980, Thompson 2009, Williams 1995). Regardless if the Irene site did include an attached village, the architectural features and remains of mortuary ritual at the heart of the site establish it as an important focal point of civic/ceremonial activities and a locus for important communal gatherings.

Thompson (2009) suggested that, during the Savannah phase, a local lineage or small subset of lineages constructed a low mound and ceremonial structure to establish the location as the seat of a defined local polity. As the lineage leaders engaged in social competition to strengthen and grow the polity, as leadership changed hands through generations, and as calendric ritual events were practiced over the years, local people constructed new temple
structures atop new mound stages. According to Anderson (1994), the new temple complex/chiefly residence atop mound stages are primarily representative of cycles in leadership.

This local lineage likely began exclusive relationships with potent spirits of the dead at the very beginning of the polity’s founding. Foremost, the ceremonial houses that were eventually raised atop the platform mound likely housed or at least referenced remains of select dead. Archaeological and ethnohistoric evidence from many places on the Southeastern coast and other parts of the Mississippian world indicate that these houses were associated with processed remains (see discussion above and discussion in Chapter 7). They frequently held icons of supernatural beings and ancestors, other ritual paraphernalia, and the defleshed remains of select, important dead.

Residents living at or near Irene interred the remains of heavily processed individuals and other, lightly treated individuals in a conical burial mound. An elite lineage may have selected Irene for the construction of a ceremonial house and mound complex because it was the site of a previously dedicated burial monument (mound). If this interpretation is correct, then the secondary cremation deposit at the center of the mound may represent an earlier (possibly late Woodland period) body treatment and burial pattern. Mississippian populations enhanced the potency and activity of their dead by placing them in these cumulative mounds. The mounds likely connected lineage spirits and family histories to long-term occupational histories of the landscape.

Alternatively, a lineage or set of lineages founded the monument themselves in the early Savannah period. Thus, the secondary cremation deposit at the center of the burial mound served as a powerful dedicatory deposit. It consecrated the monument as a space for active spirits of the dead.

Regardless of the burial sequence, though, available archaeological and ethnohistoric data indicate that elite lineages dedicated coastal burial mounds to the remembrance of active, influential dead. A principle lineage or a small subset interred the remains of heavily processed and lightly treated dead in the mound throughout the Savannah phase. It is plausible that burial in the mound’s successive shell layers corresponds to the platform mound’s stages. In particular, it
is possible that burial episodes correspond to the use and eventual decommissioning of a ceremonial structure atop the mound. In addition to burial, the mound likely served as venues for rituals that continued interaction with the spirits that inhabited it (e.g., Wallace 1975, Peter Martyr D'Anghera's account in Swanton 1922).

Thompson (2009) further proposed that local lineages established and formalized their power among local settlements in the Irene phase. As a result, leadership positions and roles expanded, and the new roles became available to larger segments of people in the polity. These positions more closely resembled the variety of Historic Contact period Guale offices and positions than Savannah phase leadership did. Thompson (2009) cited the construction of the large council house as evidence that increasing numbers of people had a hand in polity civic and ritual matters. In particular, he argued that council houses were highly structured places where all manner of civic and ritual officials from across a polity gather together.

Elite lineages appear to have formalized and broadened their relationships with ancestors during this time. They intensified these relations by enhancing the Savannah phase multi-staged program. Heavily processed remains, and presumably the spirits themselves, were now associated with an elaborate mortuary structure, a large conical mound, and even the council house. It is rather compelling that the arrangement of mortuary deposits in the Irene phase not only resembles the arrangement of burials in the Savannah phase burial mound, but also mimics the layout of a council.

In the Irene phase, the primary residence for the spirits of the dead shifted to the mortuary structure. Inside, select people – likely leaders and ritual specialists – processed and interacted with the remains of elect members of the dead. Archaeological evidence suggests that processing included interment and exhumation, smoking the body to dry the flesh, and/or defleshing. It is also possible that the structure was used to curate, display, and handle processed remains in various ritualized acts. Hopefully, future research can ascertain whether the structure was in use only for a single generation or for multiple generations. Estimation of the structure’s use-life is critical to alternative interpretations of political control.
When the structure burned, perhaps intentionally, the living dedicated the space to these active spirits of the dead. The unique mortuary deposit and low sand mound at the center of the burned structure indicate that the deposit represents a significant ritual event. I suggest that the arrangement of remains and artifacts created a memorial scene that manifested the action and influence that these spirits held in the community.

The burials outside the structure, arranged in two concentric rings around wood post lines, likely contained the remains of the increasing number of individuals who held important positions and roles in the Irene phase polity. These individuals were either not selected for complete body processing and/or display, or they waiting further processing inside the structure (See Anderson 1994, Caldwell and McCann 1941, and Thompson 2009 for discussions about the relative chronology of the mortuary structure and the burials outside the structure.). Comparison to archaeological evidence in other coastal settlements suggests that some burials were, in fact, curated, and would have been exhumed later for smoking, defleshing, and/or disarticulation (see Wallace 1975). Regardless of the chronologic sequence, these dead were still accorded a place among remembered, active spirits. These members of the dead were positioned in a space in which they could participate with (possibly watch or even guard) the highly active dead called upon inside the structure.

Several highly select spirits likely resided in Irene’s primary mound by the middle or late Irene phase. The lineages occupying Irene transformed the platform mound into a highly visible conical burial mound, and placed the remains of two groups of individuals in the mound. Both groups consisted of two nearly complete individuals and one individual missing a skull. At least one of the two groups was placed atop a prepared apron of shell. Although the excavation notes do not record any data on material accompaniments, one report suggests that one of the individuals was buried with a stingray spine. Thus, these groups of inhumations affirmed the mound as a large, highly visible memorial to elect spirits of the dead and their history of influence in the local polity.

Finally, the living interacted with influential spirits in the council house during the Irene phase. The remains of several heavily processed individuals and one inhumation with an unusual
set of material accompaniments were found near the center of the structure. Thus, the dead were physically a part of the ritual and political actions that occurred in that lived space.

**A Council of Influential Spirits**

Irene’s ancestors were active members of local lineages and factions that competed for social power through the polity’s history. In addition, these spirits may have influenced and intervened in decision-making. They were likely active in Irene phase councils.

I suggest that the Irene phase mortuary was transformed into a “council house for the dead” (Figure 5.16). The mortuary deposit that was created in the burned remains of the mortuary and its surrounding henges was arranged in the layout of a council, which have been documented in several late Mississippian period towns on the Southeastern coast. The center of the mortuary structure was a ritualized space where performance occurred, where ritual specialists performed rote actions and interacted with the supernatural (other potential actors). After it burned, a unique mortuary deposit with active figures and rare objects formed in the fill placed over the structure’s remains. Ethnohistoric accounts of council houses on the Georgia and north Florida coast suggest that the structures were theaters in the round, with ritual actions and performances in the open center (Shapiro and Hann 1990, Thompson 2009, Worth 1998).

The surrounding burials, arranged in two large circles with associated wood posts, are participants, like additional associated witnesses, to the important ritual actions and events at the center. Historic Contact period descriptions and some archaeological data have documented that most council houses contained rings of benches on which audience members sat to participate in ritual events and other gatherings (Shapiro and Hann 1990). Seating arrangements on the benches were highly structured; they were often determined by an individual’s position and/or rank.
In addition to similar arrangements, there is evidence that mortuary ritual was spatially allocated across both the mortuary structure and the rotunda. There is some archaeological evidence that, at Irene and other coastal towns, the living processed remains in a mortuary structure, removed them, and curated them in association with a council (see Wallace 1975). Perhaps Irene phase residents were performing ceremonial actions to create parallel deposits at the center of the mortuary structure and the council house. In other words, perhaps they were integrating a council house of the dead with the council for the living.
Chapter 5 Notes

1 These authors cite evidence that a single post hole from the inner enclosure was placed inside the mortuary structure entranceway. However, the published map of the mortuary displays the post hole outline of an another structure in the eastern end of this mortuary complex (outlined in orange in Figure 5.7). The western posthole alignment of this structure intersects the inner enclosure very near to the mortuary structure entranceway. It is entirely possible that the post hole in the entranceway belongs to this structure, which Anderson (1994: Figure 24) interprets as an earlier structure.

2 Ten of the vessels found in the rotunda were covered by inverted Irene Plain or Irene Incised bowls. Thirteen of the vessels were empty. One vessel contained a plain ware bottle, and another held the remains of an infant. Anderson (1994: 184) refuted Caldwell and McCann’s (1941: 31) argument that most of the vessels contained human remains that deteriorated, because most of the vessels were covered. He and Thompson (2009) suggested that these vessels may have been used to store ceremonial items or foods, such as black drink.

3 Stojanowski worked briefly with Griffin to retrieve the Irene age and sex estimates from the compressed data tables published in his dissertation. Stojanowski combined some of his demographic data with Griffin’s to create an updated demographic data set. I am grateful to Stojanowski for sharing this demographic data with me.

4 It is likely that Hulse’s original age and sex assignments are stored in notes with the Smithsonian Institution Collections in Suitland, MD or at the Georgia Historical Society in Savannah, GA. Hulse’s estimations and those of other researchers should be aggregated and stored together with existing collections for future research.

5 The Irene mortuary database contains data for 13 inhumations and only two urn burials. I collected these data from excavation and analysis notes. In the final report, Caldwell and McCann (1940: 27) state that there were at least 21 urn burials in the sand fill at the center of the mortuary. They write, “Twenty-five vessels were found in the fill. At least twenty-one of these represented urn burials. In most of them traces of bone were found which, when identifiable, proved to be those of infants or children. In others the bones seemed to have been completely disintegrated.

6 The Irene mortuary database contains data for only urn burial of an infant in the rotunda. I collected the data from excavation and analysis notes. In the final report, Caldwell and McCann (1940: 31) state that there were “[f]ifteen upright pottery vessels, presumably urn burials, were found in the same locality [in the center of the rotunda]. Ten of these had inverted cover vessels. Infant bones were found in only of them.”
During the late prehistoric and Protohistoric periods (ca 1400 – 1600), people in the Zuni area of New Mexico aggregated into large, nucleated towns in the Zuni River floodplain, along the southern reaches of the river. Current research suggests that local and non-local populations, from different parts of the American Southwest, coalesced to form what archaeologists recognize as Protohistoric communities (e.g., Gregory and Wilcox 2007; see also Huntley and Kintigh 2004, Kintigh 1985). People brought their mortuary traditions with them as they moved into these large towns. They performed mortuary rituals that memorialized particular aspects of social and familial membership, such as social and ritual responsibilities to these groups and to the community at large.

I contend that residents of late prehistoric and Protohistoric period Zuni villages performed mortuary rituals that created ancestral spirits and anonymous groups of long dead. Based on archaeological and ethnographic evidence, I argue that these ancestral spirits and long-dead curated social group and family histories and perpetuated their social and ritual responsibilities. The spirits played important roles in the formation of new community identities within Protohistoric Zuni towns. People’s relationships with these beings preserved the individual and collective pasts that shaped Protohistoric towns. Moreover, these relationships reinforced the social and ritual responsibilities that these groups contributed to form new communities.

The first portion of the chapter discusses the population history that shaped late prehistoric Zuni mortuary ritual. The discussion demonstrates that major social transformations led to the coalescence of different social groups into massive towns along the Zuni River. The aggregation of separate groups into single communities accounts for the simultaneous performance of an inhumation and a burial cremation program in these villages. It suggests that the performance of these two mortuary programs should be analyzed separately, yet still interpreted together (i.e., as part of the same community.).
I also provide a summary of the occupational context of the mortuary programs at both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. Discussion focuses on previous research that has described mortuary ritual and burial patterns at the two villages. Howell’s (1994a, 1994b, 1995, 1996, see also Howell and Kintigh 1996, 1998) and Kintigh’s (2000) extensive work with the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary records forms a solid foundation for the analysis presented here. These authors demonstrated that residents of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa performed mortuary rituals that highlighted particular aspects of the deceased’s social memberships and identities.

In the second part of the chapter, I conduct an analysis of mortuary ritual at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa during the Protohistoric period. The analysis examines archaeological data from the mortuary record in a series of multivariate statistical procedures. Similar to the previous analysis at the Irene Mounds site, I assess body treatment, mortuary facilities, burial accompaniments, and mortuary spaces. I evaluate these ritual elements to interpret the social memories surrounding the spirits of the dead. I then create a composite of these memories to characterize the identities of the spirits at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa.

To close the chapter, I place the performance of mortuary ritual and the social identities of the spirits in a broader cultural context, on the Zuni cultural landscape. Here, I situate Zuni’s ancestral spirits in relevant ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts about the place of the spirits and people’s relationships with them. I supplement the archaeological analyses with this information to understand more fully the roles of the spirits in Protohistoric and Historic period Zuni communities. These accounts and traditional stories and knowledge help us to appreciate the spirits as important agents in the Zuni world and within Zuni cosmology.

Late Prehistoric and Historic Population History of the Zuni Area

The population history of the greater Cibola area, which surrounds Zuni, profoundly influenced the performance of mortuary ritual in late prehistoric and Protohistoric period Zuni villages (Figure 6.1). One of the most dramatic and widespread social transformations in the Southwest swept through the region during the latter part of prehistory and into the early portion of the Protohistoric era (Peeples 2011). It resulted in multiple social groups consolidating into large, nucleated communities. Ultimately, this historical process culminated in the vast majority of
the regional population residing in only nine massive settlements along the Zuni River. Such a
dramatic aggregation indicates that people with different backgrounds and ritual customs
inhabited the same communities.

In the following discussion, I demonstrate that social groups with different mortuary ritual
and burial traditions lived side by side in Protohistoric era Zuni settlements. I contend that the
coalescence of different social groups into these large, agglomerated towns likely explains the
performance of both an inhumation and a cremation mortuary program in these communities
between approximately AD 1400 and 1600. Following other researchers, I contend that local,
northern Cibola area social groups conducted inhumation mortuary programs. Interestingly,
earlier prehistoric coalescence of these groups likely contributed to some of the variation that is
discernible among inhumation ritual procedures at Protohistoric towns. Newly arrived immigrant
populations performed cremation programs to inter their dead. These social groups probably
moved from southern and western areas of Cibola into Protohistoric Zuni towns as the
depopulation of the region accelerated around AD 1400 and concentrated along the Zuni River.

This discussion relies primarily on Peeples (2011) thorough treatment of the social
transformation that shaped the population history of the Cibola region and led to the formation of
Historic period Zuni. He illustrated that social groups who lived in thousands of dispersed
roomblocks and who interacted on a relatively frequent basis coalesced into dozens of large,
aggregated villages over the course of one or two generations. As inhabitants of the Zuni area
actively shaped new shared identities and social boundaries, they founded a small number of
nucleated towns. Regional populations funneled into these towns, and Zuni developed a
distinctive regional identity.
The Cibola Area and the Historical Development of Zuni

The Cibola area is the landscape in northern Arizona and New Mexico that represents the ancestral homeland of the Zuni (A:shiwi) people (Figure 6.2). This area includes the traditional lands of Zuni sovereignty and many named locations that are mentioned in Zuni migration oral traditions and other stories (Peeples 2011: 47). Here, I adopt a definition that permits a
widespread description of the population histories that led to the formation of Protohistoric Zuni towns.

Peeples (2011) argued that the Cibola area is most accurately defined in a broad sense, such that it accounts for fluctuating social boundaries through time. He envisioned the area as “a useful archaeological construct but not necessarily a cultural designation” (Peeples 2011: 48). In other words, he delimited the area to include broad patterns in material culture that ultimately resulted in the formation of a recognizable Zuni cultural district.

In his work, Peeples (2011) used several major geographic features to bound the Cibola region. The northern boundary is formed by the Rio Puerco of the West. The eastern boundary is delimited by Cebolleta Mesa. The southern boundary extends to the Mogollon Highlands along the San Francisco and Blue River valleys. Finally, the western boundary is defined by a somewhat arbitrary north-south line that runs from Holbrook, Arizona to the Forestdale Valley and areas below the Mogollon rim.

The greater Cibola area can be divided into smaller sub-regions that generally correspond to archaeological districts referenced in the literature (see Figure 6.2). Peeples (2011: 50 - 52 ) defined and named eight central districts and several peripheral sub-regions based on concentrations of major prehistoric sites (i.e., sites with more than 50 rooms). I concentrate this discussion on northern Cibola districts where prehistoric events most directly impacted the development of Protohistoric Zuni towns: 1) El Morro Valley, 2) Pescado Basin, 3) west Zuni, 4) Mariana Mesa, 5) Cebolleta Mesa, and 6) portions of the Puerco Valley.

During the latter part of the Pueblo IV period (AD 1325 - 1400) and the Protohistoric period (AD 1400 - 1600), Cibola area populations moved out of most settlements in these districts and into a few heavily populated places. I refer to the central Zuni district as the area around the Zuni River that was intensively occupied through the Protohistoric and into the Historic period. This is the immediate area recognized as Historic and contemporary Zuni.
The Late Pueblo III and Pueblo IV periods: Nucleated Communities and an Emerging Zuni Regional Identity

During the late Pueblo III to Pueblo IV period transition, there was a widespread social transformation that encompassed settlements throughout the Cibola region. The transformation involved the aggregation of separate, but highly interconnected social groups into nucleated communities, particularly in the northern Cibola area in and around Zuni. In the middle of the thirteenth century AD, local populations lived in small roomblocks often organized into tightly spaced clusters. By the end of the century, however, nearly everyone lived in one of approximately 40 large towns.
It is important to recognize that the consolidation of regional and local populations into these nucleated towns created new kinds of integrated communities, which dramatically enlarged the scale of social dynamics. Inhabitants of large towns in the Zuni area began to develop and express new shared social identities and to delimit regional social boundaries. These processes set the stage for the further reconsolidation of regional populations into massive, agglomerated towns later in the Protohistoric period.

*The Pueblo III period to Pueblo IV period transition.*

The Pueblo III to Pueblo period transition was epitomized by a significant increase in the scope of residential communities throughout the Cibola area (Peeples 2011: 73). Regional and local populations resided in larger and more aggregated settlements in the AD 1200’s than in the preceding century. This initial aggregation eventually led to the formation of large, nucleated villages by approximately AD 1275.

Across the Cibola area, populations grew during the thirteenth century (Kintigh 2007, Kintigh et al. 2004, Spier 1917, 1918). Much of the growth can be attributed to internal rises in local populations, while other increases, particularly in the southern and western regions, resulted from immigration. In the northern Cibola area, there were substantial rises in population levels in high elevation areas such as the El Morro Valley, Cebolleta Mesa, and Mariana Mesa (Danson 1957, Dittert 1959). Most notably, there was a large influx of people into the largely unoccupied El Morro Valley (Schachner 2007, Watson et al. 1980). Prior to AD 1225 or 1250, the El Morro Valley was not intensively settled. An immense number of rooms was constructed in the valley in a very short time. It is likely that a high degree of household residential mobility resulted in the construction of many small roomblocks clustered together throughout the Zuni landscape (Schachner 2007).

At both the regional and local levels, settlement organizations were rather diverse as population levels increased (see Peeples 2011: 70 - 72). In general, local populations in the northern and southern portions of the Cibola area lived in small roomblocks that were clustered together, often around large architectural features (Fowler et al. 1987, Kintigh et al. 1996, 2004, Saitta 1994). Roomblock clusters in northern areas typically contained between 100 and 500
rooms, while those in the south contained between 15 and 100 rooms. Slightly later in time, inhabitants of some portions of southern Cibola constructed large roomblocks, with 50 to 100 rooms, which grew accretionally (Lekson 1996, Reid et al. 1996).

During the middle portion of AD 1200’s, local populations in the northern Cibola area constructed large residential communities that consisted of closely spaced roomblock clusters. In the Zuni district, Mariana Mesa, Cebolleta Mesa, and Puerco Valley, settlements typically aggregated around large structures that referenced Chacoan architectural elements (Cameron and Duff 2008, Duff and Lekson 2006, Fowler et al. 1987, Kintigh et al. 1996). These structures included great houses, blocked-in great kivas, circular great kivas, berms, and associated roads. Presumably, the roomblock groups and prominent central features represented concentrations of social groups and/or households into aggregated residential communities.

By the Early Pueblo IV period (AD 1275 – 1325), inhabitants of the greater Cibola area began living in very large, nucleated villages, many of which were enclosed in a single structure (see Peeples 2011: 73 - 74). The earliest nucleated towns were likely constructed in the last few decades of the Pueblo III period, and overlapped in time with some of the roomblock cluster communities (Duff 2002, Duff and Schachner 2007). The simultaneous occupation of nucleated villages and small roomblock clusters in some portions of the Cibola area, most notably the El Morro Valley, indicates that the change in settlement happened in different ways at the local community level (Schachner 2007). However, by AD 1300, this new kind of settlement dominated the landscape throughout the Cibola area. Nearly everyone who inhabited this portion of the Southwest lived in a nucleated town (Peeples 2011: 83 - 84).

The form of these large towns varied considerably across the greater Cibola region. Villages in the northern Cibola area were built in planned layouts, often with distinct shapes (Huntley and Kintigh 2004, Kintigh 1985, Kintigh et al. 2004, Watson et al. 1980). Some of the earliest nucleated towns were seemingly constructed to consolidate multiple, smaller settlement groups into one structure; they contained over 1,000 rooms. In contrast, many villages in the southern and western portions of Cibola were agglomerations of roomblocks, presumably built
accretionally (Peeples 2011: 77). They incorporated plazas and courtyards into their layouts as they grew.

In the Zuni River Valley, the El Morro Valley, and along the Puerco, villages were rapidly constructed in coordinated labor efforts. They were very large structures with pre-arranged footprints and construction patterns (Kintigh 1985, Kintigh et al. 2004, Watson et al. 1980). They appear to have been built as single units, with cell-like rooms, oriented around a central plaza. Moreover, most were constructed in distinctive square and oval shapes. Additional settlement pattern and ceramic production data suggest that there were differences among the resident social groups of large, nucleated towns in the El Morro Valley area (Huntley and Kintigh 2004, Potter 1997).

While community forms and scale were changing at the local level, social boundaries and identities were forming at a regional scale. During the late Pueblo III and early Pueblo IV periods, there were major changes in ceramic design and technology that indicate the growing importance of regional boundaries among inhabitants of different Cibola districts (Peeples 2011: 78 - 79). A transition to glaze-painted ceramics in eastern Cibola and a divergence in painted designs on polychrome vessels seemingly separated eastern and western Cibola potting traditions (see Fenn et al. 2006, Huntley 2006). Most notably, Zuni glaze wares became the predominate tradition along the Zuni River Valley, while the late White Mountain series was the most common design style in the Silver Creek district and Arizona Mountains to the west of Zuni.

Late Pueblo IV period (AD 1325 –1400).
Throughout the remainder of the Pueblo IV period, inhabitants of the Cibola area continued to reside in large, nucleated towns. In fact, settlement contracted into fewer sub-areas than previous occupational periods. Local and regional populations began to move into massive Protohistoric towns toward the end of the period, as another major population shift took shape.

In general, the total occupied space throughout the region decreased during the fourteenth century. Some districts in the southern part of the Cibola area – such as Cebolleta Mesa, Mariana Mesa, and the Mogollon Highlands – were likely depopulated between AD 1325 and 1350 (Peeples 2011: 79, see also Dittert 1959, McGimsey 1980, Roney 1996). Increasingly
limited areas around the Zuni River, the Upper Little Colorado, and Silver creek continued to be occupied through the late Pueblo IV period. By the end of the fourteenth century, the Zuni and Acoma areas were the only intensively occupied parts of the Cibola region (Duff 2002).

This regional restriction in residential space was related to processes of population nucleation and decreases in the population growth rate. There is no evidence for substantial emigration from the Cibola area. Instead, there is a gradual decrease in the number of rooms inhabited throughout the region during the fourteenth century (Kintigh 1985, Wilcox et al. 2007). In addition, local populations continued to aggregate into large residential communities.

Local populations lived almost exclusively in nucleated villages throughout the Pueblo IV period. Several large pueblos that were established early in the fourteenth century continued to be occupied, but some were extensively remodeled (Duff 2004, Huntley and Kintigh 2004). Many of these large pueblos, though, housed resident social groups for only a single generation (Kintigh 1985). Local residential populations shifted as small numbers of new settlements were constructed in the later portion of the Pueblo IV period.

The movement of regional populations into the Zuni and Acoma areas, and the consolidation of local populations into nucleated villages accelerated toward the close of the Pueblo IV period (Peeples 2011: 81). Perhaps, as populations declined in local districts, movement into aggregated towns increased. This process ultimately culminated in the occupation of very large, agglomerated Protohistoric towns.

**Pueblo IV Communities: Multiple Social Groups with New Shared Identities.**

The Pueblo III to Pueblo IV period transition involved dramatic local and regional changes in the scale of social relations throughout the Cibola area. At the local level, it encompassed the consolidation of multiple social groups who interacted frequently into nucleated settlements. At the regional level, it entailed the development of new shared identities and social boundaries.

Peeples' (2011) dissertation research thoroughly documented these patterns. His work examined the Pueblo III to Pueblo IV social transformation across the Cibola area to trace changes in social identification. He used considerations of ceramic production and exchange, ceramic design styles, and architectural forms to outline social interactions among individuals and
among larger social groups to which people belonged. His research indicated that, although
social interactions among individuals remained consistent through the transition, there were
notable changes in the nature and scale of these interactions. At the same time, there were
dramatic increases in the expression of new social identities and boundaries in some parts of
Cibola, particularly in the northern areas.

Peeples (2011) suggested that, in the Zuni area, groups of people who interacted
frequently during the AD 1200’s established the large nucleated settlements. The novel
organization of these towns likely contributed to condensing social interactions even further. At
the same time, the people who lived in Zuni area towns increasingly expressed new group
identities and marked social boundaries that separated the locale from other communities and
regions. Among settlements along the Zuni River Valley and in the El Morro Valley, there was a
homogenization of ceramic design and the construction of new community forms that were
distinctly different from those in other parts of the Cibola area.

This historical process set the stage for the formation of very large, agglomerated villages
during the Protohistoric era. As residential settlement declined in local districts throughout Cibola,
regional populations concentrated into a small number of towns in the immediate Zuni, Acoma,
and Hopi areas. Inhabitants of these towns continued to develop and express regionally distinct
social identities.

The Protohistoric Period (AD 1350/1400 – 1600)

The early part of the Protohistoric era marks another substantial transformation in
settlement and social organization in the greater Cibola area. Populations coalesced even further
into a few settled districts, which would become Historic Zuni, Acoma, and Hopi. A number of
researchers have suggested that local Zuni area residents and newly arrived social groups
coalesced into pueblos along the Zuni River; local and non-local groups subsequently negotiated
a new pan-Zuni identity (e.g., Kintigh 2007, Mills 2007a, Schachner 2006). The detailed
contributions to the Zuni Origins (2007) volume illustrate scholarly investment in understanding
how local and non-local peoples came together to form Historic period and modern day Zuni
communities. In addition to anthropological understandings, traditional knowledge about the
origins of the contemporary A:shiwi (Zuni people) recounts the coalescence of different social
groups at the center place, around modern-day Zuni pueblo.

During the Protohistoric era, the formation of a Zuni regional social identity, which was
distinct from other settlements at Acoma and Hopi, came into sharp focus. Archaeological
evidence suggests that the people who moved into and inhabited large towns developed new
shared identities and perceptions of community (see Mills 2007a, Peeples 2011, Schachner
2006). This process of population coalescence and regional identity formation in Protohistoric
towns has also been documented to the west along the Hopi mesas (Adams et al. 2004). It is
likely that similar historical events took place at Acoma as well (see Dittert 1998).

Across the Pueblo IV to Protohistoric transition, abrupt changes in settlement
concentrations and arrangement mark significant re-configurations of communities throughout the
Cibola area. The depopulation of most settlement districts in the region accelerated. Northern
Cibola populations abandoned nucleated towns in the El Morro Valley and Pescado Springs
districts. At the same time, residential populations dramatically increased in the core Zuni area
along the Zuni River. A few large villages were established downstream of previous settlements,
in the middle and southern reaches of the river (Huntley and Kintigh 2004, Kintigh 2007, Kintigh
1985). These villages were not planned. Rather, they were massed clusters of roomblocks, which
grew over time. Moreover, the shift in village location from previous settlement likely entailed a
substantial change in subsistence practices to floodplain agriculture (Kintigh 1985).

Protohistoric period populations founded nine very large towns along the course of the
Zuni River (Figure 6.3). Kintigh (2007: 371) demonstrated that there were two subclusters of
villages, an upstream group and a downstream group (see also Mills 1995: 201 - 202). The
The downstream cluster was composed of Chalo:wa, Hawikku, and Kechiba:wa. The village of
Kwa’kin’a is positioned between the two village clusters.

Despite extensive excavation at the both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa (see below), there is
little reliable data on the founding of these Protohistoric towns. Kintigh (2007: 370, 1985), citing
Spier’s stratigraphic test units at several villages, suggested that they were established rather
rapidly in the late fourteenth century. Mill’s (2002) work at Middle Village (Halona:wa North) indicated that some towns may have been occupied as early as the middle of the fourteenth century.

A number of archaeologists have suggested that the both local and non-local social groups, from across the Cibola area and perhaps from points further south, aggregated together to form Protohistoric Zuni villages. In particular, the arrival of groups from the Mogollon highlands and some parts of southern Arizona explains some of the material patterns that characterize the formation of Protohistoric Zuni towns (see chapters in Gregory and Wilcox 2007). Substantial amounts of non-local pottery, particularly imported ceramic wares from the upper Little Colorado and the Upper Gila River areas, appear in site assemblages (Mills 2007a). There is an increase in Hopi wares and in obsidian at these sites as well (Kintigh 2007). Webster (2007) documented the introduction of southern technologies and influences among perishable artifacts, such as textiles and sandals, in the Pueblo IV period. She suggested that the appearance of non-cotton plain weaves in the Protohistoric period (ca. AD 1400) signals an affiliation with people in the Mogollon highlands and perhaps points further south. Of particular interest, she noted that these weaves were recovered from burial contexts at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa; people in the Mogollon highlands and northern Chihuahua also used them as traditional burial shrouds.
Figure 6.3. The Zuni core area, with Protohistoric and Historic period (AD 1400 – 1680) Zuni villages marked and labeled.

Biological data support assertions that both local populations and newly arrived social groups from various parts of the Southwest settled in Protohistoric Zuni communities. Peeples (2013) recent examination of biodistance data suggested that residents of these towns were more genetically diverse than people who occupied Zuni area villages in earlier time periods. His work demonstrated that there were substantial phenotypic variations between burial populations in Protohistoric villages and burial populations interred at prehistoric villages. His quantitative
comparison of cranial measurements from a sample of Protohistoric Zuni burials with measurements from individuals in other parts of the Southwest identified several potential sources of gene flow into Zuni communities. Moreover, observed differences in genetic relationships between two Protohistoric villages indicated that separate non-local populations settled in different villages.

Finally, Zuni traditional knowledge also contends that these towns were home to local populations as well as people from other parts of the Southwest. Oral traditions about the origins of contemporary A:shiwi (Zuni people) describe divergent migration paths. After emergence and initial migration, some of the A:shiwi took a middle route, while other groups took a northern and a southern route. Eventually, the Zuni people converged at the center place – Historic and present day Zuni – along the Zuni River (Ferguson 2007).

Several researchers have proposed that the varied people who coalesced into these Protohistoric towns re-negotiated some of their social identities and notions of community in the course of integration (e.g., Mills 2007a, Peeples 2011, 2013, Schachner 2006). Archaeologists have noted that a major shift in Zuni ceramic traditions occurred at the same time as this dramatic change in settlement (see Kintigh 2007: 375, Mills 2007a). Potters ceased to make Zuni glaze wares and instead produced Matsaki Buff ware, a matte-painted, buff-slipped pottery; they also began to make a plain utility ware in place of indented corrugated vessels. Schachner (2006) argued that the introduction of Matsaki Buff ware represented such a drastic break with past stylistic conventions that it marked the emergence of new community identities. In her assessment of these patterns, Mills (2007a: 233) contended that Matsaki Buff Ware was “an intentional marker of pan-Zuni identity that coincided with the consolidation of populations into fewer villages.”

The Impact of Population Histories on Mortuary Ritual in the Zuni Area

The social transformations that swept through the Cibola area substantially influenced the performance of mortuary ritual in Protohistoric period Zuni towns. The process of regional population coalescence led to the development of new kinds of communities that included multiple social groups, who brought different histories and traditions. Based on current
archaeological evidence, I argue that these Protohistoric communities included local and non-local social groups who conducted different mortuary ritual programs—an inhumation and a cremation program—over the course of a few generations.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to evaluate mortuary ritual in late Pueblo III and Pueblo IV period Zuni settlements prior to the Protohistoric coalescence. There is little published or widely accessible data on the burial record from these time periods. Despite a paucity of widely available sources, there is a consensus that late prehistoric Zuni mortuary programs were focused almost exclusively on inhumation (see Howell 1994a, Kintigh 2000, Smith et al. 1966). Lack of available information, though, prevents a full description of the inhumation program.

The most widely accessible summary of late prehistoric burial programs is Howell’s (1994a) brief description of patterns at a few sites in the Zuni area. He observed that Pueblo III and IV period inhumations were commonly placed in middens. Infants and newborns were frequently interred in rooms, near the hearth. At AZ Q:15:1 (ASM), a site near Springerville, AZ, nearly all of the 100 documented inhumations were buried in middens. Most individuals were placed either in a flexed or semi-flexed position; they were arranged in a variety of postures, with supine being the most common. Most of the deceased (72.7 percent) were oriented to the east, but others were oriented to the west, northeast, south, southwest, northwest and north. Approximately half of the burials were either wrapped in matting or placed atop a matt lining in the feature. In addition to these burial positioning patterns, Howell (1994a) also suggested that the quantity and diversity of material accompaniments increased from the Pueblo III to the Pueblo IV and late prehistoric periods.

During the Protohistoric era, there is ample evidence that residents of large Zuni villages conducted both an inhumation and a cremation program. The mortuary record indicates that many residents of Protohistoric towns performed an inhumation burial program common to the Zuni area, and other parts of the northern Cibola region (see above). Kintigh (2000) has suggested that differences in the social composition of individual towns likely explain observable variations in the inhumation program across the villages.
Other residents performed a cremation burial program similar to traditions in the southern Cibola area, particularly the Mogollon Highlands, and parts of central and southern Arizona. A number of archaeologists have suggested that newly arrived immigrant populations continued their traditional cremation programs as they integrated into Protohistoric Zuni communities at approximately AD 1400 (e.g., Kintigh 2000, Reed 1955, Rinaldo 1964, Smith et al. 1966). Although most researchers agree that a newly arrived social group or groups performed this cremation program, they differ in specifying the geographic origins of these populations.

Recently, Mills (2007a: 232 - 233) drew a connection between some attributes of the cremation program at Zuni and the Point of Pines area. There may be similarities between cremation in Protohistoric Zuni towns and the cremation programs at some late prehistoric settlements in the Sinagua area and locales around the Prescott area as well. Cushing (1890, 1979), of course, maintained that the cremation program at Zuni demonstrated affiliations with populations in the Hohokam heartland of the Phoenix Basin. Recent research lends some credence to connections among the A:shiwi and Classic period Hohokam populations (e.g., Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2006, Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006, Ferguson 2007).

