Hohokam

Pre-Classic and Classic Periods
AD 700 to AD 1450
Cooperation

• Households/ courtyard plazas reflect social identity
  – Pithouse courtyards (Preclassic)
  – Adobe complexes (Classic)
  – Ballcourts (Preclassic)
  – Platform mounds (Classic)

• Balance collective action & self interest
• The result = infrastructure that supports duration
• What about political integration?
Communities in geographic space

• What entity defined communities?
  – Multi-village polities

• Was it irrigation construction & control?
  – Water management

• Was it the location of civic architecture?
  – Civic & ritual leadership

• We can look at spatial organization of sites to address these questions
What communities represent?

• Economically:
  – farm land, homes, hunting territory, water

• Sociopolitically:
  – Friends, neighbors, distant relatives, enemies
Irrigation communities

• Proposed by David Doyel

• A single branch of the irrigation system represents a community
  – Represents a higher order community than civic centers w/ outlying settlements
    • Civic centers = big settlements with ballcourts & platform mounds
Ballcourt Communities

• Proposed by David Wilcox
• Important role of civic architecture in community organization
• Ballcourts evenly spaced across irrigation networks
  – Can draw boundaries midway between

• Ballcourt communities occur in areas w/o irrigation networks
• For example, Tucson Basin (Marana)
  – Even when irrigation occurs, not necessarily w/ center

• Demands of water management alone did not determine community organization
Ballcourts

- More than 200 in the region
- Built & used AD 700 to 1200
- Games unknown
  - Mesoamerican connection implied
“The Hohokam built more than 250 ballcourts at more than 150 of their larger communities in Arizona between about 750 and 1250. The ballcourts, say Andrews and Bostwick in an excellent description, ‘are oval, bowl-shaped depressions that vary in size but average 80 to 115 feet in length and 50 feet in width. Berms of earth, up to 9 feet high, encircled the depression and were constructed using the excavated dirt. During a Hohokam ball game, dozens and perhaps hundreds of people could watch from the embankments surrounding the ball court. The largest Hohokam ballcourt, excavated in the mid-1930s at Snaketown, 20 miles south of Pueblo Grande [in Phoenix], was large enough for 500 people to line its banks.’”
Gila River Communities
Salt River Communities

- Canal
- Community boundary
- Hypothetical community boundary
- Platform mound
- Compound

Fish & Fish pp. 46
Ballcourt/Platform mound communities

- Grow during the Pre-Classic as centers
  - Large example is Snaketown on lower Gila

- May have been chiefdoms that controlled agricultural surplus

- Hubs of trade network from core to outer areas
Platform Mounds

- Built during the late Classic AD 1150 to 1400
- Purpose poorly understood
- Seem to relate to political hierarchy & segregation of space
"The Hohokam platform mounds – typically three- to 10-foot high rectangular earthen structures with plastered flat tops and sloping sides, measuring several hundred to several thousand square feet in area – had ancient roots, although the purposes of these massive structures have never been fully understood. Mesoamerican communities began building mounds, often with earthen cores and cobblestone facing, some 3000 years ago, signaling a growing social complexity and integration. Presumably, they used the structures, which often dominated a community plaza, as a kind of Nob Hill for religious, political or military elite residences; or as a commanding stage for temples, rituals, dance and ceremonies; or as funereal monuments for community or religious leaders."

The Hohokam built "Large, rectangular mounds...at more than 40 sites between 1150 and 1300," Cordell said. "Villages consisted of clusters of houses and mounds, often surrounded by rectangular-shaped walled enclosures made of adobe and referred to as 'compounds'... In the mid-1200s, wall construction became more massive and some multistoried buildings were constructed..."

"Between 1250 and 1325, the function of the mounds changed in that houses were constructed on them and access to these houses was impeded by walls. The remaining population was housed in off-mound compounds and in outlying units. [Archaeologist David] Doyel...noting that most Hohokam did not live on platform mounds or even in compounds, suggests that the residential use of platform mounds represents a 'consolidation of power on the part of local elites.'"
Analogy: intra-community

• Observed by Ruth Underhill
• Tono O’odham mother-daughter communities
  – Mother = large, central communities
  – Daughter = smaller, outlying settlements
  – Together mother w/ daughters = village unit
  – Mother communities maintained power (leadership)
    • Hosted important village events

• Hohokam probably united in similar ways
Trade Networks: inter-community

• Red on buff pottery: mica-schist temper sources near a few centers (Snaketown)
  – Yet the pottery is found all over

• Groundstone tools: good stone near Phoenix
  – Tools made of this stone found all over
  – Important for dietary reasons

• In addition, exotic items from outside Hohokam area
  – Marine shells, obsidian, pigments
Trade Networks: inter-community

Bayman pp. 78
Community Layout

• Gila River
  – Communities on single canals paralleling the river
  – Irrigated land next to river
  – Additional crops in non-irrigated fields
  – Community ≈ 15 mi²
  – About 2550 irrigated acres per community
  – A few thousand people per community
Gila River Communities

- Classic period sites
- Dry farming areas
- Canals
- Tentative irrigation community boundaries

Italic site names indicate presence of platform mounds

Fish & Fish pp. 45
Community Layout

• Salt River
  – Repeated branching structure to canal system
  – Irrigated land close to and farm from river
    • Crossed most of the wide floodplain
  – Community $\approx 15$ mi$^2$
  – About 2300 irrigated acres per community
  – A few thousand people per community
Salt River Communities
Cultural transition

• From the Pre-Classic through the Classic
  – A shift from open to closed architecture
  – Cooperation to power inequality
  – Population grew, territorial constriction
  – How would it end?