Regardless of population origins, the performance of mortuary ritual was a product of diverse populations coalescing into Protohistoric towns along the Zuni River. The populations who moved into these towns lived in very close proximity with each other, within tightly clustered roomblocks that composed a nucleated settlement. Moreover, inhabitants performed the inhumation and cremation programs in the same shared spaces. By interring the remains of the dead in the same locations, people reinforced their membership in a single residential community.

This discussion indicates that examinations of mortuary ritual should analyze these programs separately, yet integrate the results into a single interpretation that reflects the developing Protohistoric communities. In the following exploration of mortuary ritual, I conduct separate analyses of the inhumation and cremation program to understand the social memories and identities that each shaped for the spirits of the dead. I then consolidate the results in an
attempt to understand Zuni’s spirits of the dead, their place in coalescent communities, and their
roles in the formation of a regional Zuni identity.

The Occupational Context and History of Burial at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa

The population history of the greater Zuni region indicates that the coalescence of people
into Protohistoric Zuni towns greatly influenced the performance of mortuary ritual in these
villages. The occupational records of individual towns provide the physical context for mortuary
ritual in these settlements. In other words, local histories detail how people conducted burial
programs and associated ritual actions for their deceased family members in the spaces and
places of these communities.

In the section that follows, I discuss the occupational context of mortuary ritual at
Hawikku and Kechiba:wa (Figures 6.4 and 6.5). This overview demonstrates that the
performance of mortuary ritual primarily occurred outside of lived areas, in designated and
somewhat ordered spaces reserved for the dead. More specifically, it indicates that inhabitants of
Protohistoric era Zuni villages conducted most funerary and perhaps other simple rites in
separate, kin-based cemeteries on the margins of these towns. They did occasionally inter some
persons, however, in abandoned village rooms.

First, I describe the Hendricks-Hodge Expeditions and the University of Cambridge’s
excavations of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, investigations that concentrated on uncovering large
numbers of burials. I focus the discussion on the expeditions’ documentation of the burial
program(s), and variations among burial features. The Hendricks-Hodge and University of
Cambridge records and documentation are the primary data for this analysis of mortuary ritual
(see below).

Then, I provide a summary of previous research that offered several important
interpretations of burial patterns at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I review Howell’s (1994a, 1994b,
interpretations of mortuary ritual and its contexts at these villages. Their work demonstrated that
the contexts of mortuary ritual and burial conveyed information about social memberships and
identities at different scales.
Figure 6.4. Hawikku, with cemeteries labeled and individual burial features marked as dots. Inhumations are marked with blue dots, while cremation burials are marked with red dots.
Figure 6.5. Kechiba:wa, with limited number of excavated burial features marked as dots.
Southwestern archaeology has a rather limited knowledge of the occupational histories of many Protohistoric and Historic period Zuni towns. Research efforts have infrequently focused on occupations dating to these time periods, and there have been few avenues for conducting responsible archaeological research on these settlements. Some researchers have referred to the Protohistoric period and early Historic period as “forgotten” or “lost centuries” (see Peeples 2013).

The histories of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa form most current understandings of Protohistoric period Zuni settlements. Hawikku, as the site of Coronado’s first contact with indigenous peoples of the American Southwest, receives particular attention in ethnohistoric records and research. Secondly, and most importantly, both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa are the only two Protohistoric villages to have been extensively excavated. Archaeological research on these two towns has generated nearly all the data that are available for late prehistoric and Protohistoric Zuni towns. The work at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa is and likely will remain the primary data source for the study of Protohistoric period pueblos in the Zuni area, at least for the foreseeable future.

Hawikku was one of the largest settlements in the Zuni settlement region, and it may have been a focal village for local communities. Neighboring Kechiba:wa was also a large town. On the very eve of the Historic period in the American Southwest (AD 1540), Hawikku was the location of the initial contact between Coronado’s Spanish entrada and native communities. Although the village of Kechiba:wa was not a focus of the invasion, Spanish records do mention the village. Both pueblos were occupied through the Spanish invasion of AD 1539 and 1540 until the Pueblo Revolt of AD 1680 (Kintigh 2007, Kintigh 1985, Kintigh 2000). Following the revolt, people moved into the Historic pueblo of Zuni.

In large part, Hawikku’s role at the dawn of the Historic period in the American Southwest spurred Frederick Webb Hodge’s interest in the old settlement. Between 1917 and 1923, the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation sponsored Hodge’s work through the
Hendricks-Hodge Expedition’s excavations at Zuni (Smith et al. 1966). Hodge directed the work at Hawikku and coordinated efforts for some additional excavation at the neighboring village of Kechiba:wa. The expedition’s work at Hawikku represented one of the largest and most extensive excavations of any other archaeological investigations to date.

At Hawikku, the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition focused their efforts on investigating the Protohistoric and Historic period occupation of the pueblo and on uncovering burial features (see Figure 6.4). They excavated expansive areas surrounding the pueblo’s roomblocks and dug into 340 superimposed rooms, or room columns, in the pueblo. In addition, the expedition investigated the mission church and its yard (Howell 1994a: 20).

In total, the expedition documented approximately 996 burials. The excavations exposed 955 burials placed in discrete groups just outside Hawikku’s roomblocks. According to records associated with the work at neighboring Kechiba:wa, crew members targeted burials and continued to dig as long as they encountered burial features. Thus, it is likely that workers defined the approximate margins of each burial group around the pueblo. In the final report of the expedition’s work, Smith et al. (1966: 187) numbered these groups sequentially and explicitly referred to them as cemeteries. Later, in his research of burial patterns at Hawikku, Howell (1994a: 51) argued that they were in fact “real spatial phenomena” (see below). The Hendricks-Hodge expedition also recovered 54 burials from rooms in the roomblock, along with 41 Historic period burials in association with the mission church.

Hodge did not publish a report of the expedition’s work. He did, however, compose a manuscript on Hawikku’s history and on some of the material objects found at the pueblo (Hodge 1937). In 1966, Watson Smith, Richard Woodbury, and Nathalie Woodbury published a comprehensive report of the excavations as The Excavation of Hawikku by Frederick Webb Hodge: Report of the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition 1917 – 1923. This report still serves as the primary descriptive resource for the expedition’s work and recovered data.

The Hendricks-Hodge Expedition conducted limited excavation at the village of Kechiba:wa, approximately 3 km east of Hawikku. Then, in 1923, the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology excavated portions of the village rather extensively in
cooperation with Hodge’s efforts (Bushnell 1955). Louis Clarke supervised the investigations. Excavations at the village concentrated on the cemetery areas adjacent to the roomblocks and on accessible room sections in the pueblo (see Figure 6.4).

The joint expedition resulted in the documentation of 255 burials at Kechiba:wa. Unfortunately, investigators did not maintain detailed maps or records pinpointing the spatial location of individual burials at the pueblo. Nevertheless, notes and maps record 121 burials in identifiable spatial groups surrounding the roomblocks, similar to the arrangement of burials at Hawikku. In addition, excavation in the roomblocks documented an additional 51 burials in residential contexts.

Clarke and his crew members did not publish a report on Cambridge University’s investigations. Documentation of the excavations and descriptions of specific contexts exist primarily in S. K. Lothrop’s (the field director’s) (1923a, 1923b, 1923c) field notebooks and daily notes. The University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology at Cambridge University continues to curate physical notes and some items associated with the project.

Burial Patterns at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa


Howell’s (1994a, 1994b, 1995, 1996, see also Howell and Kintigh 1996, Howell and Kintigh 1998) research focused primarily on evaluating the socio-political organization of Hawikku through an examination of the mortuary record. During the course of his research, however, he also contributed to our knowledge of mortuary ritual at the pueblos of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. In particular, his work suggested that the living conducted funerary rites that interred the
deceased in relatively formal, discrete cemeteries, which were likely organized (or maintained) by kinship-based groups.

Foremost, Howell’s dissertation research demonstrated that residents of Hawikku placed most of the deceased in distinct cemeteries that surrounded the pueblo’s roomblocks (see Figure 6.4). He proposed that the identifiable burial clusters were in fact spatially discrete cemeteries for the interment of individual social groups, likely family-related groups. Howell used age and sex distributions as well as non-metric dental data that Turner collected for a sample of the Hawikku burials to evaluate this proposal. He demonstrated that the demographic profile of the burial clusters appears to represent a "normal death profile," or at least one that is consistent with burial of a family group (see Howell 1994a: 53 - 55, Howell and Kintigh 1996: 541 - 542). Moreover, his examination of the dental data suggested that individuals interred within burial groups shared a stronger biological affinity than individuals buried in separate spatial groups.

Howell’s synthesis of the Hawikku burial record also revealed that the dead were interred in cemeteries and arrangements that conveyed information about other social memberships, such as ethnic group affiliation. Howell’s (1994a: 80) spatial analyses highlighted that inhumations and cremations were recovered from distinct cemetery areas (see Figure 6.4). In their summary of Hodge’s work at Hawikku, Smith et al. (1966: 187, 203) reported that most cremations (n=281 of 317; 89 percent) occurred in three cemeteries (areas 1, 9, and 10) in the northwestern portion of the site. In particular, they documented that approximately 70 percent of the cremations were found in Cemetery area 10 in the far northwestern corner.

Howell’s (Howell 1994a, 1995, 1996) work concentrated on the material accompaniments placed in the individual Hawikku burial features (see detailed discussion of material accompaniments below). He located patterns in the inclusion and distribution of grave goods that likely represented individual social memberships and responsibilities. He noted that these patterns were largely similar among separate cemeteries, although there were a substantial number of individuals with many unique items in one large cemetery (and inhumations contained many more items than cremations) (Howell 1994a, Howell and Kintigh 1996). He concluded that
these patterns materialized some of the community’s ritual-political organization in the cemeteries’ mortuary records.

Building upon Howell’s (1994a) dissertation research, Kintigh (2000) examined the socio-political relationship between Hawikku and Kechiba:wa through a comparative analysis of mortuary ritual. His research demonstrated that the contexts of mortuary ritual at both villages were very similar. Like the inhabitants of Hawikku, residents of Kechiba:wa interred most of the deceased in discrete cemeteries on the margins of the town. People interred some of the deceased in abandoned rooms within the roomblocks as well.

Kintigh’s (2000) comparison of mortuary ritual at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa did suggest that there were some differences in burial treatment that might convey dissimilarities in the ethnic, or at least social, compositions of the towns. He demonstrated that the proportions of particular grave orientations among the Hawikku burial population were different from the proportions of orientations among the Kechiba:wa population. Furthermore, he showed the burial population from Hawikku contained mortuary assemblages different from the population from Kechiba:wa (Kintigh 2000: 103 -111). In particular, there were dissimilarities in the proportions of particular ceramic wares and types within the assemblages from the two pueblos. At least one of these wares is more commonly associated with locations well south of the local Zuni area.

This discussion about the occupational contexts of mortuary ritual at Protohistoric era Zuni villages illustrates that residents of these towns maintained discrete spaces for the dead, and that these spaces were, at least in part, arranged according to social group affiliations and membership. They interred remains of the deceased and conducted related ritual actions in cemeteries – outside of and away from lived areas. Previous research indicates that these cemetery spaces were likely organized on the basis of social group affiliation and kinship lines. They also buried some of the deceased in abandoned rooms, likely to maintain some connection to past residential, familial spaces (The topic of residential burial in the northern Southwest needs further research to understand its associated social and symbolic meanings.) (see Cushing 1896: 336 for observations on residential burial). At the village level, there is evidence that mortuary
ritual reflected the different social and/or ethnic compositions (or characters) of individual Protohistoric era Zuni towns.

The discussion directly informs the analysis of mortuary ritual presented here. The contexts of mortuary ritual indicate that the performance of mortuary ritual may have reflected social affiliations at several different scales. Thus, it is essential to consider ritual actions at several different spatial scales.

In the following analysis of mortuary ritual, I evaluate the performance of mortuary ritual at multiple scales. I base the analysis at the individual feature level to identify variation related to individual social memberships and commitments within these communities. I examine mortuary ritual among and within spatial divisions (i.e., cemeteries and residential architecture) at each of the villages to locate the influence of kin-based social groups on these programs. More, I consider mortuary ritual at both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa together and at each of the villages separately to consider the influence of both local and non-local populations on mortuary programs in each of these communities.

The Performance of Mortuary Ritual at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, from the Late Prehistoric to the Protohistoric Period

In the remainder of this chapter, I conduct a statistical analysis of mortuary ritual performance at both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa to characterize the social identities for the spirits of the dead in Protohistoric era Zuni towns. Similar to the analysis of the Irene mortuary record, I examine several ritual elements to describe the social memories that they shaped for the spirits of the dead. I evaluate 1) body treatment, 2) mortuary facilities, and 3) mortuary accompaniments in separate statistical analyses. In addition, I consider 4) mortuary spaces and placements during the evaluation of each element.

In the analysis of each ritual element, I assess whether that procedure differentially memorialized select dead, or it uniformly memorialized the dead. For example, in the analysis of body treatment, I assess whether there is evidence for multiple different body treatments or a single treatment. If there is evidence for multiple treatments, then I determine if they were part of a multi-staged program that reserved extended treatments for a small number of individuals.
I conduct separate but complimentary statistical analyses of the late prehistoric inhumation and cremation programs at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I assess the programs separately because it is likely that separate social groups performed inhumation and cremation. Moreover, I use slightly different methods to analyze each program, as the performance of inhumation and cremation created different kinds of material remains different forms of archaeological data.

After the analyses, I synthesize the results to describe the social identities for the spirits of the dead. I summarize the performance of mortuary ritual and its social memories to bring the identities of the spirits into focus. This synthesis permits an exploration of the roles that these spirits played in Irene’s social and political affairs.

Following the analysis, I consider the ways in which the spirits of the dead participated in local community affairs. I appeal to the ethnohistoric and ethnographic records to discuss how the living continued to interact with the spirits of the dead in Protohistoric and Historic era Zuni towns. I attempt to enhance interpretation of the prehistoric mortuary record with this ethnographic information.

A Digital Database of the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa Mortuary Record

To explore the performance of mortuary ritual in late prehistoric period Zuni villages, I examine an integrated, digital mortuary database and accounts of the excavations at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. Here, I review the existing digital data that are the basis of this study’s statistical analyses. I contend that, although these data lack certain resolution and modern quality control, they are sufficient for this large-scale analysis. I first describe the selection of late prehistoric and Protohistoric period burials for the analysis, and then discuss the demographic data associated with this sample of burials.

In the years that followed the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition at Hawikku and the Cambridge Museum’s excavations at Kechiba:wa, neither Hodge nor Clarke synthesized excavation data from the villages. The Museum of the American Indian curated the Hendricks-Hodge field records and Hodge’s personal notes, while the Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology retained that institution’s data. As previously mentioned, Smith, Woodbury, and
Woodbury (1966) presented the first systematic summary of the Hawikku data in their report on the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition. These researchers organized and compiled many of Hodge’s records in the process.

Then, in the 1980’s and 1990’s, efforts by the Museum of the American Indian and the Department of Anthropology at Arizona State University conducted integrative research on these collections. Brenda Shears spearheaded the Hendricks-Hodge Archaeological Expedition Documentation Project at the Museum of the American Indian; the project computerized the expedition’s data and made it widely accessible (Shears 1989). Todd Howell’s (1994a) work then presented the first major synthesis of these data. Later, Kintigh and Shears worked with the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology at Cambridge University to integrate Clarke and Lothrop’s data for Kechiba:wa.

The collective work of Brenda Shears, Keith Kintigh, and Todd Howell created digital records for the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary data. Their joint efforts have resulted in the construction of a single integrated data set for the mortuary records. Shears, Kintigh, and Howell currently curate the data set along with other digital records that pertain to the excavations. Shears and Keith Kintigh at Arizona State continue efforts to aggregate the data in digital formats and to enhance the resolution of these data. They have graciously provided me access to the digital data for this study.

The data set contains information for 1210 remains interred in 1175 features (Table 6.1). It includes data for 955 individuals recovered at Hawikku and for 255 individuals recovered at Kechiba:wa. To examine the performance of mortuary ritual, and to make the data comparable to the Mississippian mortuary data, I integrated the Zuni digital data into an aggregated, relational database that includes mortuary data from both the Prehispanic American Southwest and Southeast. I entered all relevant data into related data sets (i.e., tables) that store information about 1) individual remains and the remains’ treatment, 2) individual demographic information (e.g., age and sex), and 3) mortuary facility attributes. When necessary, I re-coded body treatment and mortuary facility variables and variable states. I used Howell’s (1994a) and Smith et al.’s (1966) descriptions of the data to ensure accuracy in any re-coding. The relational
database is available in the Digital Archaeological Record (tDAR) at the following persistent URL: https://core.tdar.org/dataset/380985.

For ease of analysis, I maintained the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa material accompaniment data as a separate data set. It is possible to integrate these data into the aggregated, relational database. Additional work is required to complete this integration. The Hawikku and Kechiba:wa material accompaniment data that were used in this study are available in tDAR at the following persistent URL: https://core.tdar.org/dataset/392820.

Howell and Kintigh assigned burials, when possible, to one of three temporal periods: a late Ancestral Puebloan period (prior to AD 1350/1400), a Protohistoric period (AD 1400 – 1630), and a Historic period (circa AD 1630 – 1680) (see Howell 1994a: 83 - 84). Dating was based on the presence of particular ceramic types and/or the presence of Historic period artifacts (e.g., iron implements) in association with the burial. Note that they were not able to assign dates to 811 burials (67 percent) in the mortuary population from these two villages.

Table 6.1. Burial population at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, by estimated time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>No Date</th>
<th>Ancestral Pueblo</th>
<th>Protohistoric</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawikku</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kechiba:wa</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* K39 was not designated as a Historic period burial in the database, but the data indicated that the burial included an iron artifact. It was included in the count of Historic period burials in this analysis.

This analysis focuses on the performance of mortuary ritual in late prehistoric and Protohistoric period Zuni villages. Thus, I concentrate my research on the sample of 1128 burials that do not definitively date to the Historic period. I consider all those burials that date to the Ancestral Puebloan period and the Protohistoric period, as well as those burials that were not assigned to a temporal period. I suggest that the benefit of including the undated burials to
increase analysis sample size outweighs any adverse effects. Foremost, it is reasonable to assume that a large proportion of these burials actually date to a time period prior to the Historic period. If the sample of dated burials at Hawikku is representative of the burial population as a whole, then approximately 82 percent of the population dates to either the Ancestral Puebloan or the Protohistoric periods. Secondly, the sample is unlikely to include any rare artifacts particular to the Historic period or other patterns unique to the Historic period, because those items would likely identify the burial as a Historic period interment. Thus, it is unlikely that any remaining Historic period burials would impact an analysis of mortuary ritual.

The set of 1128 prehistoric and Protohistoric burials includes 855 individuals from the pueblo of Hawikku and 243 individuals from Kechiba:wa (Table 6.2). At Hawikku, the 855 sets of remains were recovered from 863 separate features. At Kechiba:wa, the 243 sets of remains were recovered from 238 features. Multiple interments within a single feature were not common.

The digital database also includes age-at-death and sex estimates for a subset of the remains from both sites. The age and sex assignments that Howell and Kintigh included in the database are a combination of assignments that analysts recorded in the field during excavation and various trained researchers collected in Smithsonian laboratories. Howell (1994a: 53 - 54) stated that Hendricks-Hodge Expedition excavators documented age estimates for many burials and sex estimates for a smaller number of burials while in the field at Hawikku. Hrdlicka received a small sample of burials in his lab at the Smithsonian Institution, and crafted his own age and sex estimates (Smith et al. 1966: 179). Finally, Stodder (1990) collected age and sex estimates for a small sample of Hawikku during her dissertation research, and Turner recorded age and sex assignments for another set of Hawikku burials when he collected dental morphology data (Howell and Kintigh 1998: 164 - 165).

To evaluate the congruence of the field estimates with Hrdlicka’s, Stodder’s, and Turner’s lab estimates, Howell (1994a: 53) compared the age and sex assignments for burials that had been examined in the field and in laboratory settings at the Smithsonian. He observed very slight differences between the different sets of estimates (see Howell and Kintigh 1998 for a detailed response to criticism of these estimates).
For the Hawikku burials, Howell and Kintigh maintained age and sex estimates from field notes when Smithsonian estimates were not available. They preferentially used Hrdlicka’s, Stodder’s, and/or Turner’s estimates whenever possible. For the Kechiba:wa burials, Kintigh recorded the age and sex assignments from existing field notes and documents. The Kechiba:wa age and sex data are less accurate than the Hawikku data, but they are used for the population-level analyses in this study.

In total, the sample of 1128 prehistoric and Protohistoric burials contains age or sex estimates for 905 individuals. Among the Hawikku burials, there are age and sex assignments for 128 individuals, and age assignments alone for an additional 589 individuals. Among the Kechiba:wa sample, there are age and sex estimates for 54 individuals, and age assignments for an additional 133 burials.

Table 6.2. Burial program samples from Hawikku and Kechiba:wa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Inhumation</th>
<th>Cremation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawikku</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>884*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kechiba:wa</td>
<td>173**</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one case (H58) was indeterminate  
**eliminated one case (K39) with iron and one indeterminate

In the remaining portions of this chapter, I explore the performance of mortuary ritual at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa by examining these digital data records. I evaluate different elements of burial and post-burial ceremony through statistical assessment of the data. Throughout the examination, I consider associations among particular elements of mortuary ritual and the demographic information discussed above. I also add descriptive detail to these data with references to field notes and feature descriptions from Hodge’s and Clarke’s excavations.

Inhumation Burial Program at Protohistoric Zuni Villages

This study’s examination of mortuary ritual at Protohistoric era Zuni villages begins with an analysis of the inhumation mortuary program at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. The analysis of
inhumation focuses on the treatment of the body and the construction of mortuary facilities. It uses descriptive statistics and multivariate statistical procedures, where possible, to evaluate the relative uniformity or diversity of body treatment and burial features.

First, I consider inhumation body treatment at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. Second, I evaluate inhumation mortuary facilities (i.e., features) at the two villages. Due to lack of sufficient data, I rely primarily on excavation narratives and field notes for a descriptive evaluation of inhumation features.

Examination results suggest that inhumation at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa involved a singular, relatively simple treatment process and basic mortuary facilities for the interment of the deceased. Residents of these villages typically followed a single treatment process to prepare and arrange inhumed remains. The program emphasized interment of the complete body and seems to have promoted extended burials with orientation in one of several prevailing cardinal directions. People also commonly constructed simple earthen trenches to house the remains and associated accompaniments.

However, the inhumation program did include appreciable amounts of variation. The living frequently treated the remains in the customary manner outlined above, but with one or two variations. For example, they buried a number of individuals in a supine, extended posture, but with an orientation other than to east to west. They also constructed a number of mortuary facilities with one or two variations, such as a mat lining or covering.

**Inhumation Body Treatment**

The analysis of inhumation body treatment evaluates whether there was a single, uniform process for the treatment of inhumed remains at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa or there were multiple, different processes. It uses both descriptive statistics and MCA to describe treatment procedures. In addition, it evaluates these treatment procedures at different scales – at both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa and then at each, individual village.

Foremost, I present a summary of inhumation body treatment to identify any generalized treatment groups. Then, I conduct several MCAs on body treatment attributes to define any treatment groups and to assess the relative uniformity or diversity of groups.
Inhumation Body Treatment Variability.

The following basic summary of inhumation body treatment uses simple descriptive statistics to outline body treatment groups prior to a multivariate statistical analysis. It indicates that inhumation body treatment at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa involved a single procedure that included some notable variation. It highlights the predominance of simple, primary inhumation, but discusses evidence for some secondary burial and the interment of isolated skeletal elements.

Foremost, most individuals were inhumed as complete or at least nearly complete bodies (Table 6.3). At both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, approximately 94 percent of individuals were represented by nearly complete sets of remains. A small percentage of individuals were represented by postcranial remains, disarticulated and/or incomplete sets of remains, or isolated skulls.

Secondly, most inhumed individuals were buried in a basic extended posture (Table 6.4). At Hawikku, approximately 35 percent of inhumed individuals were arranged in an extended posture, while 60 percent of individuals at Kechiba:wa were similarly placed. Note, however, that there is a larger percentage of burials at Hawikku that lack posture data than at Kechiba:wa. I suggest that a majority of those cases were also arranged in an extended posture. At both villages, very small percentages of individuals were placed on their sides, on their stomachs, or in a kneeling or seated position.

Finally, the majority of inhumed remains were oriented east to west at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. Kintigh’s (2000: Figure 6.9) radial bar charts illustrate orientation patterns well (Figure 6.6). He observed that, despite this “old custom” of east to west alignment, there are some variations. At Hawikku, approximately 35 percent of individuals were placed in north to south orientations, while at Kechiba:wa only 10 percent of individuals were arranged in north to south alignments. Kintigh suggested that this pattern represents significant differences in the performance of mortuary ritual at the two villages.
Table 6.3. Percentage of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa inhumations in defined skeletal completeness categories (number in parentheses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Mostly Complete Body</th>
<th>Postcranial Body</th>
<th>Clustered and/or Isolated Elements (piles, bundles, or secondary)</th>
<th>Skull</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawikku</td>
<td>94 (n=535)</td>
<td>2 (n=11)</td>
<td>2 (n=14)</td>
<td>2 (n=10)</td>
<td>100 (n=570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kechiba:wa</td>
<td>94 (n=163)</td>
<td>4 (n=7)</td>
<td>1 (n=2)</td>
<td>1 (n=1)</td>
<td>100 (n=173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawikku and Kechiba:wa</td>
<td>94 (n=698*)</td>
<td>2 (n=18)</td>
<td>2 (n=16)</td>
<td>1 (n=11)</td>
<td>100 (n=743)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I assumed that excavators encountered a mostly complete body if the burial was not identified as containing a "secondary deposit," "postcranial remains only," or a "skull only."

Table 6.4. Percentage of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa inhumations in defined different body posture categories (number in parentheses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Supine</th>
<th>Prone</th>
<th>Left or Right Side</th>
<th>Kneeling or Seated</th>
<th>No Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawikku</td>
<td>35 (n=199)</td>
<td>1 (n=7)</td>
<td>9 (n=51)</td>
<td>1 (n=2)</td>
<td>54 (n=311)</td>
<td>100 (n=570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kechiba:wa</td>
<td>60 (n=103)</td>
<td>1 (n=2)</td>
<td>10 (n=18)</td>
<td>1 (n=2)</td>
<td>28 (n=48)</td>
<td>100 (n=173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawikku and Kechiba:wa</td>
<td>41 (n=302)</td>
<td>1 (n=9)</td>
<td>9 (n=69)</td>
<td>1 (n=4)</td>
<td>48 (n=359)</td>
<td>100 (n=743)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This descriptive summary of inhumation body treatment suggests that there was a single, common inhumation treatment. It focused on the interment of complete or mostly complete remains in an extended, supine arrangement and in an east to west orientation. However, it is likely that this treatment included notable variations in some treatment attributes. For example, Kintigh’s (2000) work documented variation in orientations (see Figure 6.6).
Multiple Correspondence Analysis of Inhumation Body Treatment.

A multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) of inhumation body treatment at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa evaluates the proposition that the performance of mortuary ritual involved a single prevailing treatment procedure. Moreover, it assesses the relative uniformity or diversity of this treatment. It determines if the observed uniformity is related to one, well-defined treatment for the deceased, or if it is related to a generalized treatment that includes variation in preparing and arranging the body.

For this analysis, I conducted several separate MCAs on the Prehispanic Hawikku and/or Kechiba:wa mortuary populations to examine patterns in inhumation body treatment type (see https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391948 for Hawikku and Kechiba:wa inhumation body treatment data used in the MCAs and for MCA procedure data). Foremost, I performed a MCA on a combined sample from both villages to capture a snapshot of the relative uniformity or differentiation in inhumation body treatment procedures. In this analysis, I used six categorical variables, including a variable that records the relative degree of remains present in a burial feature (e.g., nearly complete body, postcranial body, skull, etc.).

I then performed a MCA on inhumation burials that contained complete (or mostly complete), articulated skeletal remains to locate patterns in the treatment of whole individuals (n=618). In this analysis, I used only five categorical variables for body treatment; I removed the variable that records relative degree of remains present. It is likely that the second MCA captures variation in inhumation body treatment more accurately than the first analysis, because I culled a substantial number of cases with incomplete body posture and position data.

Finally, I conducted separate MCAs on the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa to determine the relative uniformity or differentiation of body treatment types at each of these settlements. Recall that Kintigh’s (2000) research suggested residents of these two villages maintained some differences in their burial programs. I performed these analyses to ensure that patterns identified in the previous analyses were observable at both late prehistoric Zuni towns when considered separately.
MCA: Treatment of All Individuals at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa.

Foremost, I performed a MCA of body treatment for nearly all sets of inhumed remains that were documented during the excavations at both Zuni towns. In the MCA, I included 743 inhumations with relatively complete categorical data. To calculate the position of the 743 inhumations relative to each other in a two-dimensional coordinate space, I used six categorical variables related to the treatment of the body. It is important to note that I aggregated several presence/absence variables in Kintigh and Howells’ original digital data set to create these categorical variables.

A scatterplot of MCA inhumation treatment scores for Prehispanic burials at both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa reveals a singular cluster that contains most burial cases, and two small clusters of loosely affiliated burial cases (Figure 6.7). Results of a k-means pure locational clustering procedure on the MCA scores indicate that a three cluster solution best fits the distribution of scores across the coordinate space. Moreover, this solution is the most interpretable with available archaeological data.

The dense and narrowly defined cluster (in red) at the origin of the coordinate space contains all burial cases designated as primary interments. This cluster accounts for roughly 96 percent (n=716, of 743) of the burial cases in the analysis. All of the individuals in the cluster were represented by complete or mostly complete sets of remains. Most of these individuals were interred in an extended, supine posture with heads oriented east to west. Among the individuals in this cluster, approximately 45 percent (n=322) were extended, 42 percent (n=301) were supine, and 50 percent (n=  ) were oriented east to west (The percent of individuals oriented east to west includes southeast to northwest and northeast to southwest orientations.). In a limited sample (n=353) that discards all burial cases with missing data on these variables, approximately 70 percent were extended, 64 percent were extended supine, and 46 percent were oriented east to west.

Within this central cluster, inhumation burial cases are distributed continuously in several linear arrangements (Figures 6.7 and 6.8). Each of the linear arrangements contains burials with a particular set of treatment attributes. First, those burial cases that occur in a line that runs along Dimension 1 and that passes through the origin on Dimension 2 are inhumations that were
placed in an extended supine posture. Along this line, cases that have a negative score on
Dimension 1 are inhumations that were arranged in an extended supine posture, but were either
wrapped or placed on matting. Burials that occur near but just beyond the origin on Dimension 1
were placed in partially flexed or flexed positions. Burial cases that have positive scores on
Dimension 1 are inhumations that were arranged in rare postures and positions. For example,
several cases with a score of approximately one on Dimension 1 are individuals who were placed
in partially flexed positions on their stomachs.

Second, inhumation cases that occur in a line that runs along Dimension 1 and that sits
below the origin on Dimension 2 are individuals who were either placed on a special feature lining
(other than matting) or who were covered with stones. Burial cases that have negative scores on
Dimension 1 are individuals who were placed in a feature that was lined in some way. Cases that
have positive scores on Dimension 1 are individuals who were covered with stones.

Finally, burial cases that occur in a thin line curving upward from the origin on Dimension
2 are individuals whose remains were mostly complete, but were missing skulls. In other words,
they are individuals represented by complete to mostly complete postcranial remains (n=18).
Note that these burial cases are distributed across the coordinate space in a line just like those
cases that represent complete sets of remains. In this line of postcranial examples, those burial
cases with scores near the origin are sets of remains placed in an extended, supine posture.
Those cases with positive scores on Dimension 1 are sets of remains placed in postures and/or
postures other than extended, supine.
Figure 6.7. Scatterplot of late prehistoric and Protohistoric period Zuni inhumation body treatment MCA scores, with mostly complete and incomplete remains of individuals. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. The cases are color-coded by cluster assignment (through a k-means pure locational clustering procedure). The colored ovals represent confidence ellipses that outline the range of each identified cluster. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391948.
Table 6.5. Body treatment variables and variable states used in the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa inhumation body treatment MCA (see Figure 6.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body Treatment Variable</th>
<th>Variable States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remains Present</td>
<td>near complete body, postcranial body, skull, secondary deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Posture</td>
<td>extended, flexed, partially flexed, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Position</td>
<td>supine, right side, left side, stomach, seated, kneeling, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranial Orientation</td>
<td>from north to south, from northeast to southwest, from east to west, from southeast to northwest, from south to north, from southwest to northeast, from west to east, from northwest to southeast, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapped/Covered</td>
<td>Matting, matting and wrapped, wrapped, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capped/Lined</td>
<td>Lining over, lining under, lining under and stones over, stones over, wood lining around, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral/Pigment*</td>
<td>Black, blue-green, blue-green and black, blue-green and red, blue-green and white, blue-green and yellow, red, white, yellow, white and yellow, none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*supplementary variable in the MCA

The small cluster (in blue) in the upper right portion of the scatterplot consists of isolated skulls (n=11) (see Figure 7.7). The excavation records indicate that 10 out of the 11 were recovered at the pueblo of Hawikku. Nine of the skulls were found in single, isolated burial features in various Hawikku cemeteries, and one was recovered from a room in the pueblo. Although the excavation records contain data on the orientation of only two skulls, the records indicate that both were placed in a west to east orientation, or opposite of the predominant east to west orientation. Available demographic data suggest that the skulls were the remains of adults, adolescents, and children.

The diffuse cluster (in green) in the lower right portion of the scatterplot includes burial cases that Hodge and/or Smith et al. (1966), and subsequently Howell (1994a), designated as secondary interments (n=16). Unfortunately, there is little additional data to characterize the treatment of these burials. Excavation records provide data on orientation for three inhumations; all three departed from the predominant east to west pattern. The records include data on body posture and/or position for only two interments. They indicate that one individual was arranged in a prone position, and that the other person was placed in a flexed to partially flexed position.
Finally, field notes suggest that three of the burial cases were placed in features that were either lined or capped.

Nearly all of the burial cases in this cluster were recovered from the cemeteries at Hawikku. Only two were found at Kechiba:wa. The available demographic data indicate that remains include adults, adolescents, children, and infants. Although records provide sex estimation for only four of the 16 inhumations, they suggest that all four were males.

Figure 6.8. Enhanced view of the principal cluster in the Zuni inhumation body treatment MCA (see Figure 6.7). Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case.
In sum, the MCA results identify one well-defined inhumation body treatment group and two indistinct groups (see Figures 6.7 and 6.8). The pronounced group (in red) represents a general set of similar treatment procedures and common variations for the interment of complete remains. The prevailing treatment pattern involved placing a complete body in an extended, supine posture in an east to west orientation. The treatment procedures included variation in body position and posture, and rather frequent variation in orientation.

It is important to note that these treatment procedures were also applied to remains that were missing skulls. Unfortunately, available data do not permit an accurate assessment of how and/or when postcranial remains were separated from their skulls. It is possible that these individuals were interred as complete persons, and that prehistoric cultural activity or some disturbance removed the skull from the burial feature. However, Howell (1994a: 80) argued that, at Hawikku, postcranial remains were “indicat[ive] [of] decapitation.” It is possible that these individuals were interred without heads or that they were separated from their heads shortly after burial.

The other two diffuse groups (in blue and green in Figure 6.7) represent incomplete and/or disarticulated remains, specifically isolated skulls and loosely bundled or piled sets of remains. These groups appear to denote procedures that were distinct from those used to treat complete bodies. Available data indicate that these cases do not conform to discernible treatment patterns. Each case seems to be unique. It is important to recognize, though, that data for many of these cases are incomplete, and that treatment patterning is therefore difficult to evaluate. Future research should examine the isolated skulls and incomplete, disarticulated remains in closer detail.

**MCA: Treatment of Complete to Mostly Complete Individuals at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa**

The MCA of all inhumed individuals from Hawikku and Kechiba:wa indicates that the inhumation program focused on a single, predominant treatment procedure. The analysis describes this treatment procedure as simple interment of the whole body, often in an extended, supine position and commonly oriented from east to west. However, the analysis suggests that inhumation
treatment was not uniform. Instead, the procedure consisted of a conventional way for placing the body in a mortuary facility, and a number of acceptable variations for arranging the remains.

In the following analysis, I examine the identified treatment procedure in greater detail. I conduct a MCA on the sample of complete to mostly complete skeletal remains interred at the villages of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. Here, I focus on characterizing the observed variation in the treatment of nearly complete remains.

In the MCA, I included 618 cases that had sufficient data for five categorical body treatment variables. I removed 45 cases that represented postcranial bodies, secondary burials, and isolated skulls. In addition, I culled another 80 cases that lacked sufficient data on the five selected variables. Unfortunately, culling resulted in the removal of a disproportionate number of children and infants (n=56 of 80). It is important to note that this MCA may not identify all variation in the treatment of children and infants. However, the sample still contains burial cases of children and infants (n= 231 [109 children and 122 infants]; thus, the MCA characterizes at least a substantial portion of the variation in the treatment of juvenile remains.

A scatterplot of the MCA body treatment scores for the complete to mostly complete skeletal remains exposed at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa indicates that scores are distributed evenly across the coordinate space (Figure 6.9). Results of a k-means clustering procedure suggest that there is no cluster solution that sufficiently defines concentrations of case scores. More specifically, the procedure is not able to reduce the sum of the squared error sufficiently among clusters in any of the reasonable cluster solutions. The procedure advises against defining discrete clusters or concentrations for the body treatment scores.
Figure 6.9. Scatterplot of late prehistoric and Protohistoric period Zuni inhumation MCA scores, with the mostly complete remains of individuals. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391948.
Table 6.6. Body treatment variables and variable states used in the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa
inhumation body treatment MCA of complete remains (see Figure 6.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body Treatment Variable</th>
<th>Variable States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body Posture</strong></td>
<td>extended, flexed, partially flexed, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body Position</strong></td>
<td>supine, right side, left side, stomach, seated, kneeling, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cranial Orientation</strong></td>
<td>from north to south, from northeast to southwest, from east to west, from southeast to northwest, from south to north, from southwest to northeast, from west to east, from northwest to southeast, not applicable, indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wrapped/Covered</strong></td>
<td>Matting, matting and wrapped, wrapped, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capped/Lined</strong></td>
<td>Lining over, lining under, lining under and stones over, stones over, wood lining around, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mineral/Pigment</strong></td>
<td>Black, blue-green, blue-green and black, blue-green and red, blue-green and white, blue-green and yellow, red, white, yellow, white and yellow, none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*supplementary variable in the MCA

The placement of scores on the graph indicates that the analysis separates burial cases along Dimension 1 by differences in body posture, position, and orientation. Inhumations that were placed in a basic extended supine position and oriented generally from east to west occur near and just to the left of the graph’s origin. Inhumations that were placed in positions other than extended, postures other than supine, and orientations other than east to west occur to the right of the origin. Burials that differed in one treatment attribute from the basic extended, supine position and east-west orientation have MCA scores of approximately one along Dimension 1. Those burials that differed in two and three treatment attributes have scores higher than one along this dimension. Individuals who were placed in flexed positions either on their left or right sides occur in the upper right portion of the coordinate space; they have high (positive) scores on both Dimensions 1 and 2. Individuals who were placed in partially flexed positions and in a prone posture are in the lower right portion of the graph; they have high (positive) scores on Dimension 1 and low (negative) scores on Dimension 2.

The location of scores on the graph suggests that the MCA separates cases along Dimension 2 by differences in wrapping/covering and feature lining/capping. Inhumations that were in an extended, supine position and that were wrapped, covered, or placed on textile or
matting occur just above and below the origin. Individuals who were laid atop or under matting are just above the origin, while individuals whose remains were wrapped in textile are just below the graph’s origin. Next, inhumations that were placed on top of a special lining (e.g., sherd or stone paving) other than matting are scattered in the upper left hand portion of the graph. Inhumations that were covered by a special lining or by stones generally occur in the lower left portion of the MCA coordinate space. Finally, a few individuals who were associated with matting and/or wrappings and who were placed atop a lining are in the upper left portion of the graph.

The distribution of case scores indicates that individuals tended to receive only one of the following: wrapping, placed on or under matting, placed on a special lining, or covered with a special lining or stones. In the burial sample from Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, 108 burials contained evidence for at least one of these treatments. Only 16 of these 108 inhumations (15 percent) received two or more of these body treatments. Moreover, only 7 burials (6 percent) were wrapped/covered with mats and placed in a feature that was lined or capped with stones.

Finally, the MCA scatterplot highlights two set of inhumation cases associated with rare treatment as outlying cases. The plot locates two individuals (features H188 and K199) arranged in a kneeling posture as outliers in the upper right portion of the graph. Although the MCA does not highlight two additional seated persons (H119 and K141) as outliers, it does place them in the far right portion of the graph. Age and sex estimates indicate that that three of the four individuals interred in these postures were adults. Two of the four individuals were males, and one person was a female. Interestingly, none of these people were buried with rare material accompaniments or even with appreciable amounts of material items. An elderly male (H188) was interred with two pots, shell and turquoise jewelry, several different colors of pigment, and preserved food remains (corn and squash). An adult female was buried with pottery, a mano, and a metate. The kneeling and the seated individuals from Hawikku were interred in cemeteries (in cemetery 9), while the kneeling and seated persons from Kechiba:wa were interred in pueblo rooms, either on or just beneath floors.

The MCA also identifies as outliers several persons placed in a prone posture. It places individuals (H153A, H154, H864, H1248, H1307) who were partially flexed and lying on their
stomachs in the lower right portion of the coordinate space. Each of these individuals was oriented in a direction other than east to west, most often from north to south or south to north. Age and sex estimates suggest that three of the persons arranged in this posture were adult females and one was a child. The analysis places two individuals (K30 and K266) who were extended and in a prone posture at the right far portion of the graph. Demographic estimates indicate that one person was an adolescent and the other was an infant. All of the individuals who were placed in a prone posture were interred with few to no material accompaniments. However, the remains of an adult female and the remains of a child were each buried with an effigy pot in the shape of a duck. All of these burials, except one, were located in the cemeteries of the two villages.

In addition to these burial cases, the MCA scatterplot highlights several inhumations associated with multiple feature linings, matting, and/or textile wrappings. The analysis locates inhumations that were placed atop special linings and covered in mats and/or textiles as outliers in the upper left portion of the graph. Both Smith et al.’s (1966) accounts and the digital records describe special feature linings as either sherd or stone paving. Excavation records from Kechiba:wa suggest that two individuals were placed in a grave lined with wood beams.

In sum, the multivariate analysis indicates that the treatments associated with complete to mostly complete remains were variable. In fact, the MCA scatterplot suggests a continuous variation of treatment attributes. The predominant procedure was to arrange the whole body in an extended, supine posture, oriented from east to west. However, treatment attributes varied frequently. Many inhumations received some commonly occurring attributes, such as an extended, supine posture, and one or two different attributes, such as a different orientation. A moderate number of inhumations were interred with two or more treatment attributes that differed from the common procedure.

Although the MCA does not identify body treatment groups in the sample of complete remains, it does indicate that two body postures and one body arrangement were unusual. The analysis highlights kneeling/seated and prone as rare postures. There is little additional, associated data to aid interpretation of these postures.
The MCA also highlights burial with multiple wrappings, linings, and/or coverings as rare. Howell (1994a) suggested that placement on special linings and association with matting was a special body treatment as well. Excavation notes from Kechiba:wa documented a particularly rare feature lining. Excavators recorded that two individuals were placed in separate graves each lined with wood beams.

However, Smith et al. (1966: 241) stated that the use of burial mats and/or wrappings was actually quite common, particularly after 1400 AD. These authors cast doubt on the reliability of Hodge’s wrapping and lining data. They implied that Hodge’s notes do not contain complete data on the instances of matting found in graves and that poor preservation in some cases may have obscured the presence of mats or other lining textiles. Thus, I propose that matting and textile wrapping/lining are not unusual treatment attributes, but that instances of other rare feature linings – such as wood beams – do represent rare attributes.

**MCA: Treatment and Burial Location.**

In the previous sections, MCA analyses indicated that inhumation involved one predominant treatment procedure at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. A targeted MCA of this treatment procedure suggested, however, that it was variable across individual burial cases.

Here, I explore the expression of this treatment procedure in Hawikku and Kechiba:wa separately to ensure that the variability identified for the sample as a whole characterizes both villages. I conduct two MCAs of complete individuals from Hawikku and Kechiba:wa respectively. I compare the results to describe body treatment uniformity or variability at each village (see Kintigh 2000). Results demonstrate that variation in inhumation body treatment was continuous at both Zuni villages and across different burial contexts at the villages. However, they suggest that the relative degree of variation in body treatment was greater at Hawikku than at Kechiba:wa. Although this pattern could be biased due to the different sizes of the mortuary samples from Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, it is consistent with Kintigh’s (2000) assessment of mortuary ritual at the two villages.

The MCA of body treatment at Hawikku includes 467 inhumations that had relatively complete data for the five categorical variables used in the procedure. The MCA of Kechiba:wa
includes 151 inhumations. I used the same five categorical variables in this analysis as in the previous analysis to maintain consistency.

The two scatterplots of MCA body treatment scores demonstrate that the scores are distributed evenly in their respective coordinate spaces (Figures 6.10 and 6.11). For both analyses, results of a k-means clustering procedure suggest that there is no cluster solution that sufficiently defines concentrations of case scores. The procedure advises against constructing clusters of cases within the two coordinate spaces.

The locations of cases on the Hawikku MCA scatterplot are approximately the same as they were on the combined sample MCA graph (see Figure 6.9). Score placement indicates that the analysis separates cases along Dimension 1 by differences in body posture, position, and orientation. It separates cases along both Dimensions 1 and 2 by differences in wrapping/covering and feature lining/capping. The MCA distinguishes burials that received different wrapping/covering treatments on both dimensions, but primarily on Dimension 1; it distinguishes burials that were placed atop or under different linings on Dimension 2.

Foremost, individuals that were wrapped and associated with matting are located in the far left portion of the graph (i.e., have low scores on Dimension 1). Burials that were wrapped tend to occur to the left of the origin, while burials that were associated with matting tend to occur to the right of the origin (i.e., have positive scores on Dimension 1). In addition, individuals who were placed atop a special lining on the grave base tend to occur above the origin (i.e., have a high score on Dimension 2), while those persons who were covered with a special lining or stones are below the origin (i.e., have a low score on Dimension 2).

The locations of case scores on the Kechiba:wa scatterplot are slightly different than they were on the combined sample MCA plot. Nevertheless, they are in the same position relative to each other in the coordinate space (see Figure 6.9). In general, the placement of scores indicates that the MCA separates burial cases primarily by differences in body posture, then cranial orientation, and finally body position.
Figure 6.10. Scatterplot of late prehistoric and Protohistoric period Hawikku inhumation MCA scores. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391948.
Figure 6.11. Scatterplot of late prehistoric and Protohistoric period Kechiba:wa inhumation. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/391948.
Extended Inhumations occur in the left portion of the graph (have low scores on Dimension 1), while inhumations that were arranged in partially flexed and in flexed postures are in the right and far right portions of the graph respectively. Burials that were in a supine position tend to occur in a line that extends up and to the right of the graph’s origin; burials that were placed on the left or right side are in the lower right and right portion of the graph (i.e., have high scores on dimension 1 and low scores on dimension 2). The analysis did not differentiate burials that were wrapped/covered or interred in a lined/capped feature in a patterned way.

A comparison of these two scatterplots to the plot from the previous analysis suggests that the scores of Hawikku burial cases represented a substantial portion of overall MCA score variation in the analysis of inhumation body treatment at both Zuni villages (see Figures 6.9, 6.10, 6.11). Moreover, visual inspection of the two graphs reveals that MCA inhumation body treatment scores vary more widely for the Hawikku burial sample than they do for the Kechiba:wa sample. Foremost, MCA scores for the Hawikku sample are distributed more broadly across Dimension 1 than scores are for the Kechiba:wa sample. Secondly, due to several outliers, MCA scores for the Hawikku sample have a greater range along Dimension 2 than scores from the Kechiba:wa sample. Finally, the overall shape of MCA scores from the Hawikku sample creates arcs of cases across Dimensions 1 and 2. The shape of scores from Kechiba:wa forms a block of cases within a confined space in the coordinate plane.

It is important to note that the pattern could be a result of sample size differences. The MCA of Hawikku includes 467 inhumations, while the MCA of Kechiba:wa treatments includes only 151 inhumations. There is a greater probability of encountering variable and/or rare treatment attributes in the Hawikku sample than in the Kechiba:wa sample. However, there are several reasons to suspect that the pattern is not due entirely to a sampling effect.

Additional patterns in the inhumation body treatment data are consistent with the observation that body treatment attributes vary more widely at Hawikku than at Kechiba:wa. Foremost, isolated skulls and potential secondary burial deposits represent a higher proportion of the Hawikku burial sample (4 percent) than they do in the Kechiba:wa sample (2 percent) (Note that these treatment attributes are not included in the two MCAs presented here). Second,
inhumations that were wrapped/covered or that were associated with a special lining/stone cap represent a higher proportion of the Hawikku burial sample (16 percent) than they do in the Kechiba:wa sample (10 percent). Finally, inhumations that were both wrapped/covered and associated with a lining/stone cap were uncovered only at the pueblo of Hawikku.

Importantly, this result is consistent with Kintigh’s (2000) interpretation of burial ritual at the two Zuni villages. His research demonstrated that particular aspects of the burial program (i.e., orientation and accompaniments) at Hawikku were different from those at Kechiba:wa. Moreover, his work suggested that the program at Hawikku included greater instances of accompaniments and treatments considered rare and/or symbolically potent than the program at neighboring Kechiba:wa. In his analysis, Kintigh evaluated the impact of sample size on this result. He suggested that “a sample as depleted in rich graves as Kechipawan is quite unlikely if drawn from a population with Hawikuh’s proportion of rich graves” (Kintigh 2000: 104).

The analysis of inhumation body treatment at Hawikku and at Kechiba:wa demonstrates that the patterns identified in previous analyses are, in general, applicable to each village separately. In other words, the inhumation treatment procedure at both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa included appreciable amounts of variation. However, analysis results suggest that treatment variation was greater at Hawikku than at Kechiba:wa.

**Summary of Protohistoric Inhumation Body Treatment at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa.**

The performance of the inhumation mortuary program at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa involved a single treatment procedure for the interment and arrangement of inhumed remains. More specifically, it emphasized the burial of a complete or at least nearly complete body and the simple placement of remains in the mortuary facility shortly after death. Within this treatment procedure, however, there was an appreciable amount of variation. It is likely that these represent sets of individualized variations in burial treatment attributes, variations that are difficult to interpret.

Overall, the inhumation burial program at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa stressed the interment of the complete body in a simple arrangement. In the sample of 743 inhumations, approximately 94 percent (n=698) of the individuals were represented by complete or nearly
complete sets of remains. Moreover, it appears that those individuals who were missing skulls (i.e., those represented by postcranial remains) received very similar treatments to individuals whose remains were complete. A large proportion of the complete remains were placed in an extended or partially flexed, supine position. The majority of complete individuals were also oriented in a general east to west direction.

This treatment procedure included appreciable amounts of variation, predominantly in one or only a few treatment attributes. Interestingly, variation in treatment attributes did not co-occur with appreciable frequency. Most individuals were arranged in a manner that resembled the typical treatment, but that varied in only one or two treatment attributes. For instance, a number of individuals were buried in an extended, supine position but in orientations other than east to west. Another set of individuals were interred in an extended, supine position, but were either covered by a cloth wrapping or matting or were laid atop matting. A smaller set of individuals were placed in a partially flexed position to one side and either oriented in a direction other than east to west or associated with a wrapping or matting.

The inhumation burial program also included the interment of some partially disarticulated, incomplete, and/or bundled remains (i.e., potential secondary burials) (n=16) and isolated skulls (n=11). It is possible that the potential secondary burials represent a separate treatment procedure. However, available data suggest it is more likely that they represent a response to special and/or extenuating circumstances surrounding the burial of these remains. A very small percentage (two percent) of the inhumed population was represented by disarticulated, incomplete, and/or bundled remains. Despite the low number of individuals, there is little to no definitive demographic patterning among the persons who received this treatment. In addition, there is little patterning among the other treatment attributes associated with these remains. There is no identifiable spatial patterning to the placement of mortuary facilities that contained these sets of remains. Finally, the majority of individuals were associated with few material accompaniments.

I suggest that some of the individuals represented by incomplete and/or bundled sets of remains may have passed while away from their home village, and that the remains were
returned to Hawikku or Kechiba:wa for burial. A much smaller group of individuals may have been accidentally or perhaps intentionally disturbed from their previous contexts and re-buried. Alternatively, a few may have been victims of violent acts. For example, the individual whose incomplete remains were partially flexed in a prone position was perhaps the victim of post-mortem disturbance or even perimortem violence (see Darling 1998).

The interment of isolated skulls (n=11) may also denote unique circumstances surrounding these remains. Unfortunately, there is very limited data upon which to base an interpretation. The available data indicate that there is little to no patterning evident in the demographic profile of individuals who received this treatment. In addition, there is little spatial patterning in the placement of the skulls. The majority were interred in several of the cemeteries, among other burials, at Hawikku. The skulls were associated with very few material accompaniments.

Despite a paucity of robust data, I suggest that some of the skulls are the remains of persons who died away from their home village or whose burials were accidentally disturbed (i.e., They belong to the same category as the potential secondary interments). In addition, I propose that some may represent trophies of persons who were victims of perimortem violence. To evaluate these propositions, I strongly encourage additional research on the topic.

**Inhumation Mortuary Facilities**

This study’s examination of the inhumation mortuary program at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa not only evaluates body treatment, but also considers inhumation mortuary facilities. The following analysis of mortuary facilities assesses whether there was a single, predominant feature configuration or there were multiple configurations. Results suggest that the living constructed simple, relatively uniform facilities for the interment of nearly all inhumed dead. Similar to patterns in body treatment, though, facility construction included notable variation.

It was not possible to use MCA or any other multivariate statistical procedure to examine the relative uniformity or differentiation among mortuary facilities at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. Excavation records and digital data do not contain the information necessary to formulate sufficient categorical variables and variable states. Perhaps future analyses might scrutinize the
Hendricks-Hodge expedition notes, records, photographs, and drawings to retrieve more detailed data on features than is currently accessible.

To assess mortuary facilities at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, I rely on the observations and basic descriptions recorded in excavation accounts and field notes. For the Hawikku burials, I reference the summary of Hodge’s notes that Smith et al. (1966) provided in the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition report. For the Kechiba:wa burials, I collected information from Lothrop’s (1923) field notebooks.

At Hawikku, Hodge reported basic burial features that were “simple, elongated pits” or trenches (Smith et al. 1966: 202). In their summary of Hodge’s notes, Smith et al. (1966:202) noted that residents of Hawikku likely did not expend much effort on graves or their form. They referenced Hodge’s observation that people occasionally dug the grave trench slightly too deep in the middle or too short for the corpse. As a result, the individual’s head and feet rested slightly higher than the pelvis.

At Kechiba:wa, Lothrop (1923) documented simple trench features as well. His descriptions indicate that residents of this pueblo, similar to people at Hawikku, did not devote substantial time or resources to the construction of mortuary facilities. In some instances, people placed the deceased’s remains in shallow trench features or in small features that required arranging the body at an angle. Lothrop suggested that one individual’s feet may have even protruded slightly from the shallow feature (K128) in which the remains were placed.

Inhumation Facility Linings and Coverings.

Although excavation records indicate that most mortuary facilities were simple trenches, the notes did document minor variation in the some feature configurations. Of the 743 inhumations exposed at the two villages, approximately 13 percent (n=93) were placed in features that were lined and/or capped (Table 6.7). The most unusual mortuary facilities at both villages were two Kechiba:wa graves that may have been lined and/or sealed with wood beams. Both graves were constructed in abandoned rooms in a roomblock at Kechiba:wa. K168, the burial of an adult male along the wall of room 37, contained wood beams that may have represented the “remains of a small chamber designed to keep the body clear of earth” (Lothrop 1923). The burial included a
substantial number of pots and two baskets. K194, the burial of an adult female in room 42, had “traces of a wood shelter over the body” (Lothrop 1923). A bowl rested atop the remains.

The other inhumations (n=91) associated with a variant facility attribute were placed in features capped with a stone pile or cairn, covered by a mat or other special lining, and/or placed atop a mat or other lining. Hodge and Lothrop described the stone coverings as piles of moderate-sized, rounded rocks that were placed over the body. In some instances, they formed a low cairn rising above the feature. The special linings placed over and under inhumations were typically textiles, leather strips, bark, or other vegetal material. In a few instances, the base of a feature was paved with ceramic sherds or small stones. Finally, Smith et al. (1966: 240 - 241) stated the mats found under or over inhumations were likely sleeping mats. As noted previously, these authors suggested that matting may have been much more common in Zuni inhumations than documented in the available data.

Table 6.7. Percentage of inhumations with different mortuary facility traits at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa (number in parentheses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Wood Line</th>
<th>Stone Pile</th>
<th>Line Over</th>
<th>Line Under</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>Stone Pile w/ Line</th>
<th>Stone Pile w/Mat</th>
<th>Line w/ Mat</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwk*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=13)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=44)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=491)</td>
<td>(n=570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kch**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=159)</td>
<td>(n=173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwk and Kch</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td>(n=14)</td>
<td>(n=49)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=650)</td>
<td>(n=743)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hwk = Hawikku
**Kch = Kechiba:wa
It is interesting to note that these facility variations rarely occurred together in a single feature. They predominantly occurred as a single facility attribute. There are a few instances in which a burial covered with a stone pile also contained a mat lining or other special lining. In addition, there are a few instances in which a burial included a lining both under and over the body. However, the few instances of co-occurrence do not form a noticeable pattern.

Finally, there is one noteworthy difference in the occurrence of facility variations at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. Excavations at Hawikku recovered approximately 96 percent (n= 76 of 79) of the inhumations that contained a lining and/or a covering in the cemeteries outside the roomblocks. The investigations at Kechiba:wa found approximately 41 percent (n=10 out of 14) of the burials that contained a lining and/or a covering in pueblo rooms. Moreover, at Kechiba:wa, all of the female burials that contained a facility variation (n=6) such as a lining or a covering were found in rooms.

Multiple inhumations in Mortuary Facilities.
The living infrequently interred more than one individual in a burial feature. However, when they did place multiple persons in a facility, they did not distinguish the burial or the facility in any other manner. Residents of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa did not employ multiple burial as a means of establishing multi-generational tomb facilities.

Within the prehistoric and Protohistoric burial populations at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, excavations documented 31 inhumation features and 5 cremations that contained the remains of more than one individual. The 31 inhumation burial facilities contained the remains of 51 individuals (n=41 at Hawikku; n=10 at Kechiba:wa). Smith et al. (1966: 196 – 197) observed that many cases of multiple burial at Hawikku represent the placement of an adult with a newborn, infant, or small child. At least 12 of the multiple burials at both villages contained the skeletal remains of an adult, frequently an adult female, and a newborn or small child. Although there are no age and sex estimates available for some of the individuals in the other multiple burials, the available data suggest that many of these also represent the burial of an adult and a child.

Smith et al. (1966: 196) suggested that many of these multiple inhumations at Hawikku likely contained the remains of parents, particularly mothers, and their children. Moreover, these
authors discussed several cases in which a woman may have died in childbirth or pregnancy. They described two instances in which the skeleton of a fetus was found in the pelvic cavity of an adult female, and a few in which a newborn was located in between the legs of an adult female.

Discussion of Inhumation Burial Program at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa

This examination of the inhumation burial program at the Protohistoric Zuni villages of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa suggests that the living maintained a single, relatively simple treatment process for burying the remains of the deceased. Protohistoric period residents of these villages frequently interred the deceased in an extended, supine orientation in basic trench facilities, with perhaps a mat lining or covering. They most often arranged the body in an east to west orientation, but also placed some remains in other orientations.

Despite the prevalence of a customary burial pattern, a small number of incomplete bodies were interred. Postcranial remains; disarticulated, incomplete, and/or bundled remains; and isolated skulls were commonly buried in cemetery areas of both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. However, residents of Hawikku did conduct burial rituals for more of these sets of remains than did residents of Kechiba:wa. It appears that postcranial remains were treated in much the same manner as nearly complete sets of remains. Either people attempted to provide many of these individuals with a typical burial, or they removed the skulls after initial burial of a complete body. Other sets of remains, such as potential bundles and isolated elements, were treated differently, however. I suggest that people reserved these treatments for special circumstances surrounding the death of these individuals. Ethnohistoric records and ethnographic research suggest that such circumstances might include the death of a person away from the village, the burial of enemy or trophy remains, and/or instances of violent death (e.g., Darling 1999, Ellis 1968, Parsons 1916, Rodriguez and Schaafsma 2008, Walker 1998, 2008).

Several inhumed individuals were interred in unusual postures that warrant additional consideration. Residents of Hawikku buried one adult female in a seated posture and one elderly male in a kneeling pose. Similarly, residents of Kechiba:wa interred one adult male in a seated posture and one young adult of unknown sex in kneeling pose. It is possible that placement in this active posture denotes some kind of reverential memorialization. Unfortunately, none of these
individuals were placed in an unusual facility or interred with unique material objects that might aid in interpretation. Moreover, the burials were not associated with any additional contexts or artifacts indicative of continued interaction with these remains or burial features. It is likely that these postures simply represent some element of the person’s social responsibilities and/or some aspect of their death.

Residents of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa also constructed basic trench facilities to house most inhumed individuals. Descriptive accounts from excavations at both villages suggest that the living typically dug very simple features with little elaboration. Excavation notes indicate that the most frequent elaboration was either lining the base of the feature with a woven mat or occasionally placing a mat over the remains as a covering. Smith et al. (1966) suggest that this addition to inhumation facilities was more common than was recorded. The majority of elaborations, such as feature linings or coverings, likely represent idiosyncratic variations.

The living did place several inhumations, however, in more elaborate mortuary facilities. They placed two persons, who were buried in abandoned Kechiba:wa rooms, in log-lined and/or covered facilities. It is possible that the interment of these individuals in log crypts represents a unique, reverential treatment. However, Smith et al. (1966: 174, 205 - 221) described a few other burial features with similar pole and/or vegetal linings and/or coverings; these authors documented that Hodge excavated at least several similarly constructed facilities in the Hawikku cemeteries. They also reported a few instances of other facilities with additional construction preparation, including an infant in a “small but solidly built cist 14 inches long and 8 inches wide, with an adobe slab and a stone slab cover” (Smith et al. 1966: 203). Finally, they noted that burial linings such as matting were relatively common after AD 1400. Thus, the available data indicate that these facilities were likely idiosyncratic variations in construction.

Cremation Burial Program at Protohistoric Zuni Villages

In Zuni communities, those who cremated the dead likely maintained a separate burial program from those persons and/or families who engaged in inhumation burial rituals. Foremost, people who engaged in cremation maintained the program for a limited period of time in Zuni communities. Available data indicate that people engaged in a cremation ritual program primarily
during the Protohistoric era, but some likely continued to perform cremation into the early part of the Historic period. Population data and diagnostic ceramics associated with cremation features indicate that some residents introduced the program between circa AD 1400/1450 (Kintigh 2000, Smith et al. 1966). Early ethnohistoric accounts documented that some residents burned their dead during the period of the Spanish Invasion (e.g., Cushing 1894, Stevenson 1904). However, ceramic and artifact data indicate that people ceased to perform the program shortly after the arrival of Spanish priests and missionization began, circa AD 1630 (see Smith et al. 1966: 189 – 190).

In addition, people who cremated the dead placed cremains in cemetery areas separate from inhumation areas. Recall that most cremations at Hawikku occurred in a few cemeteries in the northwestern portion of the site. In fact, approximately 70 percent of all the cremations excavated at Hawikku were in Cemetery 10, a cemetery in the far northwestern corner of the village.

In the following sections, I examine the cremation mortuary program at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa to assess the relative uniformity or diversity of the procedure. More specifically, I evaluate whether or not the cremation process treated the remains of the deceased in a relatively uniform way. I then evaluate cremation burial deposits to determine whether there was a single feature configuration or there were distinctive configurations.

Here, I consider the total sample of cremation burials (n = 384 [5 possibly Historic period burials not included]) that the Hendricks-Hodge Expedition’s and the University of Cambridge’s excavations documented at the two Zuni villages. The sample from Hawikku includes 314 cremations that presumably date to either the Ancestral Puebloan or the Protohistoric period, while the sample from Kechiba:wa includes 70 cremations. Based on associated pottery wares, most cremations likely date to the Protohistoric period, between AD 1400 and the early AD 1600’s (Smith et al. 1966: 204). 5, 6

Unfortunately, it was not possible to use MCA or any other multivariate statistical procedure to examine cremation body treatments or facilities. The accounts, notes, and digital database do not offer sufficient information to collect categorical data necessary for a statistical
approach. Thus, I construct a qualitative representation of the variation in cremation body treatments and mortuary facilities at the two villages. I rely on Smith et al.'s (1966:203 - 205) descriptions and summary information on the cremations that Hodge excavated at Hawikku. I use Lothrop's (1923) field notes for information on the Kechiba:wa cremations.

This analysis suggests that the cremation program involved a relatively uniform procedure for processing and interring cremains. Results indicate that people who cremated passed nearly all deceased individuals through a two- or three-staged program. They burned and processed the body and then interred at least some of the gleaned remains in shallow features, occasionally with some accompaniments. This examination does not consider the possible curation of cremated remains, and/or the possibility of successive interment/re-visitation. More detailed data than are currently available are necessary to evaluate additional treatment and burial stages.

_Cremation Program Body Treatment_

Here, I describe the cremation procedure’s treatment of the body to determine whether it was a uniform process or it involved several different processes. In particular, I consider if it involved several treatment stages reserved for select members of the deceased. As previously mentioned, I rely primarily on excavation accounts and field notes. Results indicate that cremation involved two or three treatment stages that were applied to nearly all individuals.

Overall, there is little to no direct data for crematory pyres or associated body processing. The excavations at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa did not identify any crematory or special processing facilities in the cemetery areas or in the vicinity of the pueblo itself. Field work was not able to retrieve direct data about firing, tending to and/or processing the remains during firing, or gleaning of cremains.

Excavations, however, may have exposed two cremations in which remains were either left in the firing/processing feature or were placed in a secondary facility immediately after firing. In his field notes, Lothrop (1923) recorded the following description of burial feature K177 in the cemetery area at Kechiba:wa: “The body appears to have been burned at length in a pit. Afterwards corn and pottery were thrown in and the pit covered up.” Hodge may have noted a
comparable burial feature in a cemetery at Hawikku. He described burial H1152 as a similar deposit; he further remarked that it was "not completely incinerated" (Smith et al. 1966: 203). These two features suggest that cremation processing occurred either in shallow pits or simply on the ground surface in the burial areas bordering the roomblocks.

Most evidence about the cremation process at these Zuni villages is derived from cremains that were presumably gleaned from pyres and eventually placed into shallow burial pits. Excavations at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa exposed 382 cremations described as secondary deposits. The available information does not contain any quantitative data on the amount of remains present in these burial features, the size or condition of the remains, or the state or arrangement of cremains in individual features. The accounts and notes simply report that most, if not all of these cremation burial features contained relatively small to moderate amounts of burned bone that were typically broken into very small pieces. Presumably, many of these features contained only a portion of an individual’s or several individuals’ remains. Based on Hodge’s accounts and notes, Smith et al. (1966: 203) stated that cremation firing and processing “was carried far enough so that only ashes and small fragments of bone remained, or at least this is all that was collected and buried in the Hawikuh cemeteries.”

At Hawikku, Hodge (1919 [in Smith et al. 1966: 186]) noted that some of the cremation burials contained burned pieces of clothing and ornaments, as well as charred corn and other food offerings. Excavation records and digital data indicate that many secondary cremation deposits included burned corn. Some cremation features also contained vessels and artifacts that were not burned. Hodge (in Smith et al. 1966: 185) noted that many of the cremations were “accompanied by other utensils that had contained food and water.” It is likely that these accompaniments were placed in the feature at the time of secondary interment or perhaps during a re-visititation event.

The descriptive data suggest that cremation at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa involved two or three stages for the treatment of remains. Foremost, remains were burned thoroughly in a pyre, with some of the deceased’s possessions and/or food offerings. It is not possible to determine where the burning occurred and what types of materials were used. Bodies appear to have been
burned expediently on the ground surface. It is also difficult to determine how the body was
prepared and what exactly what activities took place in that primary body processing context.
Hodge (1919 [in Smith et al. 1966: 186]) suggested that the deceased was dressed in clothing
and personal ornaments, or at least wrapped, when the body was cremated. In addition, he
proposed that food was either placed around the body and/or tossed into the fire.

After cremation, the remains were collected and interred in burial features. Hodge
inferred that, along with the cremains, people also picked up remnants of the clothing, ornaments,
and other offerings that were burned with the body. They then interred the cremains, some
charred offerings, and occasionally some unburned material accompaniments in small pits. In
addition, it is possible that people re-visited cremation burial deposits to leave small vessels or
sherds that held water and/or food offerings.

Cremation Program Mortuary Facilities

In the following section, I describe cremation mortuary facilities to determine whether
processed and gleaned remains were interred predominantly in one feature type or several
different types. I am particularly concerned with evidence for feature types that may be
associated with additional stages of mortuary ritual. The discussion indicates that people placed
cremains in two facility types: round to oval pits that contained funerary urns and small, unlined
pits with no urns. The use of these two feature types may represent either two entirely different
ways of interring the remains of cremated individuals, or separate stages in an interment and re-
visitation process.

Excavations at both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa exposed small, round to oval-shaped pits
holding funerary urns (Table 6.8). At Hawikku, there were more funerary jars than bowls (Smith et
al. 1966: 204). In addition, people often placed an inverted bowl or sherd over the jar’s opening to
serve as a cover. Smith et al. (1966: 190 - 192) provided a summary of the vessels that held
cremated remains and those that capped the funerary urn. These authors observed that most of
the pots that housed cremains were Matsaki Polychrome jars, but that other pots were decorated
in many of the earlier stylistic traditions as well. They did not identify any instances of a Hawikku
Polychrome vessel (a Historic period vessel) serving as a crematory urn. In general, the covering vessel was the same ceramic ware and/or type as the funerary urn.

Table 6.8. Number of cremations at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa placed in funerary urns and covered, in comparison to the number of cremations that were not placed in urns and/or were not covered (based on Smith et al.’s (1966) Table 8: 205).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Container Type</th>
<th>Covered</th>
<th>Not Covered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Container</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These authors also noted that some of the vessels associated with cremated remains had small holes punched through their bases and/or notches scored on their rims. Most commonly, the jars that contained the remains had a small hole, approximately one inch in diameter, in their bases. Some bowls that were inverted over funerary urns also displayed holes. In some instances, associated vessels had multiple holes in their bases and notches along their rims. Smith et al. (1966: 205) reported four vessels that each had four notches, placed roughly in opposite quadrants, perhaps oriented to the cardinal directions. Hodge’s excavation notes suggested that the holes were punched through the vessels after the pots were placed in the feature, because crew members could often match nearby sherds to the holes.

Investigations at both Hawikku and Kechiba:wa also documented numerous small pits that contained clusters of lose cremated remains. These features typically did not contain associated ceramic vessels or other artifacts as coverings. In fact, most of these features did not contain any chronologically diagnostic artifacts. They simply held small clusters of burned, highly fragmented remains, often mixed with ash, and occasionally some remains of burned food and/or ornaments.
Unfortunately, the data do not permit any conclusive interpretations about the relationship between these two feature types. It is possible that they are simply two facility types for the disposal of cremated remains. Perhaps some families curated the gleaned cremains of deceased family members in funerary urns, and then chose to bury some or all of those remains in the vessel with associated artifacts. The excavation notes suggest that most of the accompaniments were likely other ceramic containers that contained offerings of food and/or water. Other families simply preferred to bury gleaned cremains in small, simple pits with few accompaniments.

Alternatively, it is possible that these two feature types represent separate stages in a successive burial and re-visitation program. The living may have placed some of the cremains in a principle secondary deposit, in funerary urns with associated food and water offerings. They may have curated some small portion of the cremains to bury them in simple pit features at a later remembrance event, or they may have re-opened the principle secondary features to retrieve some cremains to inter them in a tertiary feature during a remembrance event. To evaluate this possible staged interment, additional data collection and research is necessary.

Discussion of Cremation Program at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa

In Protohistoric era communities, a segment of the resident population performed a cremation sequence that was, in many ways, distinct from the inhumation program. Those who engaged in the program likely settled in the newly coalescing Zuni villages as they were established, near the end of the fourteenth century AD and the beginning of the fifteenth century. These families continued to cremate their dead and inter the cremated remains as successive deposits through the early parts of the Historic period. At the village of Hawikku, and probably at other Zuni villages, cremation features were usually located in cemetery areas separate from inhumation cemeteries.

Cremated remains were treated in a uniform fashion that involved two or three stages. Although the available data are limited, they indicate that remains were cremated thoroughly either in unidentified primary facilities or expediently on ground surfaces. Excavation notes describing the size of the cremains suggest that they were heavily burned and perhaps broken into small pieces. Hodge’s descriptions (in Smith et al. 1966) suggest that people may have
placed personal possessions and food offerings in the funeral pyre with the body. After the funeral fire smoldered, cremains were gleaned along with fragments of burned offerings. It is possible that a reference to cremation continued into the Historic period, as Cushing (1894) reported instances of people burning the deceased’s personal possessions in large pyres shortly after death and burial.

After initial processing, survivors buried the remains in shallow, round to oval-shaped pit facilities. It is likely that facilities that held funerary urns and associated, un-burned accompaniments represent a principle secondary burial feature for housing cremains. There was interaction with the remains and urn either at the time of interment or later, during re-visititation. Hodge and Smith et al. (1966) reported multiple instances of holes punched into funerary vessels and notches etched into funerary vessels or into cover vessels. Smith et al. (1966: 204 - 205) and Hodge (in Smith et al. 1966) interpreted the holes as “kill holes,” intended to release the spirit of the vessel and its contents.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine whether the unlined pit features represent a different type of secondary feature or a successive burial. Thus, an additional treatment/interment stage cannot be identified. However, even if some families did conduct additional ritual actions and burial for some portion of the deceased, it would seem that they performed simple remembrances.

Mortuary Accompaniments

The remaining analyses examine the mortuary accompaniments that were placed in late prehistoric burial features at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I evaluate whether the inclusion of objects in mortuary contexts memorialized some members of the dead selectively, or it memorialized the deceased in a uniform fashion. More specifically, I attempt to identify rare and/or uncommon items among the burial assemblages. If there is evidence for rare and/or uncommon items, I then determine whether they were distributed among a small proportion of the burial assemblage.

In these analyses, I examine the sample of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa burials that likely date to the Ancestral Puebloan or the Protohistoric period (n= 1125) (see https://core.tdar.org/dataset/392820 for Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary accompaniment data
and associated analysis results/data). I concentrate statistical assessments on the set of burials that includes one or more artifacts (n=795). I eliminate the few burials that are not associated with reliable artifact data from the analyses.

The mortuary accompaniment data for this burial sample consist of presence/absence records for 78 different artifact types (Table 6.9). Howell (1994a) and Kintigh (2000) collected these data for Hawikku and Kechiba:wa respectively. For details on data collection, recording, and coding, refer to Howell’s (1994a) dissertation research.

The first and main portion of the analysis focuses on the artifact types in the burial assemblages. I attempt to highlight rare and/or uncommon artifact types in the mortuary assemblages. Here, the term “rare” refers to low frequency of occurrence in the burial assemblages. “Uncommon” refers to a low frequency of co-occurrence with other artifact types. Specifically, it denotes a lower frequency of co-occurrence than is expected by chance (see discussion of binomial z-scores).

In the second portion of the section, I examine the burial assemblages. This analysis attempts to determine if any assemblages are uncommon relative to the other assemblages in the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary sample. I highlight those assemblages that contain rare artifacts and artifact sets to assess whether these assemblages are in fact uncommon.

Based on these analyses, I argue that material accompaniments did not memorialize particular members of the dead in a selective fashion. Instead, many objects placed in burials memorialized certain social and ritual memberships and/or responsibilities that were associated with the deceased. Other artifacts likely represented objects that were used in ritual acts associated with burial, particularly provisioning the dead for the journey to the next world. I suggest that these items and their associated responsibilities were effectively passed to the spirits.

**MDS Analysis of Artifact Types in the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa Mortuary Assemblages**

I use multidimensional scaling (MDS) to evaluate the relative commonality of items among the 78 artifact types in the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa burial assemblages (see Table 6.9 for list of artifacts and abbreviations used in the analysis). More specifically, I assess the frequency
of co-occurrence among the artifact types. The analysis attempts to locate items that co-occur with other artifact types less frequently than expected.

MDS is a multivariate statistical procedure that analyzes distance or similarity measures among variables – in this case, artifact types. More specifically, it analyzes a distance or similarity matrix that contains comparisons among all the artifact types. It transforms the matrix so that all the measures can be represented in a small number of dimensions. The goal is to display them in a graphical (i.e., geometric) space in order to visualize the distances and/or similarities among all the artifact types.

The following sections describe the MDS analysis of artifact type co-occurrence. I discuss each step of the analysis to illustrate the procedure and its results. At the close of the analysis, I present interpretations that suggest identified artifact sets represent different social and ritual responsibilities.

Artifact Type Measure of Co-occurrence: Binomial z-scores

The first step in the MDS analysis is to transform the artifact presence/absence data table into a distance matrix. I construct a similarity matrix that displays the co-occurrence or segregation among all the artifact types. More specifically, each cell of the matrix includes a similarity measure that reflects the co-occurrence or segregation of one artifact type with another artifact type in the mortuary assemblage sample.

Following Kintigh (2006), I use binomial z-scores as the similarity measure (see Savage 2000 for another application to mortuary data). Binomial z-scores highlight pairs of artifacts that co-occur either more or less frequently than expected by chance. A large positive z-score represents a strong association between two artifact types. Conversely, a large negative score represents a strong segregation between two artifact types. A score that falls between -1.0 and +1.0 suggests that the observed association is close to the expectation, based on an assumption of independence. These scores are more difficult to interpret.
Table 6.9. Artifact Types in Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary assemblages and frequency of artifact type occurrence in the assemblages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type (ARTIFACT ABBREVIATION)</th>
<th><em>#</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finger Ring (RING), Clay Tinkler (CLAY TINK)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cradle, Floor/Hair Brush (Brush_FH), Fossil Shell (FOSSSHEL), War Club</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Comb (COMBPLAIN), Mineral, Feather, Flute, Bone Needle (BONENEDL)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Shaft (ARROW), Shell Bracelet (SHELBRAC), Black Pigment (PIG_BLACK), Yellow Pigment, (PIG_YELLW), Human Hair (HUM_HAIR), Painted Wood Object (PAINTDWOOD), Pipe, Other Stone Artifact (STONOTHHR)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowstring Guard (BOWGUARD), Bird bones (BIRDBONE), Medicine</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow, Raw Clay (CLAY), Turquoise Ear Ornament (TURQEARO), Carved Stone Fetish (FETISH), Projectile Point Necklace (PROJNECK)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrader, Stone Axe or Maul (AXE_Maul), Hewe Stone (HEWESTONE), Turquoise Pendant (TURQPEND)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antler, Paint-grinding Stone (PAINTSTONE), Comb with Turquoise Inlay (TURQCOMB), Red Pigment (PIG_RED), White Pigment (PIG_WHITE)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Cup (CUP), Hammer Stone (HAMMERST)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Pigment (PIG_BLUE)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz Crystal (CRYSTAL)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammal Bone (MAMMBONE), Stone Pendant (STONPEND), Concretion (CONCRETN), Pouch of Any Material (POUCH), Tree Bark (BARK), Pinyon Nuts (PINYON)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniature Ceramic Vessel (MINIVESSL), Other Turquoise Artifact (typically beads) (TURQOTH), Weaving Tool (WEAVTOOL)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourd Remains (GOURD)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezoar, Corn Meal</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer Stick (PRAYSTCK), Polishing Stone (POLISHST), Projectile Point (PROJPT)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metate</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaped Wood Object (WOODSHAP), Textile</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Necklace</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Sherd (WORKSHRD)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric Wrapped Around Body (WRAPPED)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Necklace (SHELNECK)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Flakes (FLAKE)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Knife (STONKNIF)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Ladle (LADLE)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Pigment (PIG_GREEN)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck-shaped Ceramic Vessel (DUCKPOT), Squash</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mano</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Awl</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matting or Fabric Under or Over the Body (LINEMATT)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Bead (SHELBEAD)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Ceramic Vessel (UTILPOT)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Ceramic Jar (JAR)</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated Ceramic Bowl (BOWL)</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* # = Frequency of occurrence
Kintigh (2006) provides a thorough derivation of the binomial z-scores as a measure of co-occurrence. Here, I provide a brief example of the score to illustrate its calculation and utility. I calculate the binomial z-score for the co-occurrence among two artifact types in the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa prehistoric mortuary assemblages: war clubs and arrows. A z-score is a measure that standardizes differences between an observed $o$ and an expected $e$. It typically standardizes the differences by a standard deviation $s.d$ along a distribution. Thus, a basic z-score has the equation

$$Z = \frac{o - e}{s.d}.$$ 

I first find the expected number of co-occurrences among war clubs and arrows and the standard deviation of the expected count (see Kintigh 2006: 21 – 22). To do so, I create a two-by-two table that displays the comparison among war clubs, arrows, and all other artifact types (Table 6.10). The rows are “War Clubs” and “All Other Artifact Types,” and the columns are “Arrows” and “All Other Artifact Types.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arrows</th>
<th>All Other Artifact Types (not Arrows)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War Club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Artifact Types (not War Clubs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected proportion of co-occurrence ($p$) is the product of the row proportion and the column proportion. In other words, if we assume that the presence of one artifact type in a grave is independent of the presence or absence of another type, then we might expect war clubs and arrows to co-occur together in 0.25 percent ($2 \div 795 = .0025$) of .51 percent ($4 \div 795 = .0051$) of the graves (.0025 X .0051 = .00001275). Then, the expected count of occurrences ($e$) among
bows and arrows is the product of the expected proportion \((p)\) and the number of assemblages \((N)\) \(e = Np\) \((795 \times .00001275 = .01)\).

With an expected proportion, I can now use a binomial model. Kintigh \((2006: 22)\) explains that the binomial distribution governs the standard deviation of the expected count. The formula is

\[
\sqrt{Np(1 - p)}
\]

where \(N\) is the number of mortuary assemblages, and \(p\) is the expected proportion of co-occurrences.

I can now calculate the binomial \(z\)-score for the co-occurrence between war clubs and arrows in the mortuary assemblages. I use the formula

\[
Z_{\text{war club/arrow}} = \frac{o - e}{\text{s.d.}(e)}
\]

Or

\[
Z_{\text{war club/arrow}} = \frac{o - Np}{\sqrt{Np(1 - p)}}
\]

I know the number of observed co-occurrences \(o\) between bows and arrows. I have calculated the expected proportion of co-occurrence \(p\). I can find the expected count by multiplying the number of assemblages \(N\) and the expected proportion \(p\).

For this example, the actual calculation is as follows:

\[
Z_{\text{bow/arrow}} = \frac{1 - .01014}{\sqrt{.01014(1 - .00001275)}} = 9.89
\]

The final solution indicates a rather strong association among war clubs and arrows. It indicates that co-occur in Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary assemblages more than would be expected.
by chance. The relative strength of the association, though, depends on the binomial Z-scores of all the other artifact type pairings in the artifact assemblage population.

To create a similarity matrix of binomial z-scores for all artifact types in the Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary assemblages, I used a program script (an algorithm) written for use in the statistical package $R$. The similarity matrix is available, along with the raw artifact data, as a digital file in the Digital Archaeological Record at the following persistent URL:

The binomial z-scores are particularly useful in this analysis of co-occurrence. I want to identify any artifacts or artifact sets that are significantly uncommon among the artifact assemblages. In other words, I want to determine if there are any artifacts that co-occur more frequently than would be expected than chance, and that are also segregated from other artifacts more frequently than would be expected by chance. The binomial z-scores draw attention to artifact pairings that are strongly associated and pairings that are strongly segregated.

**MDS Procedure**

The second step in the MDS analysis is to use an MDS algorithm to represent the similarity matrix geometrically (i.e., graphically, in a small number of dimensional spaces). This step involves passing the similarity matrix into the statistical algorithm in a software package. Here, I input the matrix of binomial z-score matrix into $SPSS 20$ to run the MDS.

The $SPSS$ MDS procedure requires the user to determine the number of dimensions that are needed in order to represent the similarity matrix accurately in a graphical space. To make the determination, I evaluated a scree plot that displays the cumulative reduction in unexplained variation with each added dimension. The evaluation suggested that the representation of variation in two dimensions was acceptable, but that presentation in three dimensions was perhaps preferable. Here, I have chosen to present only the two-dimensional solution, because the addition of the third dimension did not improve the interpretation of the MDS results.

The MDS analysis returns a scatterplot that represents the co-occurrence of artifacts in a graphical space (Figure 6.12). The procedure attempts to place artifacts that co-occurred frequently (i.e., artifact pairings that had large positive z-scores) close together in the space. Conversely, it attempts to place artifacts that co-occurred infrequently (i.e., artifact pairings that
had large negative z-scores) far apart in the space. The analysis also provides MDS object scores for each of the artifact types. These object scores are the values that determine an artifact’s placement in the dimensional space in relation to all the other artifacts (again, based on co-occurrence). The object scores are a transformation of the co-occurrence z-scores to place them in the dimensional space. In essence, they are coordinates within the defined space.

A k-means pure locational clustering procedure of the artifact object scores can assist in the identification of artifact clusters, or sets. The k-means procedure suggests that a six cluster solution sufficiently reduces the sum-squared error among the score coordinate values. Moreover, the six cluster solution is interpretable with the available archaeological information.

**MDS Analysis Results: Artifact Sets Among Hawikku and Kechiba:wa Mortuary Assemblages**

The MDS of artifact type co-occurrence indicates that there are artifact sets that occurred together in burial features more frequently than would be expected by chance. In the graphical space, the artifact sets are somewhat segregated from each other. Most importantly, they are equally (or evenly) segregated from each other in the graphical space. The arrangement of the artifact scores creates a circular distribution of artifact sets in two dimensions.

These results suggest that there are no artifacts or artifact sets that are significantly isolated from other artifact sets. There is little evidence for artifacts or artifact sets that are appreciably uncommon enough that they might selectively memorialize some members of the deceased. Moreover, there is little evidence for individual artifacts that are uncommon enough that they might carry unique symbolic value or potency.

Rather, the MDS analysis highlights roughly equivalent artifact sets. I provide a brief description of each of these artifact sets in order to characterize them. I use defining artifact types to describe each set. In the section that follows, I offer interpretations of these sets.
Figure 6.12. Scatterplot of MDS object scores for artifact types in Hawikku and Kechiba:wa burial assemblages. The colored ovals are confidence ellipses that outline the range of identified clusters of artifact types. See Table 6.7 for artifact type abbreviations used in the graph. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/392820.
Artifact set 1 (in blue) includes items associated with warfare; such as war clubs, bows, and arrows; and some ceremonially significant pigments, particularly black pigment. This artifact set consists of a relatively high number of rare objects, like fossil shells and flutes. Opposite set 1, artifact set 2 (in light blue-green) includes items that are likely associated with ritual activities, like painted and carved wood objects that may have been part of shrines, feathers, cornmeal, and even possible scalps. It also contains combs, brushes, and manos and metates. Adjacent to set 2, artifact set 3 includes some ritual and ornamental items as well as some utilitarian items. It contains concretions, crystals, and the single clay tinkler found in the mortuary assemblages. It also includes bone needles, bone awls, and stone knives, all of which could serve in utilitarian and ceremonial tasks.

Artifact set 4 (in red) consists primarily of vessels, from basic bowls and jars to effigy pots. Artifact set 5 (in orange) contains a few utilitarian items, some food items such as beans, and personal ornaments (e.g., bracelets, necklaces, etc.). Opposite these sets, Artifact set 6 (in green) consists of food items such as corn and squash, herbs and medicines, and some grave furniture like mats and basketry.

Interpretation of Artifact Sets

In the remainder of the section, I argue that the MDS identifies artifact sets that represent different social and ritual responsibilities associated with the deceased (and the social and family groups to which they belonged). In addition, the analysis identifies a few artifact sets related to the process of mortuary ritual. It recognizes two sets that likely include provisions and other items that the dead might need to ensure safe journey to and arrival in their next destination.

Before proceeding, it is important to acknowledge that the interpretation of artifacts placed in burials necessitates the assignment of culturally specific meaning to items and their distribution among individuals. These assumptions and assignments are problematic, because it is very difficult to “know” these meanings and because the artifacts often carry many meanings. Discussions of artifact meanings can appeal to available archaeological patterning (e.g., rarity and diversity of artifacts, placement of objects in the grave, associations with age and sex groups,
etc.) in the burial record, and supplement that patterning with ethnohistoric and ethnographic information when available.

Here, I appeal to Howell’s (1994a, 1994b, 1995, 1996, 1998, see also Howell and Kintigh 1996) detailed examinations of the mortuary accompaniments at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I place the MDS results in the context of these researcher’s results and interpretations. Howell identified a number of important archaeological patterns among the items and burial features, and synthesized and applied relevant ethnohistoric and ethnographic information to discuss the meaning of those patterns. The ethnographic record offers an additional layer of culturally specific understandings about the material objects.

**Past Research: Howell’s Analysis of Hawikku**

Howell’s (1994a) research identified artifact sets that were likely affiliated with ritual responsibilities for males and females who may have held important leadership positions and/or roles. These artifact sets are very similar to the artifact groups that this MDS analysis locates.

First, Howell (1994a, 1995, 1996) highlighted a set of “rich” burials and the artifacts associated with them. He isolated “rich” burials by identifying those with appreciably high artifact diversity counts (the number of different artifact types). Then, he examined the contents of “rich” assemblages and several additional unique assemblages. He performed a series of multivariate statistical analyses, particularly correspondence analysis (CA), which highlighted artifact types in these assemblages. His R-mode (variable based) CA clearly demonstrated that select artifact types were associated with several groups of high diversity assemblages. During these analyses, he identified a small set of artifact types with “high mean richness scores”; these artifacts occurred frequently in burial assemblages with very high diversity scores (Howell 1994a: 99, Table 4.14) (Table 6.11). Many of the artifact types that Howell named are also the rarest artifacts in the Hawikku burial assemblages.

Ultimately, Howell used these artifact patterns to identify four groups of unique burial assemblages and two additional assemblages that he associated with separate community leadership roles (Table 6.12). Several groups of assemblages were associated with the burials of
males, while the remaining two groups were associated with the burials of females. Howell labeled these groups Male Groups 1, 1A, 2, and 3, and Female Groups 1 and 2.

Table 6.11. Howell’s list of Hawikku artifacts with high mean richness scores (recreated from Howell 1994a: Table 4.14). Artifacts are sorted by rarity (from low frequency of occurrence in mortuary assemblages to high frequency of occurrence in assemblages).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Number of Associated Burials</th>
<th>Associated High Diversity Burials</th>
<th>Sexes Associated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fossil Shell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>M? and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Needle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Club</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113, 196, 870</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>193, 1507</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>915A, 927A</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Pigment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113, 196, 216</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Wood Comb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>213, 927A</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Hair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113, 915A, 927A</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor/Hair Brush</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113, 1507</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5, 193</td>
<td>M? and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6, 915A</td>
<td>M? and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79, 113, 216</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Shaft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6, 93, 113, 216, 870</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Wood Object</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5, 915A</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antler</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>915A, 927A</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Clay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>870, 193</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewe Stone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>193, 211A, 213</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turquoise Inlay Comb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>915A</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pigment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5, 79, 113, 216</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Grinding Stone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93, 113, 193, 927A</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6, 93, 113, 196, 216, 870</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving Tool</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6, 79, 113, 927A</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouch</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5, 113, 196, 193</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6, 193, 927A</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourd</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5, 6, 79, 113, 193, 915A</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaped Wood Object</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6, 113, 870, 193, 915A, 927A</td>
<td>M and F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these analyses, Howell (1994a, 1995) characterized ritually-based leadership roles (i.e., ritual responsibilities) that were associated with males and females at Hawikku. He
identified sets of artifacts that were commonly associated with the male and female leaders (Table 6.13). Defining artifacts associated with the prehistoric burials of males include war clubs, bows, arrows, black pigment, green pigment, red pigment, pipes, flutes, bark, medicine, and shaped and painted wood. Defining artifacts associated with prehistoric female burials include rings, human hair, feathers, painted and shaped wood, combs, paint-grinding stones, pouches, hewe stones (stones used to make a traditional paper-thin bread called *hewe*), prayer sticks, medicine, and cornmeal.

Table 6.12. Howell’s (1994a) identification of possible leaders at Hawikku.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Howell Leader Group</th>
<th>Howell Richness Score</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Included in This Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H113</td>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H196</td>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>no date</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H216</td>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H870</td>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Male 1A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>no date</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H93</td>
<td>Male 1A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protohistoric</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Male 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protohistoric</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H79</td>
<td>Male 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protohistoric</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H193</td>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H915A</td>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Protohistoric</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H927A</td>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Protohistoric</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H211A</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H213</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1507</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Howell (1994a, 1995: 138 - 143) used inferences about the function of these artifacts and ethnographic understandings of these artifacts to discuss roles and civic-ritual responsibilities. For the males, the artifact sets suggest warfare related leadership responsibilities and other ceremonial duties. The inclusion of war clubs, bows, arrows, black pigment (applied to the head/face), “war pouches”, and some possible scalps may reflect responsibilities associated with Zuni Bow Priests, a significant and historically documented civic-ritual leadership position. In the Historic period, the colors black and red were associated with warfare, village defense, and
significant ritual responsibilities. In fact, Stevenson (1904: 315) noted that one Bow Priest was wrapped in black and red blankets prior his burial. Other artifacts like pipes and flutes are also indicative of ritual duties.

Table 6.13. Howell’s Hawikku leadership groups and associated artifact sets (reproduced from Howell 1995: Table 5, Table 7). The artifact sets listed here do not include items dated to the Historic period or commonly occurring artifacts, such as ceramic vessels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Howell Leadership Group</th>
<th>Defining Artifacts</th>
<th>Included in this Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>War Club, Bow, Arrow, Black Pigment, Green Pigment, Utility Ceramic, Stone Knife</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 1A</td>
<td>Bow, Arrow, Fossil Shell, Green Pigment, Flute, Bark, Medicine, Gourd, Paint-Grinding Stone, Weaving Tool, Shaped Wood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 2</td>
<td>Pouch, Flute, Red Pigment, Gourd, Painted Wood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 3</td>
<td>Pipe, Green Pigment, Red Pigment, Gourd, Weaving Tool</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>Painted Wood, Shaped Wood, Ring, Feather, Human Hair, Mano, Metate, Paint-Grinding Stone, Antler, Raw Clay, Hewe Stone, Pouch, Bark, Weaving Tool, Plain Wood Comb, Turquoise Inlay Comb, Medicine, Bone Needle, Gourd, Prayer Stick, Cornmeal, Squash</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>Mano, Metate, Ring, Paint-Grinding Stone, Hewe Stone, Plain Wood Comb, Floor/hair Brush, Ring, Prayer Stick, Cornmeal, Squash</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For females, the artifacts seemed to reflect domestic and ceremonial responsibilities consistent with the heads of matrilines. In addition, a few burials, particularly H915A, were associated with items that highlighted additional ritual concerns. The Zuni workers who excavated this women’s burial called her the “Medicine Priestess,” largely based on the painted wood that may have been part of a rattlesnake bite shrine (Howell 1995: 143). Some associations with human hair might reflect responsibilities related to women’s scalp societies (Bunzel 1932: 526, Haas and Creamer 1997, Hoijer and Dozier 1949, Parsons 1924). Finally, the inclusion of items like manos, metates, hewe stones, and brushes likely reflect domestic duties related to food preparation, storage, and service. Many of these domestic duties also overlap with ritual responsibilities.
Memorialization of Social and Ritual Responsibilities

I contend that this analysis of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary accompaniments identifies inclusions that reflect civic-ritual and possibly kinship-based responsibilities. The MDS highlights some artifact sets that likely reflect responsibilities (or roles) associated with males and females. I base these interpretations on the similarity of analysis results to Howell’s work and interpretations.

Artifact set 1 (in blue) likely represents ritual responsibilities associated with males who held important civic-ritual positions (see Figure 6.xx). It includes objects like war clubs, bows, arrows, and black pigment that Howell (1994a, 1995) associated with Bow Priest and/or other warfare related duties. Moreover, it contains items like pouches, flutes, and other pigments that were typically affiliated with ritual responsibilities.

Artifact sets 2 and 3 (in light blue-green and in purple), opposite set 1, represents ritual and other responsibilities associated with females who held important civic-ritual and/or family-based positions. Set 2 includes rings, painted and shaped wood objects, human hair, and feathers, which are items that Howell associated with important ritual responsibilities. It also includes items like manos, metates, and brushes that might represent household duties; some of these items are consistent with the items Howell affiliated with duties related to heads of village matriline.

In addition, Set 3 contains other important ritual and domestic items associated with females. It includes carved stone fetishes, bone awls, bone needles, and hewe stones. Hodge, Smith et al. (1966: 233), and Howell (1994a) relied on Zuni workers’ interpretations that these stones were implements that women traditionally used to make Zuni paper bread, hewe (see Mills 2008: 257 - 259). The set also includes quartz crystals and concretions, which are items that often serve in ritual capacities.

Interestingly, some ritually affiliated objects that are associated with both males and females occur closer to the center of the graph than those items that exclusively occur with one sex or the other. Note that shaped and painted wood objects, weaving tools, medicine, gourds,
pouches, and paint stones lie near to the graph’s origin along Dimension 2. Howell noted that these items were associated with both males and females.

Finally, artifact sets 5 and 6 appear to represent, at least in part, items that were placed with the remains of the deceased to help the spirit through the burial process and in its journey to the next destination. The placement of the sets along the origin of Dimension 1, as well as the high frequency of some of the objects in this cluster (particularly ceramic vessels [bowls, jars] and food items [corn, beans]), indicate that these items were placed in most graves. In other words, they were commonly used in inhumation burial ritual to inter nearly all the deceased, both males and females.

The ethnohistoric and ethnographic records suggest that the living often fed the dead prior to and at the time of burial (see Bunzel 1932, Cushing 1896, Ellis 1968, Parsons 1916, Stevenson 1904). People provisioned the deceased with food and water for the four day journey to the afterlife. A large proportion of burials contained corn and beans while some contained squash. Moreover, a very large proportion of burials deposits contained bowls and jars, some of which probably held food and water for the dead. In his excavation notes, Hodge noted that cremation deposits often contained additional vessels that likely contained food and/or water for the dead.

The ethnographic record also contains accounts of occasional post-funerary ritual events that involved feeding spirits of the dead. Cushing (1896: 338), Parsons (1916: 255), and Ellis (1968: 66, 70) described feast days devoted to offering food to the spirits of the dead. Hodge observed that there were additional artifact caches in the Hawikku cemeteries, pockets of buried vessels and small tokens interspersed among burial features. He proposed that at least some of these were the remnants of occasional ritual events that involved feeding the spirits of the dead.

I suggest that the living passed certain social and ritual responsibilities to the spirits of the dead, so that they might continue them. The inclusion of ritually significant items in graves, in direct association with remains, effectively decommisions them. The action removes them from the living, and makes them available in the next world. Moreover, painting the face and/or body with pigments affiliated with these duties represents a marking that is carried into death.
Provisioning the dead with foodstuffs is a relatively clear act of passing items to the spirits of the dead. If people did deliver these items to the spirits, then it is likely they handed the social and ritual responsibilities along as well.

MDS Analysis of Individual Mortuary Assemblages at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa

In the remaining section, I conduct an MDS analysis of the burial assemblages (i.e., burial cases). I attempt to determine if any of the burial assemblages themselves are uncommon in relation to all the other assemblages documented at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. In particular, I evaluate if any of the assemblages that contain some of the important ritual items identified in the previous analysis are substantially uncommon among all other assemblages.

This MDS procedure describes the relative similarity or dissimilarity of all Hawikku and Kechiba:wa mortuary assemblages to each other. The procedure bases similarity or dissimilarity of two assemblages on a comparison of the occurrence of artifact types in the assemblages. Two assemblages are similar if they contain many of the same artifact types; they are dissimilar if they contain many different artifact types. Here, I briefly review the MDS analytic process. Please refer to the MDS analysis of artifact types for a thorough description.

In this MDS, I included all those burial assemblages (n =515) that likely dated to the prehistoric or Protohistoric periods and that contained a minimum of two artifact types. I only included assemblages that contained two or more artifact types for several reasons. First, the use of these burial cases ensured that any patterns in the similarity or dissimilarity of assemblages were robust. Second, the inclusion of these cases limited the sample size sufficiently to allow the statistical software package to return results with available memory constraints.

The first step in the MDS procedure is to create a distance matrix from the presence/absence of artifact types in the burial assemblages. The matrix is composed of cells that contain a similarity measure reflecting the similarity or segregation of burial assemblages. Like the previous analysis, I use binomial z-scores as the similarity measure (Kintigh 2006). Binomial z-scores highlight pairs of assemblages that contain the same artifact types either more or less frequently than expected by chance. A large positive z-score represents a strong
association between two assemblages. Conversely, a large negative score represents a strong segregation between two assemblages (see previous discussion for calculation of these scores).

The second step in the MDS analysis is to produce a graphical representation of the distance matrix. This step involves passing the similarity matrix into an MDS algorithm in a software package. Once again, I input the matrix of binomial z-score matrix into SPSS 20.

The MDS presents a scatterplot that represents the similarity or dissimilarity of burial assemblages in a graphical space (Figure 6.13). The procedure attempts to place assemblages that contain many of the same artifact types (i.e., assemblage pairings that had large positive z-scores) close together in the space. Conversely, it attempts to place assemblages that contained many different artifact types (i.e., assemblage pairings that had large negative z-scores) far apart in the space. The analysis also provides MDS object scores (coordinate values) for each of the assemblages.

The final step is to perform a k-means pure locational clustering procedure on the object scores that the MDS algorithm returns. This procedure suggests that the seven cluster solution most effectively reduces the sum-squared errors among the score coordinate values. Moreover, the seven cluster solution is interpretable with the available archaeological information.

**MDS Analysis Results and Interpretation**

The MDS analysis of mortuary assemblages at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa indicates that there are loosely-defined groups of assemblages that are more similar than expected by chance. In other words, there are groups of assemblages that contained many of the same or similar types of artifacts. Similar to the MDS analysis of artifact types, the analysis indicates that assemblages and assemblage clusters are still somewhat segregated from each other. The arrangement of assemblage scores and clusters creates a roughly circular distribution across the coordinate space.
Figure 6.13. Scatterplot of MDS object scores for Hawikku and Kechiba:wa burial assemblages. The colored ovals are confidence ellipses that outline the range of identified clusters of artifact types. See Table 6.7 for artifact type abbreviations used in the graph. Data available at https://core.tdar.org/dataset/392820.

The results of this MDS analysis are consistent with the results of the analysis of artifact types. The procedure suggests that there are no Protohistoric era Zuni mortuary assemblages that are appreciably isolated from other assemblages. Thus, there are no mortuary assemblages or groups of assemblages that are substantially uncommon in comparison to all other assemblages. There is little evidence for assemblages that selectively memorialize the deceased.

Rather, the MDS displays groups of assemblages that contain particular kinds of artifacts and artifact sets. To illustrate this result, I highlight mortuary assemblages that contained certain
definitive items in the artifact sets that were identified in the previous MDS analysis. I locate the position of these assemblages on the graph.

Table 6.9 presents a list of mortuary assemblages that contained some of the distinctive items that defined the artifact sets in the examination of artifact types. The list is non-exhaustive, and preferentially records assemblages that contained two or more distinctive artifacts. It largely consists of burial assemblages with a high diversity of artifact types. For each mortuary assemblage, it summarizes the types of associated items.

Table 6.9. Select Hawikku and Kechiba:wa Mortuary Assemblages That Included Rare and/or Unique Accompaniments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial Feature</th>
<th>High Artifact Diversity Score</th>
<th>Rare Pigment</th>
<th>Rare Warfare Related Item</th>
<th>Rare Ceremonial Item</th>
<th>Rare Ornament</th>
<th>Rare Food or Plant Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H79</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H915A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H927A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H916</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1051</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H91A</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H23</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H28</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H222</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H196</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H102</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H93</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H911</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H63</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H19</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H229</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K47</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K50</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K52</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K102</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K105</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K80</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K19</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I then label these burial assemblages in the MDS plot (see Figure 6.12). The labels help to locate the assemblage’s relative “relationship” (i.e., position) in comparison to the other assemblages from Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. It places them in particular assemblage groups, and displays their relationship to each other as well.

First, the MDS appears to place many of the burial assemblages with distinct items (and with a high diversity of artifacts) toward the lower left portion of the graph. However, it does segregate these cases, in linear to curvilinear arrangements. Although many of these assemblages are in a particular region of the graph, at least one assemblage with a distinctive artifact type or set of artifacts occurs in nearly all of the object score clusters. This pattern suggests that the assemblages include diverse artifact types. Thus, the assemblages are somewhat different, but none are appreciably uncommon.

Second, the MDS places burial assemblages with the same or similar artifact sets near to each other. For example, it locates the burials of three males (H5, H79, H93) that contained warfare and ritual items close to each other in the lower left portion of the graph (in the blue cluster). These burials are the individuals that Howell identified as a set of leaders he called Male Group 1A, 2, and 3. This pattern indicates that the mortuary assemblages, although different, contain similar artifact sets. As previously discussed, these artifact sets likely represent particular social and ritual responsibilities.

Finally, the MDS procedure situates the two mortuary assemblages with the greatest number of distinctive artifact types – H915A and H927A – in open spaces that are encircled by lines of other burial cases. These assemblages contain items from many of the artifact sets identified in the previous analysis. They are different from surrounding cases due to the many different types of artifacts that they contain, but they are also similar because they include some of the same items. This pattern suggests that even mortuary assemblages with a high diversity of distinctive artifact types are not uncommon in comparison to other assemblages.

Overall, the MDS analysis of Protohistoric mortuary assemblages at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa identifies loose groups of assemblages that are different, but none that are
appreciably uncommon. These loose groups contain assemblages that include similar artifact sets. The segregation of assemblages even within these clusters indicates that there are noticeable differences in these assemblage’s artifact types.

Like the MDS analysis of artifact types, this MDS analysis suggests that mortuary assemblages reflect particular aspects of the deceased's social and ritual responsibilities. It identifies groups and linear arrangements of burial cases that include the artifact sets identified in the previous analysis. I argued that these artifact sets were representative of certain social and ritual memberships and commitments in Zuni communities. If that interpretation is correct, then the assemblages themselves likely memorialize these affiliations and responsibilities as well.

**Discussion**

In the following sections, I synthesize the examination's results to characterize the social identities for the spirits of the dead in Protohistoric era Zuni communities. Using the Prehispanic mortuary record, I describe the identities that surrounded the spirits. I then appeal to the ethnohistoric and ethnographic records to develop understandings of the ways in which the spirits participated in community affairs. These discussions lead to several understandings about the roles that the spirits played in the long-term socio-political histories of Zuni communities.

I argue that the performance of mortuary ritual in Zuni villages fashioned ancestral spirits and groups of long-dead who had limited direct influence in socio-political affairs. More specifically, residents of these towns shaped memories of generalized spirits associated with particular social and/or kin groups. Through mortuary ritual, the living memorialized aspects of the deceased's social memberships and their social and ritual responsibilities. Moreover, people passed these responsibilities to the spirits, perhaps to perpetuate these responsibilities and associated knowledge. Ultimately, the memories of recent spirits of the dead merged with collectives of long dead, who lived in places that were separate from but still near to Zuni villages.

First, I summarize the analysis of the prehistoric mortuary record. I review and compile the social memories that the performance of mortuary ritual created for the spirits of the dead. Together, these social memories form a composite social identity for the Zuni spirits of the dead. I suggest that the social memories described here are consistent with ancestral spirits and groups
of long-dead. The Zuni ancestral spirits were affiliated with community-based kin groups and other social groups, and they helped to curate these group’s histories and collective ritual responsibilities.

Then, in the main body of the discussion, I supplement the results of the archaeological analysis with ethnohistoric and ethnographic information. The supplement provides an overview of relationships and interactions with spirits of the dead in Historic period Zuni communities. I contend that ethnographic accounts can further illuminate the ways in which ancestral spirits and the long-dead participated in and/or were attendant to local communities. These records, narratives, stories, and songs provide details about culturally appropriate interactions with spirits of the dead, interactions that are applicable to Prehispanic contexts.

Summary of Prehispanic Mortuary Ritual and Analysis Results

Here, I discuss the results of this study’s examination of Protohistoric era mortuary ritual at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. The results suggest that the living shaped social memories of generalized spirits who were associated with local social and family groups. Inhabitants of Zuni villages conducted ritual acts that memorialized nearly all the deceased in a uniform fashion. However, they also remembered some of the deceased’s social and ritual responsibilities and/or memberships.

Foremost, examination of the inhumation mortuary program at Protohistoric era Zuni villages indicates that ritual procedures memorialized the deceased in a basic, similar fashion. The program did not involve actions that memorialized certain members of the dead selectively. Rather, it included ritual acts that treated the deceased in very similar ways, but with seemingly individualized variations.

The inhumation program at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa involved a single treatment stage and predominant treatment process. Unlike the mortuary program at Irene, it did not employ multiple stages of body processing. The prevailing treatment pattern involved placing a complete body in an extended, supine posture in an east to west orientation. This basic procedure, however, permitted appreciable variation in the placement and orientation of the deceased’s
remains in the grave. A MCA of complete remains suggested that the observed variation was continuous, a pattern which indicates that variability was somewhat individualized.

In addition to a basic, prevailing treatment procedure, the inhumation program involved the construction of simple mortuary facilities. The majority of facilities were simple grave trenches or pits with little to no elaboration. However, descriptions of these features indicate that there was some variation in one or two attributes, much like the variation in body treatment. Overall, the pattern of simple features with occasional singular variations is consistent with relatively uniform memorialization that included some individualized attributes.

Second, examination of the cremation program at Protohistoric Zuni towns suggests that these procedures memorialized the deceased in a relatively uniform fashion as well. Those who cremated the deceased applied the same general process to nearly all individuals. The available data indicate that the body was thoroughly burned and likely broken into small pieces in the cremation pyre. There is some evidence that the deceased may have been dressed, wrapped, and/or ornamented, and that the remains were accompanied by food items. Following the firing, the cremains and any burned items were gleaned from the ashes.

Nearly all cremains were then interred in subsequent (secondary, tertiary, etc.) deposits in small round or oval pits. I suggest that some of these interments represent the secondary burial of remains, while others are the remnants of remembrances that involved additional interaction with small portions of cremains and subsequent re-burial. Deposits of cremains with appreciable amounts of burned bone placed in crematory urns and then covered by inverted bowls were likely remnants of principal secondary burials. Sets of cremains with relatively small amounts of burned bone placed in small pits or pockets of earth may have represented subsequent burial episodes. The remains might have been removed from the secondary deposit or curated beyond the secondary interment. Beck (2005) has argued for a similar distinction between secondary burial deposits and “mourning ceremony” deposits in the Phoenix Basin mortuary record.

Third, consideration of the material accompaniments placed in burial features indicates that many items reflected social and ritual responsibilities as well as individual possessions. The items did not memorialize particular members of the deceased selectively, and did not associate
any particular individuals with spiritual or ritual potency. Rather, they seemed to reflect the deceased’s social memberships in ritual groups and in their age and gender cohorts, and to carry some of the responsibilities associated with these objects into the next life with the spirit.

Finally, the placement of the deceased suggests that memorialization of the deceased involved affiliation with social and kin groups. At the village level, Howell’s (1994a, Howell and Kintigh 1996) research demonstrated that most individuals were interred in kin-based cemeteries. In addition, inhumations and cremations were placed in different cemetery areas that might reflect some spatial distinction between the local and non-local social groups who lived in these towns. At the regional level, there is some evidence that differences in burial treatment patterns between Hawikku and Kechiba:wa represents differences in the overall social or ethnic composition of Protohistoric era Zuni villages.

Overall, I contend that mortuary ritual at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa shaped social memories of generalized spirits who were associated with particular social and kin groups in these communities. Ritual actions uniformly memorialized nearly all the deceased. However, some ritual acts remembered the social and ritual responsibilities and the social memberships of the deceased. Because the performance of mortuary ritual focused on removing the remains of the deceased from lived spaces, it is likely that these remembrances (and perhaps the physical objects) were passed to the spirits that the dead became.

I argue that these social memories shaped ancestral spirits and spirits of long-dead in Protohistoric era Zuni memories. These generalized spirits were associated with local social and kin groups, and they carried some of their affiliated ritual responsibilities with them to the next life. Through time, the memory of these spirits faded into groups of long-dead associated with the community at large.

*Ethnohistoric and Ethnographic Understandings of Zuni Spirits of the Dead*

In the following discussion, I attempt to enhance understandings of Zuni ancestral spirits and groups of long-dead. I address the ways in which the spirits were involved in Protohistoric communities, and the ways in which they participated in local social and political affairs. The
purpose of the discussion is to locate the roles that spirits of the dead played in local and regional socio-political histories.

Here, I appeal to ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts about Zuni spirits of the dead and people’s relationships with them. I use these records to supplement the archaeological data and interpretation presented in this chapter. These accounts can provide valuable information that has direct cultural historical relevance. I focus the discussion on how the living performed particular ritual actions in order to send newly created spirits to the afterlife and to situate them among appropriate groups of spirits once there. Furthermore, I concentrate on ritual actions and interactions that helped people maintain relationships with spirits of the dead.

*Ethnohistoric and Ethnographic Sources and Their Use in Archaeological Research*

In the Puebloan world, unlike many other indigenous landscapes of the Americas, contemporary and Historic populations have direct continuity to the people who occupied that landscape in the deep past. Scholars who have studied the Puebloan Southwest have created an extremely rich ethnographic and ethnohistoric record that extends back to the first Spanish Entradas (circa AD 1540) and attempts to peer into the last generations of the Protohistoric period. This record adds flesh to the material past that documents earlier, prehistoric settlement of the region.

It is, of course, important to evaluate Historic Zuni attitudes and actions related to death, burial, and spirits critically when applying analogies to prehistoric mortuary programs (see Adams and Zedeño 1999, Ellis 1968, Ferguson 2007: 377 - 383). In other words, it is not appropriate to assume that Historic beliefs and mortuary rituals are direct derivatives of Ancestral Puebloan mortuary customs. During the Historic period, many Puebloan communities, including villages at Zuni, endured severe population declines and radical changes in their community organization, all consequences of the Spanish invasion. Moreover, people were subjected to missionization, which forcibly introduced Catholicism and created syncretic beliefs (Liebmann 2010, Spicer 1962, see articles in Thomas 1989). Mission priests often forbade the practice of indigenous belief systems. Nevertheless, many Puebloan people continued to conduct traditional ceremonies in secret, and
many communities revived traditional beliefs during the Pueblo Revolt between AD 1680 and 1692. (e.g., Liebmann 2007, Mills 2007b, see additional articles in Preucel 2007).

Despite this caveat, many researchers have demonstrated that a judicious application of Historic period customs to the Puebloan past offers a rich basis for interpretation (e.g., Adams and Zedeño 1999, Bernardini 2005, Brandt 1980, 1994, Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2004, Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2006, Feinman 1997, Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006, Ferguson 2007, Lightfoot 1995, Walker 1999, Whiteley 1998, Zedeño 1997). Lightfoot (1995: 204 - 205) stated that “[t]he question we should be asking is not whether North American archaeologists should use ethnohistorical and ethnographic documents, but rather how they should be employed most effectively in archaeological research.” He argued that archaeologists should view these accounts as indicative of the times in which they were recorded, and as “end sequences of long-term developments in native societies …” (Lightfoot 1995: 205) Research should use them in a comparative, diachronic capacity, tacking back and forth between the document and the archaeology. In a similar argument, Feinman (1997: 375) argued that studies of the Precontact Southwest in particular could benefit from work that uses multiple lines of evidence and considers long-term change.

**Using Zuni Ethnohistory and Ethnography to the Spirits of the Dead**

I endeavor to use Zuni ethnohistory and ethnography as another line of evidence to characterize the identities of the dead. Following Lightfoot (1995) and Feinman (1997), I suggest that these records serve as valuable, supplementary information, particularly because Historic period Zuni mortuary ritual shares many material similarities with late prehistoric and Protohistoric era ritual actions.

Here, I review ethnohistoric and ethnographic sources that describe the performance of mortuary ritual in Historic Zuni settlements and the social identities that the living shaped for spirits of the dead. I also consider the ways that the living interacted with these spirits. Throughout the discussion, I attempt to focus on ritual practices that are applicable to the prehistoric ritual actions examined in this study.
I do not intend to imply that Historic era ritual acts and social identities of the spirits are directly analogous to prehistoric ones. Instead, I contend that documented Historic period mortuary rituals carry embedded cultural meanings that are valuable to prehistoric contexts. As Adams and Zedeño (1999) argued, the Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE) accounts of Puebloan ceremony describe material actions and ritualized formation processes in their behavioral settings. These descriptions, of materiality and the creation of ritual deposits, provide a way to understand prehistoric mortuary ritual in new, more developed and from multiple perspectives (see Walker 1999 for similar implementation of these ideas).

I rely principally on Bunzel's (1932), Cushing's (1896), Ellis' (1968), Parsons' (1916), and Stevenson's (1904) accounts of people's social memories and beliefs about the spirits of the dead. These ethnographer's narratives are not without error and misunderstandings. Ferguson (2007: 383) presented a valuable assessment of Cushing's, Bunzel's, Stevenson's, and Parson's work at Zuni and each of their written accounts (see Adams and Zedeño 1999 for assessment of BAE ethnography at Hopi). Both Bunzel (1932) and Tedlock (1983) criticized Cushing's poetic and metaphysical approach, which they suggested distracted him from objective details. Tedlock (1983) judged Stevenson's work as too synthetic and coherent; she noted that Stevenson was pre-occupied with descriptive summaries and not careful to include alternate versions that reflected actual Zuni practice. There has also been generalized concern with all the Boasian fieldworkers' accounts, including Parson's narratives, for their reliance on interpreters and informants (see Bunzel 1932; Tedlock 1983).

Ferguson (2007: 383) advised that, despite these limitations, the published ethnographic accounts contain so much valuable, descriptive information that they should be integrated into anthropological research. Following Ferguson's approach, I use Bunzel's (1932), Cushing's (1896), Ellis' (1968), Parson's (1916), and Stevenson's (1904) descriptions in a composite overview of Historic period mortuary ritual at Zuni pueblo. When considered together, these accounts serve can be used to evaluate each other.

In the sections that follow, I synthesize ethnographic accounts into several discussions that directly the spirits place and involvement in Protohistoric and Historic era Zuni communities.
present the discussions in a framework similar to the analysis of prehistoric mortuary ritual. I
describe (1) the Zuni home of the dead and the state of spirits in this place to situate the spirits on
the cultural landscape and in local communities. I then detail (2) the ritual actions that delivered a
spirit to this place and (3) the resulting social identities for the spirits of the dead. Finally, I discuss
(4) continued interactions with the spirits and their participation in community affairs.

Kołuwala:wa and Spirits of the Dead.

Historic period residents of Zuni settlements practiced mortuary rituals that helped the spirits of
their deceased family members and friends to travel quickly and safely to their next life in
Kołuwala:wa, commonly referred to in English as Zuni Heaven (see Ferguson 2007). After death,
the spirit either remained in the village for four days before traveling to Kołuwala:wa and/or
traveled for four days to reach Zuni Heaven (Bunzel 1932: 482, Parsons 1916: 251, Stevenson
1904). During this period, people conducted funerary rites that not only prepared to send the spirit
to the next life in a proper way but also that prevented the spirit from harming people or causing
mischief before it departed.

Narrative accounts and research on the cultural landscape of Zuni place Kołuwala:wa at
(or beneath) a lake near the confluence of the Little Colorado and Zuni Rivers 65 miles to the
southwest of the pueblo (Duff 2002, Ferguson 2007). The Zuni origin and migration tale explains
the creation of this place and, in part, the origins of death. In the story, people arrived in the Little
Colorado River and were presented with a choice of eggs. One group chose a plain colored egg
that hatched a brightly colored egg; this group migrated far to the south to the Land of the
Everlasting Sun. The second group selected a brightly colored egg that hatched a raven. The
group of people who choose the bright egg split again on their journey.

One of these groups continued eastward and came to a spot near the confluence of the
Little Colorado and Zuni rivers. Here, the Koyemshi (Zuni Mudheads) were born from an
incestuous relationship and were sent to scout the group’s travels. As the Zuni people crossed
the river, their children turned into water creatures and bit their mothers. Mothers dropped the
children into the stream. The remaining mothers were told to hold onto their children through the
crossing; the water creatures turned back into children once out of the water. The Koyemshi and
the children who were dropped entered the lake and became kokko (Katcina spirits). The place became Koluwalawa:wa, the home of the Katcinas or Katcina Village. Thus, when some Historic period Zuni residents described death, they spoke of descending a ladder into the lake to join other spirits of the dead, the kokko, and perhaps other supernatural beings in Koluwalawa:wa (Bunzel 1932: 571 - 575, Duff 2002: 186, Ferguson 2007: 383 - 385, Stevenson 1904: 33 - 34).

Most ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts suggest that “life [in Koluwalawa:wa] is just about the same as at Zuni” and that families and households were reunited (Parsons 1916: 250). Of course, details about this next life differed and were sometimes contradictory. Some accounts stated that the kokko live separately from human spirits in a multi-storied dwelling on a hillside (see Parsons 1916). Cushing’s (1896: 405) narrative described several small, adjacent towns or buildings for different supernatural beings and spirits of the dead.

Bunzel (1932: 482) noted that many Zuni ritual societies held their own nuanced versions of where the spirits of their members resided in the next life. For example, the priests of the 12 Zuni priesthoods, who are responsible for maintaining relationships with the U’wanam:í (water making spirits who reside in all waters of the earth), joined these water spirits in the four oceans of the world. The officers of the Katcina society and initiates into the society, particularly those who own masks, entered Katcina Village after death. There are several stories that mention councils and dances of the kokko with masked spirits of the dead. Some ritual practitioners who had the power of “calling the bear” maintained that their spirits joined other beast priests in a place called Cipapolima in the east (see Bunzel 1932: 517).

Once in Koluwalawa:wa, the spirits of the dead typically did not return as individual, named spirits and they did not influence the socio-political affairs of the living. In general, ancestral spirits returned as rain, which was the collective body of the kokko and other spirits of the dead. They arrived in their secondary abodes in cumulus clouds (Bunzel 1932, Parsons 1916). Puebloan oral traditions contain several tales that caution the living against attempting to maintain close relationships with the individual dead. It is these relationships that make the spirits of the dead long for this world and thus cause harm. Parsons (1916: 250) recounted the story of a man who journeyed to Koluwalawa:wa to find his recently deceased wife. He was allowed to return to this
world with her, under the condition that no living person could cry when they saw her. As the two emerged from the lake, and the man’s wife stepped on the last rung of the ladder, an old woman saw the wife and screamed. The man’s wife changed into an owl and flew away. Other versions of this tale, at Zuni and other pueblos, describe punishments for the married couple for attempting to violate the natural order.

**Death and Burial.**

In Historic period Zuni settlements, the living conducted ritual practices that removed the social memory of the deceased from the village and assisted its journey to Koluwalawawa as soon as possible. People performed some actions that attempted to pass certain ritual and social responsibilities to the spirit in the afterlife. Family members prepared and interred the remains of the deceased almost immediately after death, and performed actions to keep the spirit at bay before it left for the next life. In addition, they removed the possessions of the deceased and reminders of him/her from their lives. They interred some of these items with the deceased so that the spirit might have them in the next life and that it might continue its ritual affiliations and responsibilities.

At the time of death, the immediate family and any ritual practitioners (i.e., medicine people) present began actions to send the dying person to Koluwalawawa quickly and safely. The living often fed a person on their death bead in preparation for their journey to the afterlife. In addition, they tossed great quantities of food onto the house fire at the moment of death or just after to provision the spirit (Parsons 1916; Stevenson 1904). Medicine people occasionally kneaded the abdomen of a person who was dying in order to assist the spirit (see Parsons 1916: 251; Stevenson 1904: 314).

Preparations for burial began immediately after death to ensure that the spirit would travel quickly to the afterlife and would not long for this world and his/her family. The family, usually close female relatives, washed the body in yucca suds and rubbed it with corn meal (Bunzel 1932, Parsons 1916, Stevenson 1904). They sometimes destroyed items, such as pottery, that the deceased recently used to avoid contamination and purified themselves with piñon gum smoke as they treated the body. In addition, people occasionally took a lock of the
deceased’s hair for the living to burn and inhale if they feared that the spirit had become attached to them in some way. Family members then dressed the body in fine, new garments. People may have slashed some of the garments to allow the spirit to escape, or put some of the garments on backwards to indicate the reverse nature of the next life. They then wrapped the body in blankets.

In general, peoples across the Historic Puebloan world, from the western Pueblos to the Eastern Pueblos, prepared the deceased for burial in a manner that identified their individual ceremonial and ritual affiliations (Ellis 1968). Residents of Historic Zuni pueblo and surrounding Zuni settlements apparently followed this practice; they interred the remains of the deceased in ways that marked ritual society membership and responsibilities. It was important that a person’s spirit was properly identified by other spirits of the dead and supernatural beings in Kolvuwa:wa. The spirit may also need certain positions to continue ritual practices in their next life.

Stevenson (1904) reported that, along with the immediate family, a person’s ritual fraternity father or mother may be present when he or she died at home. This ritual sponsor and/or fellow society member frequently announced the death, particularly to the father’s clan and to the societies to which the person belonged. As the family prepared the corpse for burial, ritual society members and other relatives arrived to mourn and attend the body. Frequently, at this time, the heads and fellow members of a person’s ceremonial societies treated the body to identify ceremonial affiliations. For a priest, attendants often painted the deceased’s face with pigments and clothed him in a ceremonial costume, often in garments associated with Zuni warriors. Cushing (1896) noted that society members painted the mouths and chins of priests and high-ranking religious officials with black, to symbolize silence. They then painted the yellow and green of light and life on a priest’s eyes and nostrils to mimic the appearance of certain supernatural beings. They dressed officers of the Katcina in their white embroidered kilts and blankets and typically placed the Katcina masks in the grave. For other ritual society members (typically male), fellow members adorned the corpse with appropriate elements of ceremonial costume (Bunzel 1932, Parsons 1916, Stevenson 1904). Initiated members of the Katcina society were typically buried with their personal masks (The masks of the Katcina priests or officers were society property and kept in perpetuity in clan houses). Possession of the mask ensured that they
could join the spirit dances in Katcina Village and that they could return to this world as rain with the other spirits of the kokko.

Stevenson’s (1904: 315 - 317) narration of the death and burial of Nai’ uchi, a Bow Priest, provides a personal account of the simple yet reverential way in which Historic era residents of Zuni mourned for and buried important elders. Two members of the Little Fire society, one of whom was a woman, tended to Nai’ uchi when he died, and his children and grandchildren gathered about him. Immediately after his death, a special piece of pottery that Nai’ uchi had used was cast into the coals; once the sherds were removed, his war club was burned in a freshly lit fire. The family bathed the body and clothed it in fresh, new garments. Then, they wrapped in four new blankets, two black and two red.

While the family prepared the body and mourned, other Priests of the Bow arrived. Me’she, a young priest who was very close to Nai’ uchi, sat at his side and the other priests sat in an arc about his head. One of the priests dipped a ball of cotton into a bowl of water and gently washed Nai’ uchi’s face. He then drew a black line over the lips and painted the chin down to the throat a solid black. Finally, he made a sheet of pulled cotton and placed a roll on one side, so as to shape a cotton hood that matched those the Zuni Sha’ läko bearers wear. He placed the cotton hood over Nai’ uchi’s head, with the roll next to his face. Me’she tied Nai’ uchi’s warrior’s wristlet onto his wrist and arranged beads around his neck. Finally, Stevenson (1904: 317) noted that Nai’ uchi’s mask was not buried with him, because he had not been able to wear it or dance with the others who transformed into anthropomorphic spirits (His hair had been cut). She reported that his mask was to be given to a male member of his family. Because he was not interred with the mask, he would not be able to dance in Kóluwala:wa.

Burial of the prepared body occurred as soon after death as was possible. It was a simple affair, and generally not attended by extended family or other community members. Stevenson (1904: 306) noted that “[i]nterment is a disagreeable duty and is concluded as soon as possible.” Traditionally, only the father’s brothers, a few other clansman, or a few members of a person’s ritual society buried the body in the cemetery adjacent to the pueblo. These men dug a simple grave and usually oriented the body toward the east. After they returned from the burial, family
members washed their hair and their bodies to cleanse them. Some accounts noted that the living who performed the burial also took emetics and/or were treated with piñon gum smoke.

In the Historic period, families buried most of the deceased in the churchyard cemetery directly adjacent to the Pueblo. All of the accounts indicate that people buried all adults, young adults, and some children and infants in the cemetery. Bunzel (1932: 483) observed that some families buried infants in the house, because people feared the spirits may not be able to journey to the afterlife and they would like the child to come back into the family.

Cushing (1896: 336) noted that, in prehistory, residents of Zuni settlements may also have practiced residential burial for some important persons in the village. He wrote that the living interred “the clan elders, or the priests of tribal septuarchy, in their own houses, … or ‘under the ladders’…” He did indicate, though, that the priests and society officers remained very close to other members of the community in death. He suggested that Historic period residents of Zuni wanted to bury their family and friends in close vicinity of the priests and officers, and referred to the dead as “Fathers and children of the descending ladder” (Cushing 1896: 336).

During the Historic period, people seemed to follow a few basic principles as to the placement of material objects in the grave and/or the decommissioning of a person’s personal and ritual property. Family members recognized that the deceased needed certain provisions for their journey to Kołuwala:wa and that they may want or need to use some of their possessions, particularly ritual paraphernalia, in the next life. In the tale entitled “The Dispatching of the Souls of Things to the Souls of the Dead,” Cushing (1896) recounted how two supernatural beings showed the people how to send possessions to the spirits of the dead by breaking them. He wrote that “to this day [the living] … send[] after their brother the souls of men’s possessions that all may be well in the aftertime …” (Cushing 1896: 415). Historic period residents of Zuni generally believed that they should not retain possessions of the deceased to avoid remembrances of the spirit and to prevent the spirit from desiring these items. It was important to keep the dead from longing for this world, least the spirit attempt return, form an attachment, and take a living person back with him/her to the afterlife.
The ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts provide varied descriptions about the inclusion of material objects in the grave. Most of the authors noted that people in the Historic period placed a few personal items and/or perhaps an important personal ritual possession in the grave with the remains. However, family members tended to decommission personal possessions at other another place in separate ritual events. Parsons (1916: 252) reported that “pottery and the other valuables of the deceased are now buried separate [from the grave], at a certain spot on the banks of the river...”. She suggested that the river would carry these items to the deceased beneath the sacred lake.

Stevenson (1904) also described a ceremonial decommissioning of personal possessions in a place west of the village by the Zuni River. Family members placed the deceased’s clothes and personal possessions in a small pit by the river. They occasionally buried a ritual society mask sprinkled with corn meal in a separate feature. Finally, the family planted prayer sticks for the spirit of the deceased, as the feather’s acted as protective clothing for the spirits of the dead. Cushing (1896: 336) suggested that the living burned the possessions of the deceased along with some clan possessions and food offerings, as a reference to previous cremation practices. He noted that people threw the ashes from the fire into the Zuni River to carry the souls of possessions to the spirit of the deceased.

Although Historic period residents of Zuni did not inter many material possessions in burial features, nearly all the accounts indicate that the living did place items in graves in prehistory. Parsons (1916), Stevenson (1904), and Cushing (1896) all suggested that prehistoric residents of Zuni settlements included personal possessions and ritual items in burial features. In particular, each noted the amount of artifacts present on the surface of Zuni cemeteries, and some referred to the exposure of prehistoric graves. Ellis (1968) was quite clear that, even though some Puebloan people did not place many items in graves in the Historic period, Ancestral Puebloan people did place items in graves to send the spirit of these possessions with the deceased. It is likely that mission priests forced, or at least strongly discouraged, people from burying the dead with possessions, particularly ritual paraphernalia. In response to acts of religious persecution during missionization, perhaps the Historic period Zuni practice of
decommissioning items in caches near the Zuni River and/or tossing the ashes of burned possessions into the river was a way to continue sending items to the spirits of the dead.

Along with some personal property, Ancestral Puebloan and some Historic Puebloan peoples also placed personal ritual paraphernalia in burial features. Within Puebloan ritual and ceremonial societies, priests, officers, and society members distinguish between sacred paraphernalia that is owned by the ritual group and paraphernalia that is a personal possession (see Mills 2004). Those items that cannot be replaced, which have a universal value and collective social histories, are held in store rooms that specific clans maintain (Brandt 1994). Mills (2004) has argued that these items are collectively owned inalienable possessions and are passed on after a ritual practitioner’s death. However, those items that a ritual society member acquires himself/herself and uses as personal property are individually owned inalienable possessions. It is these items, along with most personal possessions, that the living decommission. Historic period, and possibly prehistoric era, peoples may have placed these items in the grave with the deceased to ensure that the spirit took them with him/her to Köluwala:wa. They may have also buried them in caches away from the body, cast them into the Zuni River so that the waters carried the items to the deceased in Köluwala:wa, or simply destroyed them to eliminate the power of the objects within this world and to send the object’s spirit to Köluwala:wa.

The handling of a deceased person’s Katsina mask in Historic period Zuni pueblo provides a clear example. High-ranking Katsina officers impersonated the supernatural priests of the kokko, who were named and well-known spirit beings. The masks that officers used to become these beings were collective, society property. They were kept in a ritual storeroom under the watch of a particular clan, and were passed down through generations. When a person, usually a man, was initiated into the Katsina society, he commissioned or made for himself a personal mask. Traditionally, family members buried the mask with his remains or buried it in a cache away from the grave so that the spirit might take it to Köluwala:wa. A spirit's possession of the mask guaranteed admission to Katsina Village or the dance house of the gods, and ensured that the spirit could visit the village through rain (Bunzel 1932, Stevenson 1904).
After burial, while the living waited for the spirit to reach Koluwalawá:wa, they took precautions to ensure the spirit did not form any attachments to people or possessions in this world and did not cause any harm. Family members bathed a spouse thoroughly, often with cold water. Parsons (1916) reported that people left objects used to treat the deceased and bury the body on the roof and left their doors open for four days. They also put away or destroyed remaining property of the deceased, because yearning may result in following the dead. Anyone whom the spirit visited in a dream or who felt ill after coming in contact with the corpse was either treated with piñon gum smoke or inhaled smoke from a burning lock of the deceased’s hair. Close family members took precautions against dreaming about the deceased; they placed a bit of black corn and a small piece of charcoal under their heads at night (Stevenson 1904: 307). Finally, mourners washed their hair thoroughly after four days to purify themselves (see Stevenson 1904: 306, 310).

The living also tried to ensure that the spirit had plenty of provisions for their journey to Koluwalawá:wa. Family members and/or ritual society members threw food into their fires at different intervals throughout the four day period. The practice of provisioning the spirit of the dead with food often continued at other times of the year. In Historic period Zuni settlements, the offering of food and prayer sticks was the most common and widely accepted interaction with the spirits.

Social Identities and Memories of the Dead in Historic Zuni Pueblo.

In Historic period Zuni settlements, the performance of mortuary ritual shaped social memories of ancestral spirits and collective spirits of the dead. More specifically, they merged the spirits of the dead with the a: 'lhacinaiwe (the “ancients”), who could bestow general blessings upon the living. These ancestral spirits and other supernatural beings could visit the village in large cumulus clouds that brought life-giving rains.

Residents of Zuni pueblo and surrounding villages conducted funerary rituals in part to help people forget the recent dead so that they might enjoy fulfilled and separate lives in the next world. More specifically, the living removed the person’s social identity and their spirit from their communities and assisted its journey to a new life in Koluwalawá:wa (Bunzel 1932). Families interred the deceased quickly after death in community-wide cemeteries to join them with
collective groups of family dead, or, as Cushing (1896: 336) stated, with the “Fathers and children of the descending ladder” (perhaps a simultaneous reference to old, now buried settlements and to the lake at Koluwala:wa). Both Parsons (1916: 254) and Cushing (1896: 187) noted that the name of a recently deceased family member was taboo for some time. People referenced the dead person as “[h]e who is gone” or through a kinship term. Family members were very leery of dreams about persons who had died, as they were interpreted as visitations from the spirit. People used various ritual items and actions to prevent these dreams (Bunzel 1932, Parsons 1916, Stevenson 1904).

Ellis (1968) noted that most people throughout the Historic Puebloan world were concerned with removing the deceased’s active social identity and memory from the community of the living. She (Ellis 1968: 68) recounted a common Puebloan funerary prayer that encouraged the spirit to join the other spirits in the next life and to seek fulfillment there:

Oh, my dear sister (or brother),
Now for you there is only rest,
Now for you the Shiwannah (rain priests) are waiting,
Now for you the Kupishtaiya (other rain spirits) sing,
Hear how beautiful their song.

The rain birds,
The cloud people,
The old ones,
The Katcina,
Now for you are calling,
By their first names are they calling.

...

Go now in this right way,
Now you are going, four days passing, four times ending,
Never look back,
Never touching,
Taking no one with you,
That thus, in this right way turning,
All is forgotten.

In general, the living maintained social memories of ancestral spirits and collective spirits of the dead. The a: ‘lhacinaie (the “ancients”) were a:’wona: wi’ lona, or “keepers of the roads” (Bunzel 1932: 510). Together, they guided, protected, and fostered people’s lives in Zuni communities. They, along with other supernatural beings, bestowed rain, seeds, old age, health,
and happiness upon Zuni communities as long as the living observed the ritual calendar and remembered them in prayer, song, and occasional offerings of food.

Bunzel (1932) noted that the collective identity of the a: 'lhacinaiwe often merged with the identities of other supernatural beings, largely through their association with rain and water. People sometimes referred to the dead as “those who have attained the blessed place of waters” (Bunzel 1932: 510). People prayed to the a: 'lhacinaiwe and other supernatural beings for rain, and maintained that the spirits returned to the village clothed in rain. In particular, the spirits of the dead were often associated with the Katcina and with the U’wanam:i (water spirits), who also resided in Koluwa:wa and visited the village in spirit through rain. Bunzel (1932: 510, 516) and others noted that people did hold a distinction between the spirits of the dead and these other beings; they offered specific prayer sticks (painted in black and decorated with turkey feathers) to the a: 'lhacinaiwe.

Several accounts suggest, however, that the spirits of priests and/or ritual officers joined other supernatural beings separate from the general community of the dead. Stevenson (1904: 20) reported that the spirits of Bow Priests joined the Ku’pishtaya as lightning makers, while the spirits of other community members travel to Koluwa:wa and help to supply rain to the world. Bunzel (1932) implied that officers of the Katcina joined the spirit priests of the Katcina in a multi-story dwelling adjacent to the village of the dead in Koluwa:wa. Initiates into the Katcina society supposedly continued their responsibilities to join in dances and gatherings in the afterlife. Furthermore, Bunzel (1932: 517) noted the spirits of medicine men who had the power of “calling the bear” joined other beast priests in a place called Cipapolima in the east.

Although the spirits of some ritually powerful persons may have journeyed to a few different places in the next life, they all joined with groups of affiliated supernatural beings. They were, in general, referenced and prayed to together as a: 'lhacinaiwe. They continued as a collective group of spirits who lived separate but near to Zuni pueblo. These spirits maintained some of their social and ritual responsibilities in perpetuity in Koluwa:wa, and they could return on celebrated occasions to provide blessings.
Interactions with the Spirits of the Dead.

In Historic period Zuni pueblo, the living did not interact directly with a: ’ihcinaiwe (the “ancients” or ancestral spirits) and they rarely invoked them, especially as individual spirits. Instead, people prayed and sent offerings to them as a collective group in most ceremonial events and actions. The living asked the spirits of the dead to send them the blessings of life – life, old age, health, seeds, and rain. They are particularly identified with rain and clouds. Thus, a: ’ihcinaiwe did return to Zuni on occasion, with the priests of the kokko. They came clothed in rain inside large cumulus clouds.

Bunzel (1932: 510) explicitly stated that there were no special ceremonies devoted exclusively to invoking active members of the a: ’ihcinaiwe, and that there was nothing esoteric about interactions with spirits of the dead. She wrote that “all individuals [were] on equal footing and [had] direct access to the supernaturals without the mediation of priests.” Moreover, the living did not have any special ritual paraphernalia for contacting the a: ’ihcinaiwe and did not maintain any special places for interacting with them. Instead, people referenced the spirits of the dead, prayed to them, and made small offerings at most ceremonies and during some other ritual actions.

Several accounts described an All Soul’s Day, however, that may have some antiquity within the Puebloan world prior to Catholic influences (see Cushing 1896: 338; Parsons 1916: 255; Stevenson 1904: 238). Parsons (1916: 255) called this day a’hapa awán dewa or “dead their day,” while Cushing (1896: 338) referred to it as the “Feast of the Dead.” Near the end of the days counted to announce arrival of the Sha’leko, a religious official broadcasted that households had four days to gather wood and prepare food for the occasion. When this day of the dead arrived, people offered a portion of all food prepared to the spirits of the dead. In addition, during the great Sha’leko ceremony, the Koyemshi (or Mudheads) collected wafer bread from every household to offer it to the a: ’ihcinaiwe at the river (Parsons 1916: 255). Ellis (1968: 66, 70) documented a similar observance of an All Soul’s Day at some Keresan pueblos and at Acoma and Laguna. In general, families offered food and prayer sticks to the long-dead by either placing them outside their homes or by burning them and saying a few prayers.
In general, the living mentioned the a: ‘lhacinaïwe in most prayer and song and offered them small tokens of food. They prayed, sang, and made offerings for the spirits to send them blessings, particularly in the form of rain. People threw food into a fire on some ceremonial occasions to offer it to the spirits of the dead in Koluwalâ:wa, and some families offered small scraps of food at the evening meal to them. Men also fed the dead prior to a deer hunting expedition (Bunzel 1932, Parsons 1916). In addition to food, people planted prayer sticks in the ground, often by the river or at the edges of the cemetery, to offer them to the spirits of the dead. Bunzel (1932) noted that the prayer sticks for spirits of the dead were painted black and decorated with turkey feathers (while those offered to the Katcinas were decorated with duck feathers). Prior to a war expedition or a footrace, men offered prayer sticks to the spirits of the dead in solemn locations by the Zuni River (Parsons 1916: 255).

Although Historic period residents of Zuni referenced the spirits of the dead as a collective group in nearly all instances, Bunzel (1932: 510 - 511) noted one exception in which small groups of ritually important people invoked individual members of the dead. She reported that officers of some powerful ritual societies may have maintained special relationships with departed officers or priests of their order. Living priests, officers of the Katcina, or medicine men may have invoked past priests, officers, or medicine men to send their spirits to sit with them during important, controlled ritual observances or practices. They never engaged with these spirits, however, as active progenitors of a ritual order or society. Instead, ritual officers called on these spirits as past representatives of that order or society to offer support and additional blessings, just as others may have referenced familial ancestral spirits at ceremonial occasions to send blessings.

In the Historic period, the a: ‘lhacinaïwe resided in a community – Koluwalâ:wa – that was a parallel (or an inversion) of living communities. There, the spirits retained important components of their social and ritual responsibilities, and continued those responsibilities to maintain this other-worldly community in perpetuity. They contributed to the collective group of Zuni spirits and merged into that collectivity. If the living remembered them in prayer, ritual actions, and small
offerings, then the spirits might bestow blessings upon them. They might return to Zuni villages for periodic visits in the form of high cumulus clouds that bring drenching rains.

The Ancestral Spirits of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa

I have argued that the performance of mortuary ritual in Protohistoric Zuni towns fashioned ancestral spirits who merged into collectivities of the long-dead and other Zuni spirits. Through the course of this chapter, I developed an argument about the social memories surrounding the spirits of the dead in late prehistoric Zuni villages. This argument grew from considerations of prehistoric population histories in the Cibola area and the occupational context of burial in Protohistoric Zuni villages. Then, I presented an examination of mortuary ritual to evaluate ideas about the social memories for the spirits of the dead. Finally, in the discussion sections, I offered a composite overview of Historic era Zuni mortuary ritual and interactions with spirits of the dead to interpret prehistoric social identities for the spirits.

In this concluding section, I discuss the ways in which the spirits of the dead participated in Protohistoric era Zuni communities. I contend that the ancestral spirits and groups of long-dead were curators of group histories during a period of rapid social transformation and population coalescence. They kept social and family group histories and knowledge in perpetuity. Moreover, they continued to engage with these pasts and to conduct important ritual actions in the next life, so as to contribute them to a complete community of both the living and the dead.

Ancestral Spirits and Groups of Long-Dead as Curators of Social Group Histories in Zuni Communities

Here, I use both archaeological data and the ethnohistoric and ethnographic records to construct a composite picture of the performance of mortuary ritual in Protohistoric and Historic era Zuni communities. I establish that these performances shaped ancestral spirits and groups of long-dead who maintained some basic ties to the inhabitants of Zuni towns. Moreover, these performances and continued interactions with the deceased established the spirits as curators of local social group histories. The spirits kept social and family group affiliations, responsibilities, and knowledge, and perpetuated them.
Both the archaeological and ethnographic records indicate that people prepared the remains of the deceased for burial rather quickly after death. Ethnographic accounts suggest that family members may have washed the body and then proceeded to dress it in some of the person’s fine garments. As they prepared the body, perhaps persons associated with the deceased’s ceremonial societies arrived and helped to treat the body to identify ritual affiliations and responsibilities. Ritual officers and/or sponsors may have painted parts of the body, particularly the face, in meaningful ceremonial colors with pigments and/or added ornaments and objects to the deceased’s dress. In some instances, people wrapped the body in blankets of cloth just prior to burial. The documentation of pigments, ornaments, some elements of ritual costume, and textiles in the mortuary record suggests that these behaviors had some antiquity.

After preparing the remains, persons then removed the body from its resting place and carried it to a burial location, most often in a designated cemetery area in front of the roomblock. Archaeological and supporting ethnographic evidence demonstrate that families and affiliated ritual societies maintained nearby cemeteries for the burial of kin-based social groups (see Howell 1994a and Kintigh and Howell 1996). It is likely that the living did not plan these areas rigidly, but rather interred familial and socially affiliated deceased in close proximity to each other. Recall Cushing’s (1894) observation that people in the Historic period preferred to bury the remains of the dead near to their ceremonial fathers and mothers.

Within these burial areas, the living predominantly constructed simple trench facilities for the interment of the dead. The mortuary record indicates that they lined the grave with matting or vegetal matter in many instances, and occasionally covered the deposit with a mat or other material. In a few instances, people constructed slightly more elaborate burial facilities, such as wood-lined trenches. It is likely that they built these log- or stone-lined facilities either to maintain the integrity of the feature and the remains in a less stable matrix or perhaps to commemorate a familial connection or ritual responsibility that the person held and thus mark the grave’s location.

During burial, family members and/or ritual society members arranged the body in the feature along with burial accompaniments. Archaeological evidence indicates that they most frequently placed the body in an extended, supine position in an east to west orientation.
However, it was not uncommon for survivors to place the body in a different position or orientation, likely to represent some element of social membership, ritual society membership, and/or ceremonial responsibility. For example, ethnographic accounts reveal that the deceased of some ritual societies may travel to worlds that lie in directions other than west of Zuni pueblo (see Bunzel 1932).

Unlike documented Historic era mortuary ritual, the living decommissioned at least some of the deceased's personal possessions and ceremonial paraphernalia in the burial facility. Evidence from the archaeological record suggests that they included personal items that were strongly associated with the deceased, such as household possessions and frequently used utilitarian objects. In addition, they placed a number of individually-owned ceremonial objects in the grave with the body.

The ethnographic record indicates that people intended to pass these items and their ritual responsibilities to the spirit for use in the next life. It was these items that enabled the spirit to belong to his/her ritual societies and to participate in necessary ceremonies in the community of spirits. In addition to these accompaniments, people also included food and water offerings for the deceased. The prehistoric mortuary record contains evidence that corn, beans, squash, and perhaps some liquids were placed in the grave. Ethnographic accounts interpret food and water accompaniments/offerings as aids that help the spirit in its journey to the next world. Food items help the spirit subsist on its journey and ease its transition to the next life after initial arrival.

At the time of burial or shortly after, family members and ritual society members may have also destroyed and/or decommissioned additional possessions of the deceased. The ethnohistoric record explicitly documents the destruction of property and certain ritual items. Although these destructive actions may have been the result of Catholic pressures to stop placing possessions in mortuary deposits, there is archaeological evidence that this method of decommissioning objects has some antiquity. In his excavations at Hawikku, Hodge (in Smith et al. 1966: 279 – 293) recorded a number of deposits that contained what appeared to be personal possessions, ceremonial paraphernalia, and occasionally food. He found nearly all of them in the cemetery and midden areas surrounding the roomblocks, but only a few appear to have been
directly associated with a burial feature. It is likely that at least some of these features represent the decommissioning of items separate from the remains of the deceased.

Some residents of the Protohistoric Zuni towns, likely immigrants from areas south of Zuni, performed a cremation program for their deceased. There is no record of cremation in the ethnographic accounts, although Cushing (1896) suggested that the occasional burning of personal possessions referenced the program. Interpretations of the prehistoric cremation program rely solely on archaeological contexts.

Those families who cremated their dead processed the remains in large pyres either within primary facilities or on the ground surface. They often processed the remains thoroughly, perhaps even breaking them in the fire. Excavation notes suggest that people often burned some of the deceased’s possessions and/or food offerings in the fire as well. Family members and/or affiliated persons then gleaned the cremains along with some charred artifacts. Sometime later, they interred the remains in funerary vessels in round to oval, secondary pit features. Hodge (in Smith et al. 1966) noted that, subsequently, other vessels containing food and/or water offerings were placed in the pits.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine if people who performed the cremation program continued interaction with the remains of the deceased at some point after secondary burial. The living may have buried small sets of curated remains in shallow pits to mark an anniversary of death and/or burial, or they may have even re-opened secondary features to obtain a small handful of cremains for these mourning rituals. The data do not permit a proper assessment of these activities.

Once spirits departed for the next world, after either an inhumation or cremation ceremony, residents of Protohistoric towns did not interact directly with individual, named spirits of the dead. Rather, people likely interacted with them through simple ritual actions that remembered them and honored them collectively. The ethnographic and ethnohistoric records suggest that the living offered prayers and food to the spirits of the dead for blessings at nearly all ritual occasions. It is possible, though, that residents of Protohistoric towns did host a “dead their
day” or “Feast of the dead” to provision the spirits of the dead explicitly during a particular time of the ritual calendar.

As previously discussed, Hodge (in Smith et al. 1966: 279 – 293) recorded a series of non-mortuary features that contained material items and appreciable quantities of food. He suggested that, similar to Historic residents of Ojo Caliente, residents of Protohistoric era Zuni left offerings of food for the spirits of the dead in cemeteries, either on particular nights or at ritually proscribed times of the year (Hodge [in Smith et al. 1966: 280]). The detailed ethnohistoric and ethnographic presented here suggest that this is certainly a plausible interpretation. Future research might devote additional attention to these deposits to understand their relationships to mortuary ceremonialism.

Overall, the performance of mortuary ritual in Protohistoric and Historic era Zuni villages created social memories of generalized spirits who were affiliated with local social and family groups. The living memorialized nearly all the dead in a very similar manner. They did, however, recognize particular social affiliations and memberships, such as family associations and membership in particular ritual societies. Moreover, people passed certain possessions and important, individually-owned ritual items to the deceased around the time of burial. Ethnographic accounts suggest that the passing of these material objects ensured that the spirit could continue to use it in the next life, in Kōluwa:wa. It was important that the spirit maintained its ritual responsibilities among the community of other spirits.

Zuni ancestral spirits curated these memorialized social affiliations and ritual responsibilities. They kept these affiliations and commitments active in the next life. The ethnographic record indicates that the spirits were to contribute their ritual knowledge and observe ritual actions in order to perpetuate the communities of the living and the dead. As the recent-dead became the long-dead, and the memory of spirits faded, the ancestral spirits merged into a collective group of Zuni long-dead. The spirits formed a cohesive community where they maintained pasts and safeguarded the future.
Zuni Spirits of the Dead as “The Keepers of the Roads”

During the Pueblo IV period and early part of the Protohistoric era, major social transformations swept through the greater Zuni area. By AD 1400, regional populations were coalescing into large, multi-ethnic villages along the Zuni River. Both local and non-local social groups, perhaps from places as far away as central and southern Arizona, moved into these towns. Residents brought their own histories and social affiliations, but also participated in the formation of new communities. They continued to remember the roads that they walked to settle in these towns.

As Protohistoric era Zuni villages developed, inhabitants were likely carefully shaping their new shared identities. Archaeologists have begun to discuss the nuances of how these people negotiated their pasts and their identities, and how they created a Zuni identity that became regionally distinctive (Mills 2007a, Schachner 2006, see Gregory and Wilcox 2007). Recent research has suggested that different patterns of interaction can help to explain how people constructed these collective histories and identities in late prehistoric and Protohistoric Zuni villages. In other words, these patterns describe the many paths and roads that people took to these villages; they detail how these roads intersected in the formation of new, large communities.

I suggest that Zuni ancestral spirits and groups of long-dead played a significant role in the development of Protohistoric era Zuni communities and collective identities. Ancestral spirits, who were affiliated with local social and family groups, curated the histories of these groups. In ethnographic accounts, the spirits are referred to as “the keepers of the roads” for their families, social groups, and local communities. They preserved social memberships and ritual responsibilities, and they perpetuated them among the spirits. Through continued ritual service and maintenance of knowledge, they contributed to the maintenance of communities of both the living and the dead. Eventually, these ancestral spirits merged into the collective group of Zuni long-dead and other supernatural beings. In this way, the spirits forged collective histories and fostered shared identities in Zuni communities.
Thus, the residents of Protohistoric Zuni towns shaped and maintained relationships with the a:’lhacinaíwe (the “ancients”). People continued simple interactions with them to ensure that the spirits remained aːwonaː wi’lona, or “keepers of the roads,” for their families and communities. Along with other supernatural beings, these spirits of the dead returned from time to time to bless people with rain, seeds, old age, health, and happiness. The living could even watch their return in the large cumulus clouds that gathered in summer months to water the fields.
Chapter 6 Notes

1 In the digital database, most individuals in a multiple burial are designated with the same burial number and sequential letter (e.g., H27A, H27B, H27C). The data set contains 4 cases, however, in which burials with sequential feature numbers are marked as multiple burials (ex: H113, H114, H115, and H116). The count presented here assumes that sequential burials marked as multiple burials may have been found in the same mortuary feature.

2 Smith et al. (1966) describe Hawikku burials H909, H912, H916, and H917 as individuals in a multiple burial deposit. The digital data base does not identify these individuals as being in a multiple burial.

3 I included the feature linings and coverings in the MCA of inhumation body treatment, because the living either placed the body directly on the lining or covered the body with the lining or with stones.

4 This figure likely does not include any instances in which an isolated, additional skeletal element was found in a burial feature with a single individual. The available data do not contain any records of excavators identifying isolated elements in graves; however, given burial patterns in other parts of the Puebloan world, it is likely that this behavior occurred at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa.

5 The available digital data indicate that approximately 36 percent (n= 114 of 314) of cremation burials at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa was associated with temporally diagnostic pottery. Of the burials that were assigned to a time period, approximately 18 percent (n=20) were dated to the Ancestral Puebloan period, while 82 percent (n=94) were dated to the Protohistoric period.

6 It is possible that cremation burials that did not include pottery vessels date to the Ancestral Puebloan period. Thus, the living did not prefer to place pottery in these burial deposits until the Protohistoric period. However, the stratigraphic placement of many cremation burials lacking pottery and the context of these features suggest that many date to the Protohistoric period (see Smith et al. 1966: 204).

7 Kintigh credits James Allison with the development of this binomial z-score standardization for archaeological research. The measure is sometimes referred to as Allison’s binomial z-score in the literature.
CHAPTER 7

Conclusions

Archaeology can and should directly address the spirits of the dead in considerations of the mortuary record. The spirits are central to the ways in which history shapes and affects politics in both regional and local social environments. Different kinds of spirits – ancestors, ancestral spirits, and anonymous groups of the dead – participate in people’s socio-political affairs in varied ways. These spirits are significant agents in the nature and character of long-term political trajectories.

In this final chapter, I address the spirits’ connection to political histories. I contend that the spirits of the dead are deeply rooted in long-term sociopolitical traditions. More specifically, I argue that people shape distinct identities for the spirits of the dead in particular historical traditions of social competition. The relationships that people maintain with these beings embed them in social affairs and power dynamics, and they become integral players in regional and local political trajectories.

Following Morris (1991) and Keightley (2004), I construct a framework that outlines how the spirits develop within and become involved in political traditions of competition. Previous research indicates that active spirits of the dead play influential roles in settings where people contest social and economic standing. The spirits are key agents in competitions over resources, social positions, and even political authority (see Chapter 2: Why Ancestors? Tales of Social Competition and Power Dynamics). I suggest that people foster relationships with ancestors in cultural-historical environments where social power and prestige are openly contested. In contrast, people tend to transform the spirits of the dead into ancestral spirits and anonymous groups in settings where social power and prestige are rigidly fixed masked.

In the first portion of the chapter, I review this study’s results to address an initial goal – to understand how particular spirits of the dead participate in communities. I summarize the social identities that surrounded the spirits of the dead at the Mississippian village of Irene and the
Ancestral Puebloan towns Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I discuss the identities of the spirits to place them in these communities and on cultural landscapes.

In the second portion of the chapter, I consider the study's ultimate purpose – to illustrate the spirit's involvement in and influence upon long-term political trajectories. I incorporate the spirits of the dead into a comparative history of social competition in the Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan worlds. I situate potent Mississippian spirits in Eastern Woodland historical traditions of open social contestation. Then, I place stalwart Zuni spirits in Western Puebloan traditions of masked social and ritual inequalities.

**Ancestors, Ancestral Spirits, and History**

The main portion of this study is devoted to examining the performance of mortuary ritual in a Mississippian period town on the Georgia coast and in two Protohistoric era Zuni villages in New Mexico. Here, I compare and contrast results from the analysis of mortuary ritual at Irene and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. The comparison highlights the different identities for the spirits in these two places, and emphasizes the different ways in which these spirits participated in community affairs.

In the following comparison, I use both the archaeological data and the ethnographic and ethnohistoric evidence presented in this study to characterize the social memories and identities for the spirits. I consider the analysis of archaeological evidence to offer the primary, most accurate interpretation of these memories. In particular, the archaeological data form the principal evidence for memories that lead to the social identities of the spirits. I turn to the ethnohistoric and ethnographic data whenever possible to enhance these interpretations. These data help to illuminate further the ways in which the spirits participated in community social and political affairs.

The study’s results indicate that the performance of mortuary ritual at Irene fashioned ancestors who were active in political factions. In contrast, the performance of mortuary ritual at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa shaped ancestral spirits and anonymous groups of long-dead who preserved social and ritual responsibilities and group identities. Mississippian ancestors continued to use and shape history, while Zuni ancestral spirits curated histories.
The performance of inhumation burial programs at Irene and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa shaped very different social memories for the spirits of the dead. I argue that, at Irene, inhumation procedures involved a multi-staged treatment and burial program. A few of the treatments appear to represent separate, special rites that crafted memories of select dead. I contend that, at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, the inhumation process was a single-stage treatment and burial program. The procedures were relatively simple and uniform, but they did memorialize some aspects of the deceased’s social and ritual responsibilities.

Foremost, inhumation body treatments at Irene differentiated and memorialized select members of the dead, while body treatment at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa uniformly memorialized nearly all members of the dead. At Irene, people engaged in a multi-staged body processing program that was unequally applied to the dead. The living processed the remains of some individuals heavily; the processing treatments included potential exhumation, smoking and/or defleshing, bundling and/or curating the remains, and occasionally displaying them. It is likely that only a very small subset of the mortuary population received all treatments (Table 7.1). Finally, people lightly prepared the remains of many of the deceased for interment in primary burial contexts in the burial mound or elsewhere on site.

At Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, people prepared the remains of the deceased simply and efficiently for interment, without multiple stages (see Table 7.1). Archaeological evidence, augmented with ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts, indicates that people dressed and perhaps fed the dead shortly after death. They also occasionally ornamented the individual with symbols of social and ritual responsibility, such as jewelry or body painting. Then, the living wrapped the body in textiles and/or matting and transported the remains for burial.
Table 7.1. Comparison of the percentage of remains present within inhumation burials in Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan mortuary samples (number in parentheses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites (Culture Area)</th>
<th>Mostly Complete Body</th>
<th>Postcranial Body</th>
<th>Clustered and/or Isolated Elements (piles, bundles, or secondary)</th>
<th>Skull</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irene (Mississippian)</td>
<td>81(^{(*)})</td>
<td>4(^{(*)})</td>
<td>9(^{(*)})</td>
<td>5(^{(*)})</td>
<td>100(^{(**)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawikku and Kechiba:wa (Zuni)</td>
<td>94(^{(699)})</td>
<td>2(^{(18)})</td>
<td>2(^{(16)})</td>
<td>1(^{(11)})</td>
<td>100(^{(***)})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes one case in which body was missing a long bone.
** total excludes 48 cases lacking sufficient data.
*** I assumed that excavators encountered a mostly complete body if the burial was not identified as containing a "secondary deposit," "postcranial remains only," or a "skull only."

Inhumation mortuary facilities at Irene further differentiated and memorialized select dead. In contrast, facilities at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa emphasized the uniform, yet somewhat individualistic memorialization of the dead. At Irene, the multi-staged body processing program was related to interment in different architectural contexts. The remains of individuals who had been heavily processed were interred in particular locations within prominent architectural features. Some were placed in spaces that were memorials to the dead – the burial mound and the mortuary structure; others were placed in features devoted to the living – the council house. The remains of individuals who had been lightly prepared for burial were interred in groups within the body of the burial mound, in concentric rings around the mortuary, and elsewhere on site.

At Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, most mortuary facilities that housed inhumed remains were simple burial trenches and pits placed in cemeteries outside the pueblos. The only variations among facilities in these cemeteries were different feature linings (bark, mats, textiles, etc.) and coverings (mats, vegetable matter [perhaps foodstuffs], and stone cairns). Some persons, however, were buried in or on the floors of abandoned pueblo rooms. A few of the burial facilities in rooms were lined with wood beams and/or covered with stones. Although these cases warrant additional consideration, the variation in mortuary facilities likely represents individualized differences and/or elements of social group membership.
Finally, at Irene, the inclusion of mortuary accompaniments often memorialized or enhanced unique mortuary deposits. At Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, the inclusion of material items memorialized the individuals interred in separate burial features. These divergent patterns are evident in a comparison of artifact diversities among burials at Irene and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa (Figure 7.1). The comparison indicates that inclusion of material accompaniments in burial features was perhaps a rare event at Irene, while it was a relatively common event at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. It is important to note, though, that this comparison does not account for the differential preservation of perishable items in the American Southeast and Southwest. Some of the paucity of Irene assemblages in comparison to Zuni assemblages might be the result of poor preservation conditions on the Georgia coast. Nevertheless, the overall pattern remains intriguing.

At Irene, only 19 percent (n=51 of 267) of the dead were interred with material goods. Thirty eight of these 51 individuals were buried in association with a single item, such as a bone awl, shell pin, or a strand of shell beads. Only two people were placed in mortuary contexts associated with a substantial number of objects, which included three and four different types of artifacts respectively.

The “richest” and most unusual material assemblages at Irene were associated with mortuary contexts at the center of prominent architectural features. The arrangement of human remains and items in these deposits suggests that the deposits themselves formed larger scenes. In other words, the deposits themselves and not the individuals were important. These unique mortuary contexts were created at the heart of the Savannah phase burial mound, the interior of the mortuary structure, and the center of the rotunda.
At the Zuni villages of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, during the late prehistoric period, approximately 71 percent of individuals (n=795 of 1125) were buried with at least one mortuary accompaniment. A substantial percentage—36 percent—of the dead were associated with three or more different types of artifacts. Finally, a few individuals (n=16) were placed in mortuary facilities with large quantities and diversities of material culture (with ten or more different types of artifacts).
The archaeological patterning indicates that material accompaniments placed in burial features at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa were directly associated with individuals and each individual’s interment. More specifically, it suggests that some items were closely affiliated with that person (i.e., possessions, in some form or another), while others were foodstuffs provided to the deceased person (e.g., corn, beans, and squash). The ethnohistoric and ethnographic records support this interpretation and permit additional conjectures about the social and personal meaning of included objects. These accounts indicate that many accompaniments were likely personal possessions and individually owned ritual paraphernalia. They represented social and ritual group memberships and aspects of ceremonial responsibility. Moreover, some ethnographic accounts suggest the objects were decommissioned in burial to pass them to the spirits of the dead. In addition to possessions, the living often placed food and water in and above the grave to aid the deceased’s journey to the land of the dead.

*The Performance of Cremation at Irene and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa*

In general, the ritual performance of cremation has been underappreciated and under-problematized in archaeological mortuary analysis (see Williams 2008: 239 - 241). There has been a scholarly perception that cremation destroys the remains of mortuary rituals prior to burial, and that information about these acts is inherently limited. The prevailing attitude is that cremation data is meager data. Moreover, there is a long-standing assumption in the literature that examination of cremations requires detailed taphonomic and other technical analyses. This view reduces cremation to a taphonomic process or an osteological and contextual puzzle.

Recent research has begun to emphasize cremation as a ritual procedure, or a sequence, that transforms the body, the person, and the spirit. Williams (2008, see also 2004) and Sørensen and Bille (2009) have argued that cremation should be theorized and examined as a complete ritual process of transformation. More specifically, cremation is a process that involves many tangible experiences and senses, and a fundamental act of transformation – a transformation of the physical and the spiritual. It is a performative event.

Here, I highlight the *performance* of cremation at Irene and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I attempt to demonstrate that these two distinct performances fashioned very different social
memories for the spirits of the dead. I argue that, at Irene, cremation and secondary interment represented dedications and activations of potent, supernatural deposits and/or memorials. The process was an act of destruction and simultaneous renewal. I suggest that, at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, cremation denoted a termination and removal of the supernatural from the physical world (see Rakita and Buikstra 2005). The procedure created distance between this world and potential supernatural deposits.

I structure the following comparison of cremation at Irene and Hawikku on several aspects of the cremation sequence. I rely principally on Williams’ (2008) and Sørensen and Billes’ (2009) work to define the relevant aspects and material patterns. Based on these authors’ work, this discussion focuses on 1) the state of the remains selected for cremation, 2) firing and the inclusion of goods (pyre goods) in the crematory pyre, 3) visibility of and participation in cremation ritual 4) gleaning and curating burned remains, and 5) burial of burned remains and commemoration.

The State of the Remains Prior to Cremation

Cremation can be a ritual sequence that is part of a larger treatment program, or it can be the primary ritual sequence for the treatment of the remains. When cremation firing and body processing is applied to remains that have received previous, protracted body treatments, then it is a stage in a broader ritual treatment program. It may represent a selective treatment if only a subset of the population received the previous treatment. When cremation firing is applied to complete, unprocessed remains, then it is a primary treatment for transforming the deceased. Cremation is typically not a selective treatment in these instances.

I contend that cremation at Irene was a selective treatment that was perhaps part of a multi-staged body processing and burial program. It was a rare procedure at Irene and at many other Mississippian sites on the Georgia and South Carolina coast (see Chapter 5). Approximately three percent of the mortuary population at the Irene Mounds site was cremated and then interred in a secondary or successive context. A deposit that contained the cremated remains of several individuals was placed at the center of the Savannah phase burial mound, while a single cremation was buried near the center of the rotunda.
Those remains that were cremated at Irene and other Mississippian coastal sites might have been processed prior to firing. In other words, they may have been defleshed, disarticulated, and then bundled to curate them for cremation. Waring (1968b) advanced this argument in his interpretation of the cremations at the center of the Haven Home site burial mound near Irene (see Chapter 5). Moore (1897: 45 - 55) excavated a burial mound known as the Walker Mound (in present-day McIntosh County) that included the possible remnants or traces of a ritual sequence culminating in curated and buried cremains. He encountered deposits of co-mingled, unburned remains; co-mingled burned remains associated with a possible crematory pyre; and a cluster of funerary urns holding calcined, fragmentary remains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites (Culture Area)</th>
<th>Inhumation</th>
<th>Cremation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irene (Mississippian)</td>
<td>97 (n= 259)</td>
<td>3 (n=8)</td>
<td>100 (n=267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawikku and Kechiba:wa (Zuni)</td>
<td>66 (n=744)</td>
<td>34 (n=384)</td>
<td>100 (n=1128)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, I suggest that cremation at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa was a single treatment separate from inhumation. Population histories and other archaeological evidence indicate that non-local social groups who aggregated into Protohistoric era Zuni villages conducted cremation programs. It was a relatively common treatment at these villages. Approximately 34 percent of the population received a cremation treatment at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. Most cremations were interred in cemeteries on the margins of these villages. Some, however, were placed through or on pueblo room floors; the rooms presumably were abandoned.¹

*Cremation Firing and Pyre Goods.*

In their works, Williams (2008) and Sørensen and Bille (2009) emphasized the experiential and transformative nature of cremation firing. These authors highlight the various methods that attendants can use to transform the deceased. These methods or procedures inform the creation
of a spiritual being and the delivery of that being to its next destination. Similarly, the ways in which ritual attendants and observers interact with, view, and sense (e.g., smell, hear, feel) the transformation impact their perceptions of the transformation. For example, the placement of goods (pyre goods) in the cremation pyre with the deceased can effect a transformation of these items along with the person. The act can simultaneously destroy and transmute these items to send them along with the spiritual being.

Firing and body processing procedures were undoubtedly different at Irene and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. The complexity of the multi-staged treatment and burial program at Irene and coastal Mississippian sites suggests that cremation might have been a somewhat specialized, constrained procedure. In contrast, the wide accessibility and simple nature of body treatment at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa indicates that firing was a large-scale, communal event.

At Irene, there is no direct evidence for a cremation pyre or crematorium. It is possible that firing and processing were conducted at another location and that gleaned, curated remains were transported to Irene for inclusion in the burial mound (One cremation interred in the burial mound was placed in an unusually-shaped jar). However, archaeological evidence from another Mississippian period burial mound on the Georgia coast suggests that firing did occur sometimes in the immediate vicinity of burial. Moore (1897: 46, 49) recorded at least one pyre and possibly several more built next to burials within the Walker Mound in present-day McIntosh County. He noted that one contained fragmented, calcined human remains. His description and corresponding map suggest that these crematory fires were not particularly large or prominent. In addition, Moore (1897: 16 - 18) observed inhumations placed in log tombs, or pens, in several other mounds (Mounds B and C in Lawton’s Field) in McIntosh County. It is possible that these log tombs might have represented unburned pyres.

Unfortunately, the few descriptions of possible cremation pyres and the information about cremains are largely too deficient to construct useful interpretations. In particular, the accessible records for cremated bone do not include bone weights, skeletal representation, burning patterns, or color markings. Future research should concentrate on describing cremation firing and body processing.
Cremation deposits and associated contexts at Irene suggest that inclusion of pyre goods in the cremation fire was not common. These deposits do not include burned or charred artifacts. It is possible that perishable items, such as clothing and textiles and even foodstuffs, were completely consumed in the fire, or that attendants removed burned perishables when gleaning cremains (Note that the carbonization of perishable items in a cremation fire increases the chance of preservation.). Nevertheless, excavations did find unburned material accompaniments in association with cremation burials.²

Similar to Irene, there is little direct archaeological information about pyres and firing. The available data indicate that cremation took place either on the ground surface and/or in shallow trenches within or near to village cemeteries. Hodge described one cremation feature at Hawikku (H1152) that likely contained remnants of the pyre in a shallow pit dug into a cemetery area; Lothrop recorded a similar feature at Kechiba:wa (K177). Both features should receive additional research.

The cremation firing and processing at Protohistoric Zuni villages was very thorough. It is likely that the firing was intensive and prolonged, and that attendants stirred the remains to break them into smaller fragments. Hodge’s descriptions of cremation burials at Hawikku and Lothrop’s notes on cremations at Kechiba:wa emphasized the small, fragmentary nature of recovered cremains. Descriptions also occasionally mentioned intensive burning patterns.

Furthermore, the mortuary record suggests that cremation at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa typically involved the inclusion of pyre goods. Hodge suggested that the deceased was clothed or at least dressed in a few favorite ornaments and then provisioned with food items. He based this interpretation on the location of burned and charred textile fragments, ornaments, and food stuffs among cremains and in direct association with cremations in burial deposits. In fact, corn and beans were some of the most common items included in cremation deposits.

Ethnohistoric accounts are consistent with archaeological data on cremation pyres and firing. These records indicate that pyres were open-air processing structures that permitted participants to include goods. In an article exploring cremation among Pueblan communities, Toulouse, Jr. (1944) synthesized several relevant accounts that describe cremation, some likely
at Zuni. Obregón (1928), who cited the Don Antonio de Espejo’s expedition to New Mexico, noted that village residents constructed heaps of wood to burn the remains of the deceased and their articles of clothing. Bandelier presented a passage on cremation from Padilla’s *Historia de la Nueva Galacia* (in Toulouse 1944: 68). Padilla discussed a ritual event that members of the Coronado Expedition witnessed in a Tiwa settlement, east of Zuni. The account noted that people built a large wood pyre that was covered with a mantle to burn the remains of the deceased. Then, most residents of the pueblo – both men and women – arrived at the pyre site with food items such as piñole, squash, beans, atole, and toasted maize. Attendants set fire to the wood pile, the remains, and the food. The other accounts that Toulouse, Jr. (1944) presented also mention the inclusion of tools, personal possessions, and/or food in the cremation pyre.

*Visibility of Cremation Pyres and Participation in Cremation Ritual.*

The visibility of cremation pyres and the ability to participate in ritual acts can profoundly impact people’s perception of the deceased’s transformation (Sørensen and Bille 2009). If the pyre and processing are not open to observers, then people might consider the transformation to be punctuated and somewhat mysterious. Conversely, if the pyre and processing are open to observers and participants, then people experience the transformation themselves. They view the destruction of the body and the person’s physical transmutation into another being.

I contend that cremation at Irene might have been restricted from broad public visibility and participation. Cremation firing was likely conducted on a modestly sized fire, perhaps in the vicinity of burial (see description of Mississippian pyres above). Architecture might have concealed the pyre itself and the act of firing in some instances. It is even possible that some cremation took place inside structures or enclosures dedicated to body processing.

Many portions of the multi-staged body processing program at Irene took place in controlled and likely regulated spaces, such as the mortuary structure. Both archaeological and ethnohistoric evidence indicate that defleshing and/or smoking remains occurred in specialized buildings separated from regular community spaces. Maintaining at least some portions of cremation hidden from public view and participation would be consistent with these other procedures. If cremation occurred in the immediate vicinity of the interments at the burial mound’s
core, then one of the fence lines enclosing the burial and platform mounds might have concealed the pyre. The few material traces of fires associated with burial mound deposits indicate that they were moderately-sized, ephemeral features. Alternatively, cremation might have occurred in association with a nearby structure or other enclosure that served to process remains, similar to the later Irene phase mortuary structure. In this scenario, the remains would have been transported to the burial location in an urn. The cremation placed in the Irene phase rotunda was likely curated and transferred for interment.

In contrast, I argue that cremation at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa was highly visible and that it was open to community participation. In some instances, a relatively large audience might have witnessed and perhaps experienced cremation events that took place just outside the village.

At Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, the mortuary record suggests that cremation took place either on the ground surface and/or in shallow trenches within or near to village cemeteries. Hodge described one Hawikku feature (H1152) that likely contained remnants of the pyre in a shallow pit dug into a cemetery area. In addition, Lothrop recorded a similar feature at Kechiba:wa (K177). Both features deserve additional research.

As previously discussed, ethnohistoric accounts also indicate that pyres were widely visible, open-air processing structures. Some accounts emphasized that the pyre and cremation process drew many community members. Obregón (1928), who cited the Don Antonio de Espejo’s expedition to New Mexico, suggested that all the village women typically attended a cremation. They often brought corn and a piece of wood to toss into the fire (see Toulouse 1944). Bandelier’s reproduction of Padilla’s account from Historia de la Nueva Galacia (in Toulouse 1944: 68) mentioned that nearly all members of a Tiwa pueblo, men and women, attended a cremation pyre. Like Obregón’s description, this narrative indicates that most participants brought food to place in the fire.

Gleaning and Curation of Burned Remains.

The gleaning and curation of cremated human bone that has been processed in a pyre or crematoria shapes continued interaction with the remains and remembrances of the deceased. Ritual participants might collect all of the burned bone, and then carefully curate all the remains.
for burial. Alternatively, they might collect only tokens, or they might collect most of the remains and then divide them into token parcels (see Williams 2008: 242). These acts suggest different ways of interacting with cremains, and different ways in which remembrance of the deceased will continue.

At Irene and other Mississippian mounds, the process of gleaning and potential curation of remains is difficult to describe in detail. The mortuary record at Irene and other coastal burial mounds indicates that, in some instances, cremation may have occurred in the immediate vicinity of burial. If cremation firing did occur adjacent to burial deposits with co-mingled remains, then the remains were likely swept or placed directly into these deposits. Ritual attendants could still curate some portion of the cremains for display, re-burial, or other ceremonial uses. They could even re-open these deposits, and glean and curate remains at some later date. Assessment of bone weights and skeletal representation within co-mingled sets of cremains could address these questions.

In other instances, cremation firing and body processing likely did not occur in the vicinity of burial, and gleaning was necessary. The mortuary record at Irene and at other sites on the Georgia and South Carolina coast includes cremains curated and buried in vessels, typically urns or jars. At Irene, two cremations were curated and then buried in jars – one in association with the cremation deposit at the center of the burial mound and the other in the rotunda. In other burial coastal burial mounds, vessels containing fragmented, calcined remains were interred in groups, in association with other masses of co-mingled remains, and in individual features.

At Hawikku and Kechiba:wa, ritual attendants likely gleaned the remains of a burned individual shortly after the firing and then swept the area clean. The mortuary record suggests that the cremains, along with ash and some burned offerings, were placed in a funerary urn, which was typically a polychrome vessel. These remains were then curated for any unidentified period of time prior to burial. It is also possible that some small portion of the cremains was curated beyond a principal secondary burial for use in one or more remembrance events (see discussion below).
Interestingly, some of the vessels were notched along their rims in a quadripartite pattern, and some had chips removed from a portion of the rim. It is difficult to determine if these intentional, symbolic markings were done prior to, during, or perhaps even after secondary burial. These notches could be related to the holes ("kill holes") punched in the base of funerary urns at the time of burial (see discussion below).

*Burial of Cremated Remains and Commemoration.*

Finally, the subsequent burial and commemoration of cremated remains shapes the place(s) of the dead and potential ways to maintain interaction with the spirits. Burial situates the cremains on a landscape and often associates them with particular natural or built features. In some ways, it defines where the dead reside and/or where they intersect with the world of the living. The placement and construction of these features can also determine how people maintain relationships with spirits of the dead or severe those relationships. Burial deposits that encourage interaction with remains and that memorialize the spirits in spaces close to lived environments bring the spirits into communities. In contrast, burial deposits that encourage distance between the dead and lived environments separate the spirits from communities.

At Irene, cremated remains were often interred in unique mortuary deposits at the center of prominent architectural features. A group of cremated remains (approximately seven cremations or individuals [?]) was placed in a founding deposit at the heart of the burial mound – a space dedicated to memorializing and interacting with the dead. Another cremation was buried in a shallow burial near the center of the rotunda – a space dedicated to active decision-making among the living.

Moore’s (1897, 1899a, 1899b, 1899c) excavations of other Mississippian period burial mounds on the Georgia and South Carolina coast indicate that burial deposits of co-mingled cremated remains were often placed near the center of these mounds, usually beneath thick layers of shell. Although it is difficult to determine the date of many of these burial deposits, the identification of Mississippian era ceramics in association with some deposits suggests that the burial of some co-mingled sets of cremains dates to the Mississippian period. Interestingly,
Moore’s descriptions of the mounds also include the location of urns containing single or perhaps portions of multiple individuals.

The central deposit of cremains in the Irene burial mound and many deposits of co-mingled cremains in other mounds on the Georgia and South Carolina coast contained material accompaniments, most unburned. Many of the items appear to be associated with the deposits and not individual sets of cremains (i.e., individual persons). The items are often rare and unique. At Irene, the central deposit contained a conch shell cup, which many archaeologists and anthropologists associate with the Southeastern black drink ceremony (e.g., Anderson 1994, Caldwell and McCann 1941, Thompson 2009).

In contrast, cremated remains at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa were predominantly interred outside villages and away from lived spaces. They were typically buried in cemeteries outside roomblocks. Moreover, they were placed in cemeteries and concentrated groups that were often noticeably separate from inhumation burial features.

Secondary cremations were often interred in funerary urns, most frequently in Matsaki Polychrome jars. The remains were held in upright jars, and were then usually covered by an inverted bowl. Some of the jars and bowls had holes punched in their bases. Hodge interpreted these as “kill holes,” intended to facilitate release of the spirit from the burial deposit (Smith et al. 1966: 204 - 205). They might also symbolize the release of the pot’s essence or spirit as it was decommissioned in a burial feature (Presumably, much of the deceased’s spirit was released from the remains during the cremation process.) (see Walker 1999).

These secondary deposits occasionally included a few material accompaniments that were not passed through the fire. Common objects were a personal ornament, a tool, or some foodstuffs. Vessels were the most common accompaniment of any of the items placed in secondary cremation burials. They likely contained food and/or water provided to the spirit at the time of burial or some time later.

Finally, there is some evidence that secondary burial was not the final stage of interment. Continued commemoration in the cremation sequence might have involved successive burial and/or re-visitation. Small pits that contained handfuls of cremated remains (i.e., very small
portions of an individual) may represent successive burial episodes associated with remembrance. People may have curated a fraction of the cremains to bury them in simple pit features during later remembrance events, or they may have re-opened principal secondary features to retrieve cremains for a remembrance event.

Mississippian Rites of Incorporation and Zuni Rites of Separation

Williams (2008) drew a distinction in cremation ritual between “rites of incorporation” and van Gennep’s (1960 [1909]) “rites of separation.” He suggested that “rites of incorporation” are secondary or special rites that people conduct after other ritual acts or treatments, such as temporary burial, mummification, disarticulation and bundling, etc. They are acts that can install potent, active spirits. In the context of this study, these rites can help to shape memories of ancestors. He suggested that “rites of separation” are primary rites that occur shortly after death. These rites separate the deceased from the social world of the living, and simply transform the dead into spiritual beings. They help to shape memories of generalized spirits that become ancestral spirits or anonymous groups of spirits.

I use this simple distinction to summarize the comparison of cremation at Irene and at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa. I characterize the performance of cremation ritual at each of these places as either a “rite of incorporation” or a “rite of separation” based on the comparative discussions in the previous sections. This characterization forms a synthesis of the social memories that cremation creates for the spirits of the dead at Irene and Hawikku, and a picture of the social identities that surround these spirits.

The performance of cremation at Irene likely represents a “rite of incorporation” for the spirit of the dead. The ritual sequence, at least in some instances, was a separate, additional procedure that followed other treatments. It served to install a spirit and to burn its presence into a place.

Cremation at Irene can be viewed an advanced stage of processing in a multi-staged body processing and burial program. The ritual sequence appears to embody one “end” for select sets of remains that had been smoked and/or defleshed. Thus, some secondary cremation deposits in Mississippian period burial mounds, particularly those that contained the calcined
remains of adults interred in co-mingled groups, may represent the burned remnants of defleshed remains that had been curated in mortuary structures, in other ceremonial facilities, or in containers within domestic contexts. Recall that Waring (1968b) presented a similar argument about the cremations he encountered at the heart of the Haven Home site burial mound near Irene (see Chapter 5).

I suggest that, on the Mississippian period Georgia and South Carolina coast, rare and unusual cremation deposits dedicated sacred spaces and activated the supernatural in and around them. Cremations, particularly collective cremation interments, were used as founding deposits at the heart of prominent built features. They formed the core of burial mounds, which were active memorials to the spirits of the dead. Moreover, they were occasionally placed in council-houses or pavilions, which were spaces where the living gathered. It would appear that cremations and other heavily processed remains that were placed in councils served to introduce the spirits into these lived spaces.

In contrast, the performance of cremation at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa was a “rite of separation.” The ritual sequence was the primary vehicle for separating the deceased’s person from the social world of the living. It effectively transformed the deceased into a spirit and then delivered that spirit to its next destination.

Cremation at Protohistoric era Zuni towns was a separate body treatment and burial program from inhumation. Archaeological data indicate that separate social groups performed cremation and inhumation. Those who cremated their dead passed the remains through several primary, basic stages that were applied to nearly all persons who received the treatment. The stages included the firing and churning of remains (perhaps with some material items and foodstuffs), gleaning and potential curation of recovered cremains, and eventual burial of cremains (with perhaps additional material items and/or foodstuffs). Finally, the program may have involved some successive interaction and additional re-burial of small sets of cremains in simple, periodic remembrance ceremonies (see Chapter 6).

I contend that cremation at Protohistoric era Zuni towns was a body processing and burial program that destroyed the physical body and released the spirit from the world of the
living. Cremation processing likely took place in spaces away from lived settings and architecture. This processing involved thoroughly burning and likely churning and/or breaking the remains to create small, fragmentary cremains from the body. The potential inclusion of artifacts and/or foodstuffs in the cremation pyre suggests that the destruction of the body was accompanied by the destruction of some affiliated objects and food, perhaps as a method of passing them with the spirit to the next realm. After the remains were gleaned, secondary interment occurred in discrete cemeteries outside the village. Simple, periodic remembrance events indicate that people likely maintained a time to recall these spirits who resided outside the community. In other words, they did not engage in regular or intensive interaction with these beings. Rather they remembered these spirits who merged into distant groups of the dead.

Although speculative, it is plausible that differences between Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan cremation programs are related to ritual uses of fire (Sørensen and Bille 2009). In the prehistoric Southeast, many cultural traditions viewed fire as a regenerative force. People in the Mississippian world often maintained persistent fires in elaborate hearths within ceremonial houses (Residents at Irene built several elaborate hearths and fire gutters in the ceremonial houses that sat atop the platform mound stages). Seasonal ritual cycles were tied to renewal events that involved refreshing this fire. Cremation likely destroyed the body to regenerate the spirit of the dead, perhaps even to instill a new potency into this spirit. The ritual sequence simultaneously dedicated and activated the spaces and monuments where these spirits were memorialized.

In many parts of the Prehispanic Southwest, communities considered fire to be a destructive and terminating force. Researchers have argued that people burned kivas and other ritual structures to close them after use. Several archaeologists have implicated the use of fire in the destruction of witches (Darling 1999, Walker 1998, Walker 2008). Thus, in the Southwest, fire likely served to release supernatural forces from the earth. Cremation destroyed the body and the social person, and transformed the deceased into a spirit that was immediately released from this world. It is interesting to note that large, open-air cremation pyres, like those that processed remains at Protohistoric era Zuni towns, might produce appreciable amounts of smoke. Puebloan
traditions and stories hold that the spirits of the dead can travel between this world and the next as clouds, which share a visual similarity with puffs of smoke. Perhaps the smoke rising from a cremation pyre visualized the transformation into a spirit and the spirit’s passage to its next destination.

*Irene’s Ancestors as Political Actors and Zuni’s ancestral spirits as Historical Curators*

Through the performance of mortuary ritual, people at the Irene Mounds site fostered relationships with ancestors. The multi-staged processing and burial program – which included inhumation and cremation – shaped memories of potent spirits associated with active, likely powerful mortuary deposits and spaces. Protracted processing distilled these spirits into special beings whose remains were displayed and handled in spaces devoted to the living and the dead. Additional archaeological and ethnohistoric evidence suggests that the spirits and their remains were even fed on a regular basis.

These ancestors were active in socio-political affairs and were likely influential in local political factions on Mississippian period landscapes. In the Savannah phase, a lineage likely curated and displayed the heavily processed remains of select dead in ceremonial houses atop mounds. The eventual burial of these displayed remains as bundles and isolated elements in the flanks of the burial mound associated these spirits with active monuments that continued to memorialize them. Restricted access to ceremonial structures, mounds, and the spirits they housed lent supernatural power to leaders at a time when power was highly contested in the Savannah River basin and on the Georgia coast.

In the Irene phase, elect lineages not only displayed and handled remains in mortuary structures but also in council houses. The mortuary record contains evidence that people occasionally curated the heavily processed remains of select dead in councils. The curation and/or burial of these remains in council houses indicates that particular spirits played influential roles in activities that took place in political venues. In addition, the living likely transformed the mortuary structure into a council house for the dead. In the mortuary’s decommissioned architecture, people shaped a deposit that placed remains of the dead into an arrangement resembling other late prehistoric and Historic period councils. It was a scene that forever
memorialized the roles of the dead in decision-making within Late Mississippian period communities on the Georgia coast.

In contrast, residents of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa maintained relationships with ancestral spirits and anonymous groups of dead. Separate social groups conducted an inhumation and cremation burial program. Nevertheless, archaeological evidence suggests both programs fashioned social memories of generalized, stalwart spirits who resided separately from the living. People imbued the dead and the spirits that they became with identifiers of their social and ritual group memberships. In addition, ethnographic accounts indicate the living passed certain social and ritual responsibilities to the spirits so that they might continue these obligations in the next world, in perpetuity.

These ancestral spirits and groups of long-dead curated Zuni social group histories and preserved their ritual duties. The mortuary record indicates that people interred the deceased in ways that memorialized individual and group memberships as well as important ritual affiliations. Perhaps the living passed these memories to the spirits. Moreover, ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts suggest that people periodically remembered their family’s and/or ritual societies’ deceased. They recalled the spirits in their prayers, made small offerings, and likely even welcomed a visit at one or two ritual occasions during the year. In return, the spirits provided blessings for continued well-being of families and communities and for the continued effectiveness of ritual practices.

At Protohistoric Zuni villages, the spirits likely played a part in the coalescing of large, multi-ethnic communities. People from multiple social groups, from different parts of the Southwest, were aggregating into massive, agglomerated towns along the Zuni River. Several archaeologists have suggested that residents of these towns were actively negotiating identities in these new villages, as they maintained some elements of their own histories while also forging contributions to their new communities (e.g., Mills 2007a, Schachner 2006). The performance of mortuary ritual and the relationships with ancestral spirits may have been a venue for solidifying family histories while establishing those memories in newly aggregated communities. Ancestral spirits helped people to remember and honor the histories of their families and other social
groups, wherever they may have moved on the Puebloan landscape. As ancestral spirits merged into the long-dead, or the group of collective spirits, they rooted individual social groups and their histories in developing, coalescing towns. In essence, the ancestral spirits helped to forge new Protoprohistoric era Zuni communities of the living and the spirits of the dead, communities that were a woven tapestry of collective histories.

**Histories and Traditions of Social Competition**

In the closing sections of this study, I attempt to demonstrate that the spirits of the dead are deeply embedded in regional political histories. I contend that different kinds of spirits – *ancestors*, ancestral spirits, and anonymous groups of dead – are rooted in particular socio-political traditions. More specifically, people develop distinct social identities for the spirits of the dead in particular historical traditions of social competition. As people continue their relationships with these beings, the spirits become important agents in long-term political trajectories.

Here, I present a framework that situates different spirits of the dead in separate historical trajectories of social competition. This framework suggests that social groups foster relationships with *ancestors* in socio-cultural settings where peoples openly contest power and prestige. In contrast, social groups maintain ties to ancestral spirits and anonymous groups of the dead in environments where people mask inequalities and power relations.

Past research, such as Morris’ (1991) and Keightley’s (2004), indicates that *ancestors* are often associated with traditions of lively competition (see Chapter 2). These potent spirits are related to contests over property and resources, social position, and even political authority (Freedman 1966, Metcalf and Huntington 1991, Morris 1991). In short, they are affiliated with contests for social power. Sellato (2002) demonstrated that other, less potent spirits (i.e., not *ancestors*) – ancestral spirits and anonymous groups of dead – are associated with traditions that mask or dampen social competition. He contrasted the central Borneo Aoheng who did not maintain relations with *ancestors* with other Indonesian groups who did. Aoheng society maintained a rigid system of stratification. Sellato stressed that relations with ancestors were unnecessary because social standing was not openly negotiated. Instead, Aoheng peoples shaped spirits with moderate to little agency in sociopolitical affairs.
I argue that people in Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan communities shaped different spirits of the dead, because they were part of very different historical traditions of social competition. Residents of Mississippian polities crafted relationships with ancestors on landscapes where power and prestige were openly contested. These potent spirits were active players in these visible contests. In contrast, residents of Ancestral Puebloan villages maintained ties with ancestral spirits and anonymous groups of long-dead in social environments where power, inequality, and prestige were masked. These spirits of the dead did not participate in social competition.

Second, I situate Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan relationships with spirits of the dead in their respective regional socio-political traditions. I describe how Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan relations with spirits articulated with regional traditions of social competition. The discussion places continued interactions with Mississippian ancestors within the contested landscapes of the Prehispanic Southeast, particularly those in present day Georgia, South Carolina, and southern Tennessee. Then, it places periodic relations with Zuni ancestral spirits and anonymous groups of long-dead within Puebloan cultural landscapes, which were filled with social group histories of movement, coalescence, and re-organization.

Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan Traditions of Social Competition

In the following discussion, I describe the historical traditions of social competition in the Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan worlds. A literature review suggests that the traditions, or the ethos, surrounding competition and contestation were markedly different in the prehistoric American Southeast and Southwest. Social contests over power and prestige were publicly displayed on the Mississippian period landscape in the American Southeast. In contrast, social competition was masked in the Puebloan Southwest. Power and prestige were contested in private arenas that were concealed from public view.

Social Competition in the Mississippian World.
Southeastern archaeologists have long maintained that social power and prestige were frequently contested and expressed in prehistoric Mississippian communities of the American Southeast.
Archaeological and ethnohistoric data indicate that communal orientations to power in the early Mississippian period laid a foundation for exhibitions of and competition over more exclusionary forms of power in the middle and late Mississippian periods (Brown 2003a, Brown 2006, Goldstein 2000, King 2006a).

A series of material patterns across the Mississippian world indicate that contestations over exclusionary forms of power intensified in the middle and late Mississippian periods. First, leaders and leading lineages openly competed for power and prestige through coercive force. Ethnohistoric accounts describe offices in many Southeastern social groups that were directly related to warfare and protection. Several accounts even contain descriptions of armed conflict (Dye 1990, 1995, 2002, Dye and King 2007, Van Horne 1993, Varner and Varner 1951). In the archaeological record, defensive architecture such as palisades and incidences of skeletal trauma indicate that violence was undoubtedly a part of life (e.g., Cobb and Steadman 2011, Ostendorf Smith 2003, Milner 2000, 2005, Steadman 2008, see Milner 1999 for overview).

The inclusion of utilitarian and non-utilitarian weapons and warfare related iconography in burials (particularly of males) suggests that certain persons drew power from their role in violent activities (Fowler 1991, King 2006a, Phillips and Brown 1978, Van Horne 1993). Recorded mythologies contain references to supernatural warriors with special powers (see King 2007a, Reilly and Garber 2007), and the archaeological record contains evidence for the symbolic treatment of weapons, warfare, and trophy imagery (Brown and Dye 2007, e.g., Brown 2007b, Cobb and Giles 2009, Dye 2004, 2006, Reilly and Garber 2007). In his diachronic analysis of leadership in Northern Georgia, King (2006a) concluded that, by the Late Mississippian, leaders were drawing large amounts of social power from competitive activities such as warfare.

Second, archaeological and ethnohistoric data have demonstrated that Mississippian leaders used control, or at least influence, over agricultural surpluses and other comestibles to incur debt and possibly underwrite their political/ritual activities (e.g., Ambrose et al. 2003, Blakely 1995, Hatch and Willey 1974, Jackson and Scott 2003, Powell 1988, 1992, Wesson 1999). There is some evidence that leaders both collected foodstuffs as tribute from vassal chiefs defeated in warfare, and received foodstuffs as tithes from local family groups. Ethnohistoric accounts
repeatedly tell that Southeastern chiefs proudly provisioned Spanish troops from *barbacoas*, or large granaries. Some scholars have suggested that these facilities represented a conspicuous display of surplus. Several zooarchaeological and bioarchaeological studies have also demonstrated that elite households had access to higher quality and/or more rare/valuable foods than did village households (Ambrose et al. 2003, Blakely 1995, Hatch et al. 1983, Jackson and Scott 2003, Kelly 1997).

Cobb (2003) argued that use of surplus foodstuffs in the Mississippian world was tied to much more than just eating (see Rees 2002, Wesson 1999). Foremost, politically ambitious lineages and/or persons likely used stored foodstuffs for feasting events, which seems to have been a significant component of collective gatherings in the Mississippian world (Blitz 1993, Dye 1995, Muller 1997, Pauketat and Emerson 1997, Rees 1997, 2002, Welch and Scarry 1995). In addition, the presentation of gifts to other elites and to guests at ceremonial events created debts rooted in displays of surplus. Pauketat et al (2002) described a series of large, stratified refuse deposits that contained evidence not only for feasting, but also for crafting and the display of sumptuary and ceremonial items during singular ritual events.

Leadership power in the Mississippian world also relied on the co-ordination, if not control over, labor (Blitz and Livingood 2004, Milner 1998). The built environments of the Mississippian world contained a number of features, such as mounds, palisades, and other enclosed structures that would have required large-scale efforts. However, scholars disagree over the degree of control that Mississippian leader’s exercised over labor parties, because there is little consensus about the scale of individual construction events (see Milner 1998, Muller 1997 for a periodic labor argument, and see Pauketat 1994, 1997 for a singular "Big Bang" argument).

Persons in leadership positions were undoubtedly interested in the production of fine craft items (Knight and Steponaitis 1998, Welch 1991). However, there is little definitive evidence for attached or embedded specialization. Leader’s (1998) identification of copper-working tools (embossers and templates) and scraps of worked copper in several graves on Etowah’s Mound C illustrated the difficulties in interpretation. It is clear that Etowah’s elites were associated with copper crafting, but there are only hints as to what these associations were.
The development of prestige-goods exchange networks in the indigenous Southeast may account for elite interest in certain kinds of craft production. Several authors have suggested that the leaders of Mississippian communities engaged in the periodic exchange of special objects endowed with ritual and/or ideological significance. These objects served as either badges of office or as generalized expressions of social wealth and access to surplus (Brown et al. 1990, Cobb 1989, Dye 1995, Peregrine 1990, Trubitt 2000). Potential Mississippian prestige goods included “marine shell beads, columella pendants, ear ornaments, and engraved shell gorgets and cups, repousse copper headdress plates and hair ornaments, copper ear ornaments, and rattles, stone discoids, non-functional weapons such as ground-stone axe heads and chipped-stone maces and ‘swords’, and pearls” (Trubitt 2000: 676, see also Brown et al. 1990, Muller 1997, Pauketat 1992).

Southeastern Ceremonial Complex (SECC) items were a special class of crafts that seemingly circulated among Mississippian elites to demonstrate connections to otherworldly power. King (2007b) recently defined the SECC as a style, with different style horizons (stylistic traditions with ling-lasting and far-reaching impact) that developed through time across different parts of the South. This regional style seems to have carried ideas about Mississippian leadership and social ranking as well as the relationship of social power to the sacred. Several authors have suggested that these items imbued their owners with sacred responsibilities and powers (e.g., King 2007a, Reilly and Garber 2007, Townsend 2004).

Finally, increasing research on elite connections to the supernatural has resulted in suggestions that much social power and authority in Mississippian communities was derived from access to supernatural realms and beings. Knight (1986, 1989) and Brown (1997) effectively argued that Mississippian elites occupied central places in a Mississippian sacred landscape. Leaders appropriated the sacred power residing in mounds by placing their houses atop them and burying their dead in them. It is also clear that certain prominent social groups had preferential access to portable sacra and ritual paraphernalia. In most Mississippian communities, SECC goods and other rare crafts are located in and around mound complexes and frequently occur in elaborate mortuary contexts placed in mounds (King 2006b, 2007a). King (2007c)
argued that sacred bundles placed in burial contexts within Etowah’s Mound C may have granted rights to particular ritual performances (songs, dances, etc.), and may have even help to materialize some supernatural beings.

This study’s results and other research indicate that certain social groups created and controlled access to influential spirits of the dead (see Dye and King 2007). Ethnohistoric accounts described mound-top temples where leaders kept the bones of prominent lineage dead, carved supernatural figures, and other ritually charged objects (Blitz and Livingood 2004, King 2006a, King 2006b, Lindauer and Blitz 1997, Swanton 1911, Waring 1968a). Such temples have been identified atop Mississippian mounds, and a pair of culture hero/deity figurines was located in a burial deposit within Etowah’s Mound C (King 2002, Larson 1971). Moreover, interpretations of the Fatherland site’s mortuary deposits used both ethnohistoric and archaeological evidence to detail some of the mortuary ritual that led to the creation and veneration of prominent spirits of the dead (Brown 1990, 1997).

On Middle and Late Mississippian period landscapes in the Southeast, power relations within and among communities were dynamic and frequently contested. Anderson (1994, 1996) suggested that politics and power were in near constant flux among Mississippian settlements in Georgia and the Carolinas. Individual and competing polities emerged, expanded, and fragmented in persistent cycles tied to changes in social power (see also Blitz 1999). Factionalism was likely endemic within communities, and “[i]ntersocietal conflict, or at least some form of armed combat, was a consistent and integral part of Mississippian life” (Dye and King 2007: 163).

*Masked Inequality and Secrecy in the Ancestral Puebloan World.*

Anthropologists who work in the American Southwest have long recognized the communal ethos of Puebloan communities (see Brandt 1994). Historic and contemporary Pueblo peoples rarely display power or wealth in public, and most people do not actively seek or contest ritual/political positions that carry social power (Cushing 1979, Dozier 1960, Ford 1972, Goldfrank 1927, Parsons 1917, Reid 1985, Saitta 1994, Stevenson 1904, White 1932, Whiteley 1988). Although Southwestern archaeologists have long wrangled with the projection of political organization and
attitudes into prehistory, most have recognized that power was not a public matter in Ancestral Puebloan communities (Feinman 2000, Feinman et al. 2000, Mills 2004, Rautman 1998, Saitta 1997). Social power was not materialized in highly recognizable ways and it does not appear to have been contested in publicly visible arenas. Rather, power in the pueblos was and still is intimately connected to secrecy.

Most scholars currently agree that there was social and political differentiation in Prehispanic Puebloan communities. Ethnohistoric and ethnographic research indicates that some people held recognized leadership positions within various ritual-politic organizations in Ancestral Puebloan communities, and that access to these positions was embedded in kinship relationships. Ethnographers have documented a great diversity of leadership positions within historic and contemporary Puebloan communities. The diversity of these positions is likely due to histories of migration, community budding (mother-daughter villages) and factional splitting, and the emergence, dissolution, and movement of ritual societies among communities (Brandt 1985, 1994, Mills 2000a, 2004, Whiteley 1998).

For example, Whiteley (1985, 1986, 1988, 1998), Connelly (1956, 1979), and Titiev (1944) described different formal leadership positions in the historic Hopi community of Oraibi. The positions in the community included Kikmongwi (“village chief”, or “civic chief”), the Qaletaqmonqi (“war chief”), the heads and officers of the thirteen ritual societies/sodalities, the kiva heads, and the clan heads. Each position held a set of defined responsibilities, and each position’s power could only be exercised under specific social contexts and could only influence defined groups of people. Prominent lineages of certain clans “owned” the leadership positions in Oraibi. Some social power accrued to the lineage because they maintained ownership of the knowledge and some ritual paraphernalia to perform one or more important ceremonies. In Hopi, the term pavansinom (meaning “most powerful people” or “ruling people”) describes members of core matriline segments who hold principal offices and who effectively lay claim to particular ceremonies and knowledge. The pas (“real”) pavansinom in the Bear clan are the members in the core lineage segment who may become Kikmongwi, who own the Soyalangw (Winter solstice ceremony), and who provide officers for the ceremony.
Despite the presence of formally recognized offices and positions, the archaeological record as well as ethnohistoric and ethnographic data suggest that people in the Prehispanic Puebloan world did not openly compete for social power. Foremost, there is little evidence that people in Ancestral Puebloan communities used economic inequalities as a basis for accruing power. Research on resource management and surplus in the northern Southwest has typically focused on risk mitigation in local marginal environments (e.g., Hegmon 1996, Kohler and Van West 1996). Relatively high incidences of residential mobility among Ancestral Puebloan households suggest that the maintenance of economic inequality through resource surplus was uncommon (see Schachner 2007, Varien 1999). However, ethnographic research does indicate that first-comers, or “older” lineages, had access to the most productive land, and that new migrants had decidedly limited access to agricultural lands (Levy 1992, Stinson 1996).

Feasting in the Puebloan world was and still is intimately tied to ritual events and places. The archaeological record contains evidence of feasting deposits, and points to the increased importance of these ceremonial events in the development of cross-cutting religious societies between A. D. 1000 and 1300 (Blinman 1989, Kantner 1996, Mills 1999, Mueller 2006, Potter 1997, 2000, Spielmann 1998, 2002). Ethnographic accounts have provided narrative descriptions of feasting events at important ritual occasions, and of ritual society members gathering and redistributing food during ceremonial occasions (Ford 1972, Ortiz 1969, White 1974).

At present, there is little scholarly consensus on the nature of coercive force and violence in the Prehispanic world. The archaeological and ethnohistoric records clearly demonstrate that physical force and violence were a part of life into the early Historic period (e.g., Billman et al. 2000, Kuckelman et al. 2000, Lambert 2002, LeBlanc 1999, Nichols and Crown 2008, Rice and LeBlanc 2001, Schaafsma 2007a). Large deposits of co-mingled, disarticulated bone, and sometimes partially burned remains have been found near Castle Rock Pueblo, at La Plata, and at Polacca Wash (Kuckelman et al. 2002, Martin et al. 2001, Olson 1966, Pérez 2006). Some osteological evidence of trauma and post-mortem cruelty can be attributed to raiding and/or violent attacks, while other cases might represent the annihilation of witches (Darling 1999, Hurlbut 2000, Lambert 2007, Lambert et al. 2000, Ogilvie and Hilton 2000, Walker 1998, 2008).
In the Historic period and presumably in the past, Puebloan communities had officers whose responsibility was to protect the pueblo from outside threats, to guard ritual officials and their esoteric knowledge, and to handle migration (see Walker 2009 for role of supernatural agents in warfare, e.g., Dozier 1960, Ellis 1951b, 1951a, 1953, 1979, White 1935, Whiteley 1998, see McGregor 1943, Morris 1924, O’Hara 2008 for references to weapons and warfare in the mortuary record). In addition, ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts describe warfare-related societies for both men and women (e.g., Zuni’s Priesthood of the Bow, women’s scalp societies) (Bunzel 1932, Cushing 1979, Haas and Creamer 1997). It would seem that most coercive force in the Puebloan world was related to raiding, protection from raiding, and ritual acts of violence, and that force was rarely if ever used to gather social power over others.

In recent scholarship, researchers have focused on the role that control of esoteric knowledge and secrecy has played in the construction of Puebloan leadership powers. Brandt (1980) was among the first to propose that differential access to knowledge within Puebloan communities could create a status hierarchy amongst kinship groups and cross-cutting ritual societies (e.g., dual organizations, clan societies, kiva groups, medicine societies, etc.). She argued that Puebloan communities, currently and in the past, have practiced an internal secrecy that restricts the flow of many different kinds of esoteric/religious knowledge. Whitely (1987, 1998) then demonstrated that, because possession of esoteric knowledge and participation in religious societies is a pre-requisite for involvement in the political system, secrecy helps to control the allocation of political power. In a series of publications, both Brandt (1980, 1985) and Whiteley (1987, 1998) presented evidence that Puebloan leaders and their families controlled important pieces of knowledge and access to social power.

Mills (2004) linked this control of knowledge with material-political economic models in her consideration of the role of inalienable possessions. She contended that some leadership powers in Puebloan communities stem from the custodian-ship of inalienable goods. Moreover, she argued that these powers were in fact limited by the presence of these objects. Mills suggested that various kin groups and ritual societies in the Prehispanic Southwest used
inalienable possessions to authenticate their ritual authority, and simultaneously to undermine attempts at individual aggrandizement and/or personal gain.

Revisionist approaches to classic Puebloan ethnography now emphasize the contradiction between social values espousing cooperation and integration, and the social realities of differential access to some resources (particularly land) and to ritual power (e.g., Feinman 2000, Feinman et al. 2000, Peregrine 2001, Rautman 1998, see also papers in Mills 2000b). Whiteley (1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1998), Levy (1992), and Connelly (1979) demonstrated that the inclusive nature of Hopi kinship and ritual organizations masks inequalities between lineage segments in ritual, jural, and economic affairs. Both Brandt (1980, 1994) and Whiteley (1987, 1988) have suggested that cooperative ideologies and secrecy also conceal these inequalities. In fact, ethnographic sources suggest that muted power relations have led people in Puebloan communities to evade appointments to ceremonial offices and leadership positions (e.g., Ellis 1953, Goldfrank 1945, Lange 1959). Recruitment to important ritual organizations, which furnish most community ritual and political leaders, is often through familial obligation, fulfillment of debt for a service (such as a healing), or even entrapment (Brandt 1980, 1994).

Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan Spirits of the Dead and Histories of Social Competition

I now place Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan spirits of the dead in their respective socioeconomic traditions. I describe how Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan relations with spirits articulated with regional traditions of social competition. Moreover, I emphasize the ways in which the spirits participated in these histories at both local and regional scales.

Interactions with Ancestors on Mississippian Contested Landscapes.
Throughout most of the Mississippian world, leadership and social power were enmeshed in relationships with ancestors. Elite lineages cultivated relations with these beings because these spirits were active, influential players on a cultural landscape filled with social contest. These spirits of the dead did not simply afford access to social power and authority in these contexts; in many ways, these beings were power.
In many Mississippian communities, leading lineages appear to have maintained restricted access to potent spirits of the dead and other supernatural powers. Several authors have noted that the Middle and Late Mississippian periods, between AD 1200 and 1450, were times of heightened elite social competition, with increases in conflict, acquisition and display of prestigious objects, and monopolization of relations to the supernatural (e.g. Brown 2001, Dye and King 2007, King 2004, 2006a, 2007c). The distribution of architectural features and material culture that facilitated relationships with powerful spirits was widespread throughout the Southeast.

Both ethnohistoric and archaeological data describe ritualized structures, often called “temples” in the archaeological literature, where sacra and sometimes the dried, bundled remains of important dead were kept (e.g., Brown 1990, 1997, 2001, Dye and King 2007, Knight 1986, Shelby 1993, Swanton 1911). Although the details of many accounts are problematic, repeated observations of these structures in many interior Southeast and Mid-Atlantic communities suggest that the buildings themselves and associated objects and activities were actual historical elements on Mississippian landscapes. Most narratives highlight buildings to which community leaders and priest-like officials held restricted if not exclusive access. They note that these buildings held ritual paraphernalia and other numinous bundles, which seemed to belong to the leading lineage, kept on a series of benches, shelves, and sometimes in alcoves. Bundles and items were variously displayed and stored in carved wooden boxes or trunks and in baskets with sealed lids. The types of bundles and objects and their arrangements inside the structure varied substantially among local polities, as each leading lineage and community held their own unique ways of approaching supernatural power.

Principle among the sacra, leading lineages often curated the heavily processed, cleaned, and bundled remains of important dead in these buildings. They were commonly kept in carved wooden boxes or in baskets placed on display. In addition to remains of the select dead, leaders and affiliated priests sometimes placed the body parts of enemies, as trophies, along the exterior of the structures (see accounts in Dye and King 2007: 167 - 169). Although Garcilaso de la Vega’s accounts from the Hernando de Soto expedition are particularly problematic, I provide
one here for its geographic relevance to this study (Shelby 1993: 298 - 306, Varner and Varner 1951: 315 - 325). He described the temple of Talimeco, where the leaders of the Cofitachequi polity kept their sacra; archaeological evidence suggests that it may have been located near the Adamson mound group near present day Camden, South Carolina (Anderson 1994, Depratter et al. 1983).

On the floor against the walls, on very well-made wooden benches, as was everything in the temple, were the chests that served as sepulchers, in which were the bodies of the curacas who had been lords of that province of Cofachiqui, and of their sons and brothers and nephews, the sons of their brothers. No others were buried in that temple.

The chests were well-covered with their lids. Exactly one vara [approximately a yard or a meter] above each chest was a statue carved from wood, against the wall on its pedestal. This was a portrait taken of the deceased man or woman who was in the chest, at the age at which they died. The portraits served as a record and memorial of their ancestors. The statues of the men had weapons in their hands, but those of the children and women had nothing (Shelby 1993: 302).

The details of de la Vega’s account are likely exaggerated. However, when placed in the context of other accounts with similar descriptions, the observation of bundled remains and human figures is likely accurate (see Brown 2001).

There is ample archaeological evidence supporting the existence of these structures, as well other special-use structures like ossuaries and charnel houses for processing and storing remains of select dead. Remnants of these structures and the remains processed in them have been identified in a myriad of locations across the upper Midwest, the interior Southeast, and even the Mid-Atlantic (e.g., Baltus and Baires 2012, Brown 2003b, Dye and King 2007, Goldstein 1980). Moreover, both Seeman (1979) and Brown (1979) provided through overviews of charnel houses in the Hopewell and Woodland periods. Finally, Swanton’s (1911, 1931) descriptions of Natchez and Choctaw charnel houses and the activities associated with them, including the processing of the dead, provide plausible analogies for some prehistoric mortuary structures.

In addition to these structures, leading lineages and affiliated officers and/or priests in many Southeastern communities cared for human figures closely associated with powerful spirits of the dead (Figure 7.5). There is an emerging consensus that these figures made from wood,
pottery, and stone were animate representations of powerful, central spirits, who merged the identities of recently created ancestors with the identities of founding ancestors and/or culture heroes (Brown 1997, 2001, Knight 1986, e.g., Smith and Miller 2009). Both ethnohistoric and archaeological data indicate that the figures were treated as active beings, and handled similarly to the processed remains of select dead.

The statues and representations were frequently kept in ritual structures like the ones described above; they were also kept in close association with bundled remains housed in these buildings or other mortuary structures. Ethnohistoric records suggest that the living venerated some statues in particular ways, that they fed these beings and other spirits of the dead, that they interacted with them to facilitate relations with other powerful forces and spirits of the dead, and even that they called upon them to protect the ritual structures and the spirits of the dead housed in them (see Smith and Miller 2009: 165 - 180 for multiple accounts).

When they were decommissioned, they were often treated like elect members of the dead. Archaeological research has documented the interment of human figures in burial deposits beneath the floors of ritual buildings and other mortuary structures, and occasionally in highly restricted platform mound contexts. Some were accompanied by lavish material culture or ritual paraphernalia and heavily processed human remains (Brown 2001, Dye and King 2007, Smith and Miller 2009). For instance, a pair of male and female stone statues was placed in Burial 15 at Etowah, one of the last burials at the site, at the base of the burial mound’s (Mound C’s) ramp (Figure 7.2). The two figures, which were painted, had been placed in a prepared facility with the disarticulated, scattered remains of up to four individuals. The facility also included shell beads, copper-covered ear discs, antler projectile points, sheet copper ornaments, and stone and clay pipe bowls. Several archaeologists have suggested that this burial was conducted hastily, as the figures were broken and items scattered, prior to a raid that demolished the ritual structure atop the burial mound (Dye and King 2007, King 2002, Larson 1971).
Figure 7.2. Human figures recovered from Burial 15, Mound C at Etowah, a large mound site in northwestern Georgia.

These monuments and the spirits that the monument’s housed were central to the sociopolitical affairs and well-being of Southeastern polities. They were so vital to the power of polities and their leading lineages that these monuments and spirits were primary targets in raids (Dye and King 2007). In fact, it can be argued that desecrating relationships with these beings was tantamount to destroying the power of a local lineage and their associated political sphere.

Dye and King (2007) synthesized both ethnohistoric and archaeological evidence for the targeted destruction of these buildings in warfare and raids throughout the interior Southeast. These scholars detailed several instances in de la Vega’s account in which Southeastern warriors took advantage of their positions with the Spanish to enact revenge on enemy towns. The narratives described how raiders purposely sacked these ritual structures and curation facilities for the remains of select dead; they were intent upon destroying the town leaders’ sacra, any trophies or objects of wealth, and the stored remains of the deceased.

These authors also documented several instances of “temple desecration” or destruction in the archaeological record. They described the burned remnants and associated material
culture of buildings on Mound B at Toqua (in the present day state of Tennessee), a mound at Jonathan Creek (in western Kentucky), Mound C at Etowah (in north Georgia), Mound 2 at Towosahgy (in southern Missouri), and Mound B at Chucalissa (in southwestern Tennessee). The destruction events span approximately 250 years, from AD 1200 to 1450, when researchers suggest that these structures were widespread and elite contestation was at a peak across the Mississippian world (Brown 2001).

Ties to Ancestral Spirits and Puebloan Traditions of Masked Competition.

Across most of the Ancestral Puebloan world, social groups and families maintained ties to ancestral spirits and the long-dead who curated these group’s histories. Ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts suggest that people sustained relations that focused on general remembrances and requests for blessings of continued well-being. They recalled the spirits of the dead in prayers, in small offerings, and in their collective, brief visits to villages at select times of the year. They did not involve the spirits in social competition or other political affairs. For most of Puebloan history, social inequalities and power were masked in an economy of knowledge and secrecy (Brandt 1985, 1994, Whiteley 1988, 1998). The archaeological record and ethnographic accounts document few instances of intensive interaction with influential spirits of the dead. Nearly all cases of extended interaction with human remains were likely attempts to resolve negative impacts of supernatural forces on the living.

Ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts suggest that safe relationships were maintained with spirits of the dead through generalized acts of remembrance, acts that celebrated the spirits but that left them detached from this world. Many Historic period Puebloan peoples recalled the spirits of familial dead and collective spirits of the dead in prayers and offerings. They occasionally offered small morsels of food to the spirits of the dead at evening meals, or tossed some food into the fire, or left it in a special location for the spirits to receive it. People also presented other gifts, particularly prayer sticks, to the spirits of the dead in order to secure blessings. Bunzel (1932) observed that Historic Zuni residents planted prayer sticks painted in black and decorated with turkey feathers; they buried them in cemetery caches or in secret
locations by the Zuni River as offerings to the dead. Men frequently left these gifts prior to a war expedition or a footrace (Parsons 1916).

Additional accounts discuss an All Soul’s Day whose origin may pre-date Catholic influences in many Puebloan communities. In their descriptions of Zuni, Parsons (1916: 255) referred to the event as a’ hapa awân dewa or “dead their day”; Cushing (1896: 338) called it simply the “Feast of the Dead.” The day was part of the larger Sha’leko ritual event and required people to offer substantial quantities of food to the spirits of the dead. At Acoma and Laguna and at some Keresan pueblos, Ellis (1968: 66, 70) recorded a similar observance of an All Soul’s Day. Families offered food and prayer sticks to the long-dead by either placing them outside their homes or by burning them and saying a few prayers. Recall that Hodge documented a number of artifact caches and associated remnants of foodstuffs in pits or small trenches within the Hawikku cemeteries (Smith et al. 1966: 279 - 293). He interpreted these deposits as decommissions of personal property and ritual paraphernalia in cemetery areas, as well as offerings to the spirits of the dead. Perhaps some of these caches, particularly those of food and prayer sticks, were made during such ritually proscribed times of the year.

People at Zuni and elsewhere in the Puebloan world did not foster persistent, intensive relations with spirits of the dead. Evidence for continued interaction with the remains of the deceased is not common in the mortuary record of the northern Southwest, especially compared to the American Southeast. There are no documented instances of specialized ritual structures for the extended processing of human remains in the Puebloan Southwest. In addition, there are no clearly discernible features for the curation or for the display of processed remains of the deceased, with the possibility of one exception. Ethnohistoric records indicate that residents of some villages maintained structures or features for the treatment and display of human trophies, particularly scalps, taken in warfare. Accounts mention that some groups in the American Southwest kept the scalps of enemies in scalp houses, the residences of ritual officers, and even in the walls of kivas (see Ellis 1951b). In addition, scalps were often hung on poles and/or stretched on frames for display at dances. When curated, they were attended to and fed to harness elements of the enemies' power and to entice that power to bring rain and to provide
strength (Ellis 1951b, Schaafsma 2007b). Recall that some Protohistoric Zuni burial features included human hair; in some instances, Zuni workers identified the clumps of hair as scalps.

Several archaeologists have interpreted many other instances of continued interaction with human remains in the northern Southwest as attempts to mitigate witchcraft or other malevolent spirits. Recently, Walker (2008) argued that a great deal of the ritual violence to prehistoric Puebloan human remains, which included instances of persistent interaction with these remains, were witchcraft killings. He conducted a synthetic review of violent burial and ritual deposits across the northern Southwest, predominantly in a re-examination of Turner and Turner’s (1999) data. In addition, both Walker (1998) and Darling (1999) detailed violence done to both living persons and to the remains of the dead in attempts to stop witchcraft and sorcery. In his synthetic treatment, Walker (2008) concluded that the data represent a long-term tradition of ritual violence that either emulated or followed the witchcraft killings described in Puebloan origin stories.

Many recorded Puebloan oral traditions are clear that interacting with the spirits of the dead and spirits who reside among the dead can often have grave consequences. Several stories tell of people who attempted to either visit or retrieve a loved one from the community of the dead, often in an underworld landscape. They never succeed, and are left to bear punishments for attempting to violate the natural order (Malotki and Lomatuway’ma 1987a, Malotki and Gary 2001, Parsons 1926). Hopi tales contain many accounts of people’s encounters with Maasaw, a masked spirit who guards the entrance to the land of the dead and who dwells among the spirits (1987a, Malotki and Lomatuway’ma 1987b). In these tales, he often serves as an intermediary between the living and the spirits of the dead, or simply Death. He is a very mischievous and sometimes malicious character. Interactions with him frequently result in a person’s death. In fact, many traditions mention that a person walking alone at night should be careful, less he or she encounters Maasaw; this would be a sure harbinger of impending death.

The spirits involvement in Protohistoric and Historic era Zuni communities is perhaps best described by Bunzel’s (1932: 510) observation that they were (are) a:’wona: wi’lona, “keepers of the roads.” In many Puebloan communities, people refer to roads or paths as metaphors for
histories – paths that have been walked and that will be walked in the future (e.g., Bunzel 1932: 486, Ortiz 1969) Archaeological evidence and ethnohistoric/ethnographic accounts of mortuary ritual are congruent with the notion that the spirits curated, or kept, social group histories.

Recent archaeological research has documented substantial population shifts and even large-scale migrations across the northern Southwest during prehistory (e.g., Ortman 2010). Peeple’s (2011) work detailed a social transformation across the Cibola area that led to the coalescence of multiple social groups into single, integrated settlements. The transformation culminated in the formation of communities that developed and expressed shared identities at a regional scale. This process of aggregation accelerated later in prehistory, and led to regional populations concentrating into a few settlements along the Zuni River during the Protohistoric period. Other research has described high degrees of residential mobility among Prehispanic populations in many parts of the northern Southwest (e.g., Varien 1999). In particular, Schachner’s (2007) work indicated that residential mobility in the northern Cibola region likely played a substantial role in the formation of new types of large-scale communities within the Zuni area.

I suggest that ancestral spirits curated the histories of the social groups that moved from different parts of the Cibola region and coalesced into massive settlements in the Zuni area during the Protohistoric period (see Kintigh 2007, 1990, 1985, Kintigh et al. 2004, Peeples 2013, 2011, Schachner 2007). In other words, they were the “keepers of the roads” that these peoples walked to arrive in and shape new communities. They maintained aspects of these groups’ identities and their ritual responsibilities, in part to perpetuate historical traditions and knowledge, and also to document each group’s contributions to the community. In this capacity, the spirits were tied to both social groups and cross-cutting ritual organizations. They were embedded in the diversity of civic and ceremonial positions that many archaeologists presume existed in Protohistoric towns and that ethnohistorians and ethnographers have documented in Historic period villages. Researchers maintain that the multiplicity of these positions and the ritual knowledge associated with them was intimately related to histories of migration, community

Furthermore, Puebloan ancestral spirits contributed to the creation and expression of shared, collective identities. The spirits maintained histories that documented social group formation, coalescence, and fragmentation, and they perpetuated ritual traditions that resulted from these histories. The ancestral spirits, like the living, contributed these traditions to their new communities. As they merged into collective groups of dead, they perpetuated their group memberships and ritual responsibilities amongst the collective community of the dead.

The Contributions of the Spirits of the Dead

In the concluding sections of the study, I consider the contributions that this study makes to anthropological understandings of the spirits of the dead. First, I frame this study’s contributions in Fortes’ (1961, 1965, 1976) influential description of the ancestor cult. The discussion focuses on my efforts to refine concepts for differentiating the spirits of the dead, beyond the ancestors. I presented a framework that defines identities for ancestors, ancestral spirits, and anonymous groups of spirits, and that allows other researchers to locate additional identities for the spirits. I emphasize that explicitly defining separate kinds of spirits permits exploration of the different ways that the spirits participate in social and political affairs.

Then, I situate the remaining contributions in Morris’ (1991) work on ancestors and political histories. Building on Morris’ research, I argue that the spirits of the dead – ancestors, ancestral spirits, anonymous groups of the dead, and others – are embedded in particular political historical traditions. Throughout the course of this research, I have attempted to illustrate the ways in which different spirits of the dead participate in local social and political affairs, and articulate with regional political histories.

Additions to the Ancestors

In a seminal work, Fortes (1965) focused anthropological understandings of the spirits of the dead on what Gluckman (1937) called the "ancestor cult." His research directed many anthropologists and archaeologists to the ancestors and people’s relationships with the spirits of
the dead. This attention, however, led to a proliferation of the term “ancestor” and to problematic uses of “ancestor cult” in anthropological interpretation.

Fortes (1961, 1965, 1976, see also Calhoun 1980) consistently argued that describing the identity of ancestors was important to understanding their roles and place in society. His work advanced an identity that was explicit and that drew attention to the place of ancestors in social structure and to their continued involvement in socio-politics. He defined ancestors as “named, dead forebear[ers] who [have] living descendants” in subsequent generations and who could maintain the spirit’s position in social structure (Fortes 1965: 123). In other words, he identified these beings as spirits that are recognized and named and that have descendants who can maintain relationships with them, particularly in socio-political matters.

Fortes scholarship effectively established an identity for the ancestors in anthropological research. However, in continued applications, it has gradually become apparent that even this explicit identity is too broad. Fortes’ classic definition of the ancestors encompasses other, different kinds of spirits, who also have important roles in attendant social groups. In subsequent work, Fortes alluded to these different kinds of ancestors, although he did not yet identify them as separate spirits. He mentioned “all grades of ancestors” (1976: 10), which included “remote ancestors” (1976: 10), “remotest communal ancestors” (1976: 11), “remotest lineage or clan ancestors” (1976: 13), “lineage ancestors” (1976: 9), and finally “politically central ancestors” (1976: 13).

This study has endeavored to expand the study of the spirits and people’s relationships with them, beyond the ancestor cult. I have argued for differentiating the spirits of the dead and for recognizing these spirits in their specific socio-cultural environments. I contend that people form relationships not only with ancestors but also with other, different kinds of spirits of the dead. I have emphasized that each of these spirits is no more or no less important than any other spirit. Rather, each kind of spirit maintains its own influences among the living and is involved in community affairs in its own particular ways.

Here, I have advanced a framework that describes identities for several different kinds of spirits – from ancestors to anonymous groups of spirits. I constructed a continuum that uses the
agency that people attribute to spirits to locate different social identities for these beings. It defines particular spirits according to their influences and interventions in community social and political affairs. For this research, I emphasized three identities for the spirits: *ancestors*, ancestral spirits, and anonymous groups of the dead. I suggest that subsequent research might use this framework to locate other, additional identities for spirits.

*Ancestors* are a specific kind of spirit, defined by their ability to intervene both directly and profoundly in people’s lives. They are well-identified, named beings who wield considerable agency in community socio-political affairs. They have access to, influence upon, and, in some instances, can even exercise social power in communities. The creation of these beings requires not only protracted mortuary rituals, but subsequent, separate, rites designed specially to install them and to instill them with influential powers. Fortes (1949: 329) himself stressed this characteristic of *ancestors* in his description of special installation rites: “[t]he dead has first to be ‘brought back home again’, re-established in the family and lineage, by obsequial rites, and will even then not receive proper ritual service until he manifests himself in the life of his descendants and is enshrined.” After these ritual acts, people’s relationships with *ancestors* and interactions with them are both persistent and regularized.

Ancestral spirits are beings who can exercise moderate to limited amounts of agency in specific contexts. They are often the remembered dead of kinship groups, such as lineages, or other social groups, and they tend to merge into a group of long-dead through time. The creation of these beings typically involves some protracted mortuary rituals, which are applied to most of the deceased. People’s interactions with ancestral spirits are periodic and frequently simple in nature. Anonymous groups of the dead are collectives who exercise very little direct agency in socio-political affairs. These groups of spirits maintain influence in other ways and in other spheres of people’s lives. They are created through simple, uniform mortuary rituals that are applied to nearly all the deceased. In general, people do not maintain direct contact or interactions with these spirits; rather, they perceive that these spirits dwell in a place far beyond the physical world.
Refining and Elaborating the Spirits’ Involvement in Community Affairs

Fortes research solidified the importance of ancestors to anthropological research in his description of their continued roles and influences in socio-political structure. He situated their relationships with people and their involvement in local communities within political domains. More specifically, he tied their influences and action to authority.

Based on his work among the Tallensi in Africa, Fortes (1961, 1965, see Calhoun 1980) argued that the people shape ancestors who are vested with an inviolable kind of authority. He suggested that the living craft ancestors from the authoritative components of the deceased (i.e., authority in socio-political relations). In essence, people transform the socially- and politically-influential parts of a person, and then transmute them into the spirit. It is this characteristic of ancestors – this distillation of authority – that ensured their continued sway in socio-political structure. In addition, it is this central characteristic that established the spirits’ relationship with the living, a relationship that involved exacting ritual obligations and reverence.

Despite this important contribution, continued research on the spirits of the dead indicates that ancestral authority explains only part of the spirits’ participation in community affairs. Fortes’ (1965, 1976) rather broad-based identity for ancestors led to a similarly broad understanding of the spirits’ influences and perceived behavior in social and political matters. In his own work, Fortes (1965) limited discussion of ancestors’ influences and actions to their involvement in what he called descendant’s social and moral universes. He suggested that these beings exacted propitiations through punishment (for ritual neglect or moral injustices) and through occasional expectations of benevolence. In his later work, he did specify that some ancestors protect the living and perpetuate the socio-political order, while others merely maintain contentment and peace in the universal order (Fortes 1976). Calhoun (1980) attempted to elaborate on the ancestors’ roles in communities. His work discussed the spirits’ communication with diviners and alluded to their influence in political decision-making and oratory.

This study has emphasized different social identities for the spirits of the dead to characterize the distinct ways in which these spirits participate in local social and political affairs. I have argued that ancestors, ancestral spirits, and anonymous groups of dead maintain different
amounts and kinds of agency in socio-political affairs. Moreover, the spirits exercise this agency in particular ways within specific socio-cultural settings (e.g., in particular places and times).

Here, I have attempted to describe some of the ways in which different spirits participate in community affairs, and to locate these influences in regional and local settings. I explored and compared the social identities that people shaped for the spirits of the dead in Prehispanic Mississippian and Ancestral Puebloan communities. In both cases, I analyzed the performance of mortuary ritual to recognize the identities surrounding the spirits of the dead and then to consider their involvement in socio-political matters.

First, I examined mortuary ritual in the Mississippian town of Irene and its surrounding polity to identify the spirits of the dead in this and surrounding settlements. I used archaeological evidence, and enhanced that evidence with ethnohistoric data, to argue that ancestors in coastal Mississippian communities were active members of political factions. In the Middle Mississippian period (AD 1150 – 1300), select lineages likely fostered relationships with these beings to instill them with social power and to solidify access to that power and influence. Then, in the Late Mississippian period (AD 1300 – 1450), ancestors solidified their intervention in political-decision making processes.

Similarly, I analyzed the performance of mortuary ritual at the Protohistoric era (AD 1350/1400 – 1600) Zuni towns of Hawikku and Kechiba:wa to describe the social identities for the spirits in these communities. Village residents, who were members of various local and non-local social groups that had aggregated together, shaped relationships with ancestral spirits and groups of long-dead. These spirits curated social group histories and important ritual knowledge as populations coalesced into massive, agglomerated towns. Ultimately, they helped the living to preserve group identities and to construct new community and regional identities during a period of large-scale social transformation.

The Spirits’ Ties to Political Histories and Traditions

Fortes recognized that his research on ancestors and their authority implied a larger connection to political traditions. Toward the close of his classic piece, he posed a series of questions to encourage consideration of the relationship between ancestors and political authority.
at regional and historical scales (Fortes 1965). He pondered how the ancestors’ authority related to the expressions and character of political authority in particular social settings (e.g., in the Tallensi, as compared to in the Nuer and Tiv, who do not interact with ancestors). Furthermore, he deliberated about the nature of ancestors and their authority, and asked why these spirits are not developed in some social systems with different political histories and traditions (e.g., in settings with and without kingship).

In another influential work, Morris (1991) began to address the relationship between ancestors and political histories. He considered this connection between spirits and politics, however, in a rather specific way. He was concerned with the ways in which the spirits of the dead and people’s relationships with them “mediated the transmission of rights to power and property” (Morris 1991: 156, see Fortes 1965 for observations on ancestors and succession to power).

Morris (1991) tied people’s relationships with ancestors to property rights and access to other influential resources. He emphasized, and effectively demonstrated, that powerful spirits can hold these rights for successive generations, and can pass them to appropriate persons in those generations. Preferential or exclusive relations with these spirits lead to legitimate rights of access and use. Thus, establishing ancestors and claiming preferential relations with them are central to claims over property and other valuable resources.

Like Fortes, Morris (1991) alluded to connections between the spirits of the dead and wider patterns in political histories. In a number of instances, he refers to the roles that influential spirits of the dead played in social competition and contest. He observed repeatedly that ancestors in Taiwan were embedded in social competition at different scales. Morris emphasized Freedman’s (1966) conclusions that established relations with ancestors in formal ancestor halls displayed power relations within and among Ch’inan lineages. The formation of ancestors and relations with them in other contexts were venues for competition within the lineages. Thus, people used established relations with these beings to maintain social power; they attempted to shape new ancestors and relations with them to challenge current power relations and vie for power and prestige of their own.
In this study, I have endeavored to tie different kinds of spirits of the dead to broader patterns in political histories and trajectories. I have argued that these spirits are, in fact, deeply embedded in particular political trajectories. They are both products of these histories, and influential agents in the continued evolution of local and regional traditions. In other words, the spirits of the dead are integral components of and actors in long-term political histories.

Here, I have proposed that the spirits are rooted in particular historical traditions of competition over social power. I have highlighted the ways in which different spirits of the dead participated in two political historical traditions of Prehispanic North America. The Mississippian cultural tradition of the American Southeast perpetuated an ethos of open social competition and contest for power, while the Puebloan tradition in the American Southwest maintained an ethos of collectivism that masked competition and power dynamics.

In this study, I situated Mississippian ancestors in the socio-politics of the Prehispanic Georgia and South Carolina coast, particularly along the Savannah River. These potent spirits were agents that carried social power and were influential members of political factions on a landscape filled with publicly visible, open competition. They were significant players in the construction and destruction of power at local levels, and the flow of social power among leaders and their communities at a regional scale. Then, I placed Puebloan ancestral spirits on a Protohistoric period landscape that was experiencing a profound shift in settlement and community organization. These spirits curated social group histories and important ritual knowledge as non-local and local populations aggregated into a few, massive towns along the Zuni River. They were instrumental to these people’s integration into new kinds of communities, and to their formation of a Zuni regional identity that was distinctive from other communities at Hopi and Acoma.

The Widespread Impacts of the Spirits of the Dead

To conclude the study, I suggest that there is great deal for anthropology and archaeology to learn about the spirits of the dead and their ties to regional political histories – from small-scale social groups to state-level organizations. Additional research can expand our understanding about the identities that people shape for the spirits, the places that the spirits
occupy on cultural landscapes, and the influences that spirits wield in long-term socio-political trajectories. Archaeological concerns with the spirits of the dead should extend to many socio-cultural environments, where there are yet different identities for the spirits and unique ways in which they articulate with local histories.

In the American Southwest, the Hohokam cultural sequence in the Phoenix and Tucson basins presents a unique setting in which to explore the involvement of spirits of the dead in a complex, dynamic political trajectory. Residents of the lower Salt River and the middle Gila River valleys occupied expansive villages that spread along vast canal networks stemming from the river channels. Several authors have suggested that the nearly continuous settlements, which were coterminous with large, canal systems, were integrated into individual irrigation communities (see Abbott et al. 2006, Hunt et al. 2005). Hohokam settlements were heavily invested in an intensive agricultural economy, which also included craft specialization.

During the Pre-Classic period (AD 600/700 – 1000/1100), residential populations were centered on irrigation villages along the middle Gila River Valley, but were also substantial in the Salt River Valley and other river valleys in southern and central Arizona. By the early part of the Classic period (AD 1000/1100 – 1400/1450), Hohokam settlement and cultural expression were primarily centered on the swath of villages and homesteads concentrated along the enormous irrigation works in the lower Salt River Valley. Large numbers of people lived in extensive settlements along Canal System 1 and the Lehi System on the south side of the river, and along Canal System 2 and the Scottsdale System on the north side of the river.

Throughout the Hohokam world, the transition between the Pre-Classic and the Classic period represents a profound socio-political transformation. The wide-reaching Hohokam economic regional network, which spanned large parts of central and southern Arizona, retracted toward the Phoenix Basin. Population levels increased rather dramatically in large settlements along canal networks in the Salt River valley. At approximately the same time, inhabitants of Hohokam settlements began to construct and occupy above-ground, adobe structures, which were eventually surrounded by compound walls. Moreover, people ceased constructing and using Preclassic era ballcourts, which were significant public architectural features. Instead, they turned
their ritual and communal focus to platform mounds, which were also enclosed in compound walls.

I suggest that the spirits of the dead likely played influential roles in the acute changes that swept through the Hohokam socio-political trajectory during the Classic period. As outlined in this study, consideration of the spirits should directly address the social identities for the spirits of the dead. It should investigate who the dead were – ancestors, ancestral spirits, anonymous groups of spirits, etc. – and then explore how they were involved in community social and political affairs.

Several authors have begun to postulate about the social identities of the dead in Classic period Hohokam villages. At present, there is little consensus about these identities or the roles that the spirits played in local and regional politics. In their contribution to the volume *Alternative Leadership Strategies in the Prehispanic Southwest*, Elson and Abbott (2000) proposed that there are indications of ancestor worship in association with Hohokam platform mounds (see also Abbott 2000). They suggested that, as new immigrants from central and northern parts of the Southwest arrived in Phoenix Basin communities, people constructed platform mounds as markers affiliated “with particular ancestor spirits and their living descendants” (Elson and Abbott 2000: 131). However, in the same volume, Fish and Fish (2000: 159) stated that there is little evidence for the “veneration of lineal ancestors” in the archaeological record.

An examination of the performance of mortuary ritual can address these questions about the social identities for the spirits of the dead and their involvement in social and political affairs. Through the course of this research, I have described an examination procedure that involves characterizing the social memories that people shaped for the spirits of the dead. This procedure attempts to locate any protracted and special rites that might memorialize and install ancestors, and to distinguish those rites from ritual acts that simply separate the deceased from the living social order and create a generalized spirit of the dead. More specifically, it attempts to distinguish ritual acts that selectively memorialize particular members of the deceased from those that uniformly memorialize nearly all of the deceased.
The examination process involves analyzing several mortuary ritual elements to describe the social memories that they shaped for the spirits. I advocate analyzing the 1) treatment of the body, 2) construction of mortuary facilities, 3) inclusion of mortuary accompaniments, 4) spaces and places of mortuary ritual, and 5) evidence for continued interaction with the dead and the spirits. These ritual elements craft particular social memories for the spirits of the dead. Together, these social memories form a composite social identity for the spirits of the dead.

To illustrate the potential for exploring Hohokam spirits of the dead, I provide a brief overview of body treatment in several Classic period villages situated along a major canal system, Canal System 2, on the north side of the Salt River. This preliminary analysis includes 714 individuals interred in mortuary features at the Classic period villages Pueblo Grande, Casa Buena, and Grand Canal Ruins. This mortuary population consists of 407 cremations and 317 inhumations.

Foremost, there was a profound, fundamental alteration in the treatment of most dead across the Preclassic to Classic period transition in Phoenix Basin settlements. In the Preclassic period, residents of Hohokam villages in both the Salt and Gila River valleys cremated the vast majority of the deceased. Later, in the Classic period, inhabitants of Salt River settlements inhumed many of the deceased. Large-scale excavations throughout the valley indicate that approximately 70 percent of the dead were inhumed, while 30 percent were cremated. Interestingly, the preference for an inhumation burial program may have subsided in the Late Classic period, as there is evidence that cremation became prevalent again, particularly in settlements on the south side of the Salt River (Brunson 1989, Mitchell and Brunson-Hadley 2001).

The dynamic between cremation and inhumation across the Preclassic to Classic period transition is critical to understanding changes in the social identities for the spirits of the dead in Classic period communities. This relationship is not well understood, even though many researchers have considered the issue (e.g., Brunson 1989, Cushing 1890, Doyel 1991, Gladwin et al. 1937, Haury 1945). Current archaeological evidence indicates that the change from cremation to inhumation among many residential populations in the Salt River Valley is connected
to large influxes of people from other parts of the Hohokam world, reductions in local residential mobility, and alterations in land tenure systems. Perhaps the cremation program continued as simply a traditional ritual procedure associated with Preclassic lifeways and local social groups tied to desert riverine traditions. Perhaps the cremation procedure became a selective, somewhat reverential treatment. Or, maybe it represents both a traditional and a selective treatment. Future research on Hohokam mortuary ritual should continue to address these issues directly.

Here, I discuss preliminary results for the analysis of both cremation and inhumation to highlight the different social memories that they shaped for spirits of the dead. An MCA of Classic period cremation body treatment attributes suggests that the program involved a multi-stage processing and burial program that was uniformly applied to nearly all those who were cremated (Figure 7.3). The clusters of cremation cases in the graph depict a primary cremation treatment, a principal secondary interment of moderate amounts of cremated remains in funerary urns, and successive (e.g., third, fourth) interment of small amounts of cremains in simple pits. I contend that these additional interments represent the use or re-use of remains in remembrance events (Beck 2005).

An MCA of inhumation body treatment attributes indicates that this program involved a single stage for the treatment and burial of the deceased’s remains (Figure 7.4). The results do not identify evidence for protracted, separate or special rites that might formally install potent spirits of the dead (i.e., ancestors). However, the plot does illustrate a pattern of continued interaction and/or handling of some inhumed remains. These behaviors suggest that the living were engaging with the dead and with the spirits in increasingly physical forms within Classic period settlements. Additional examination of these inhumation features indicates that residents of Classic period villages interacted with the remains of some adults in burial spaces adjacent to architecture, and even occasionally inside residential compounds. However, the living interred deceased children and infants in residential spaces more than the adults. It is these remains of children and infants that display some intriguing evidence for continued handling at some Classic period platform mounds.
Figure 7.3. Scatterplot of Classic period Hohokam cremation body treatment MCA object scores. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. The cases are color-coded by cluster assignment (through a k-means pure locational clustering procedure). The colored ovals represent confidence ellipses that outline the range of each identified cluster.
Figure 7.4. Scatterplot of Classic period Hohokam inhumation body treatment MCA object scores. Each point represents the MCA object score of an individual burial case. The cases are color-coded by cluster assignment (through a k-means pure locational clustering procedure). The colored ovals represent confidence ellipses that outline the range of each identified cluster.
This brief discussion of Hohokam mortuary ritual suggests that the social identities for the spirits of the dead were changing at a time when the regional political trajectory was undergoing fundamental changes as well. During the Preclassic period, a cremation ritual program transformed nearly all the deceased into generalized spirits, who did not reside in communities but who were still present. During the Classic period, this ritual procedure continued, but it was no longer the predominate sequence for treating the dead. An inhumation program served to separate the spirits of the dead from the living. This program brought a new emphasis on the physical presence of the complete body, and with it, a developing pattern of interacting and handling some remains. At present, it is difficult to determine if residents of Classic period villages were intensifying their interactions with the spirits of the dead. It does appear, though, that the spirits’ presence and influence were growing among the living toward the later part of prehistory in Salt River Valley communities.

As the Hohokam example illustrates, the spirits of the dead were and remain influential agents in the continued evolution of socio-political trajectories. They are part and parcel of these local and regional political traditions. People tend to shape particular kinds of spirits that can participate in their long-term political traditions, and they develop particular kinds of relationships with these spirits. For instance, inhabitants of the Mississippian world crafted interactions with potent, politically powerful ancestors who could influence competitions and contests over social power. These spirits brandished local histories like a weapon, and used it to sway socio-political matters. Residents of Protohistoric Zuni villages fostered relations with ancestral spirits who curated group histories and knowledge, to persuade them for communities of both the living and the dead. These spirits guarded and maintained the histories, or the roads, that were critical to the formation of new Puebloan towns. Each of these cases demonstrates that the spirits’ participation in social and political affairs is not only tied to histories and traditions themselves, but also to how people engage with these histories. When the living interact with and/or confront their pasts, and actively articulate it with the present, then the spirits sit at the very nexus of history and politics.
Chapter 7 Notes

1 Residential burial at Hawikku and Kechiba:wa needs additional research. In particular, the context of burials placed in rooms should be documented in greater detail.

2 In his notes on the excavation of burial mounds throughout the Georgia and South Carolina coast, Moore (1897, 1899a, 1899b, 1899c) recorded cremation deposits and some associated material items. Future research might examine these records to determine if the living did place items in cremation pyres in some places along the coast. It should be possible to evaluate if this study's discussion of pyre goods at Irene is representative of mortuary behavior in other settlements.
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