

*Jordan Anthony Burich*

# In Your Wildest

# Memes:

## Toward A Cooperative Methodology of Pre-Religion and Ritual

---

*Jordan Anthony Burich is an anthropology major at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, pursuing minors in religious studies, history, and classics. He is interested in early religious thought and its role in the creation and evolution of human culture in the Near East. He has done fieldwork in the Abruzzo region of eastern Italy under the direction of Oberlin College (Ohio) and Durham University (UK), and he is currently doing research on altars and hearths of Ancient Greek and Roman temples in Cyprus with the Athienou Archaeological Project (Davidson College, NC) as a recipient of the National Science Foundation-Research Experience for Undergraduates award (NSF-REU).*

### **Introduction**

When we study religion, we do not study gods and goddesses, but people. When we study the religious experience, we study many reflections of the intersection between the natural world and human culture. These religious experiences become an intricate history of human thought and organization. While these experiences manifest themselves in beautifully unique ways, there are also many parallels between cultures through time and space. Studying the religious experience, therefore, becomes a study of meaningful human ideas regarding our place within the natural world and the cosmos. The nature of ritual and religion is hidden—though to be sure, their emanations are physically abundant in the arts, linguistics and symbols. It thus becomes difficult to debate the source, intent, and function of the phenomena of religion and its varied ritualistic manifestations.

Religion is pervasive throughout human culture, and historically we glimpse both its structures and philosophies as taking many guises and spawning a multitude of ideologies that have been known to, in some cases, produce powerful political entities and cultural movements. This ubiquity is well attested archaeologically; evidence has yet to come forth showing an ancient culture that does not practice some form of religion.<sup>1</sup> Religious ideology is perhaps the most all-encompassing aspect of human culture, and this paper uses Göbekli Tepe and Çatalhöyük as case studies in order to attempt to determine how we may begin to describe symbolic religious forms from out of deep prehistory and into historical and archaeological frameworks. Unfortunately, archaeological research runs into difficulty when attempting to catalog immaterial culture, especially those aspects that deal with religion and ritual and the ideas from deep prehistory that shaped them. Many cultures share similar symbolic motifs throughout space and time, and perhaps we can view these ideas and symbols as a reference for describing human relationships and responses to the natural, the supernatural, and the cultural

worlds. Perhaps by viewing symbolic material memetically we can at least begin to place religious belief more firmly alongside ritual practice and socially hierarchical roles. By using memetic theory, this paper offers a possibility to begin to discuss these cultural experiences by leaning on ideas from outside of the discipline of archaeology. Anthropologists often use religion, language, and art as prerequisites for defining "complex" societies, however, growing evidence from the fields of psychology and evolutionary biology suggest that the universality of these three criteria may be as closely linked to evolutionary theory as it is to cultural evolution (in its broadest sense); future research may find anthropology, biology, and psychology beginning to work in a triumvirate fashion.<sup>2</sup>

It may be because of the disconnection between religious belief (immaterial) and ritual objects (material) that there seems to be a reticence on the part of archaeologists to discuss religion in terms that are outside of the functional, as in a sense of creating blind obedience (religion as opiate), or socioeconomic regulation (religion as police force). Viewing religion in these contexts is attractive archaeologically as we require a certain amount of hard data from material culture, and the economic, legal, and coercive functions of religion are often more visible in these contexts than its primary institution, that being human thought and belief. These are not found buried in the earth (obviously), but we attempt to catalog the evolution of spiritual thought *via* the physical material culture found in context. There is a danger, however, in describing religious and ritualistic thought as "secularly" functional in these regards as it creates a one-dimensional and ahistorical perspective of the role of religion and human spiritual thought – religion must be *believed* before it is able to function in other capacities. To view it primarily in terms of its secular functionality robs religion and ritual of its deep history and deep meaning, both of which are monumentally abundant in sites such as Göbekli Tepe and Çatalhöyük. How are we to bridge the gap between the material and immaterial? To begin this work, we must first view sites such as these as having not existed in a vacuum; the archaeological record attests that these Neolithic sites were engaged in complex networks of contact and trade. That, in a sense, is why analysis of these sites in space and through time is so valuable not only materially, but also in terms of the exchange of ideas. An analysis of the invisible realm of ideas takes us to the outer limits of anthropology, to a liminal space shared with evolutionary biology.

## **On the Edges of Anthropology: Toward a Memetic Methodology**

Perhaps the one irrefutable facet of humanity that separates us from other primates is the invention of culture. We have arrived at this cultural stage in the evolutionary process due to the indifferent efficiency of Darwinian natural selection. At once it seems as though we are governed by two, sometimes competing evolutions: *natural* selection and *cultural* selection. One might say that culture spreads – socially and subconsciously as a self-imposed *artificial selection* – through ideas that manifest themselves into and onto the cultural environment. These may include symbols, art, language, architecture, technology, etc. In his book *The Selfish Gene* (1976), Richard Dawkins classifies these varieties of human cultural narratives and forms as "memes," which can be described as a "unit of imitation" in much the same way that a gene could be referred to as a "unit of replication."<sup>3</sup> Though memes are not biological units, they transmit cultural ideas in ways that are analogous to genetic principles in that each meme's success is due to processes of selection, variation, mutation, competition, and inheritance. We may view certain symbols as memes, as being representations that derive their value not in their mere existence, but only within the conscious mind of the observer. This allows for relative cognition of its value and a mutative nature of its content within personal and social perspectives.

The success of some memes may be due to "absolute merit"<sup>4</sup> or due to inclusion within a *memeplex*, or "a set of memes which, while not necessarily being good survivors on their own, are good survivors in the presence of other members of the memeplex."<sup>5</sup> Memeplexes are variably complex sets of memes that are intertwined together. For instance, a memeplex of the Roman Catholic Church contains a wide array of memes: virgin birth, transubstantiation, eternal life, *et cetera*. We may also say that the memes present in pre-religion comprise a memeplex: privileged maleness, ancestor worship, communality, and so on.

Memetics has been a fairly recent development. Coupled with genome sequencing, and recent advances in neuroimaging, we may begin to push these biocultural theories into the realm of empirical study. For now, these should be used by anthropology and archaeology qualitatively, and this paper merely asserts that viewing memetics as a possible method to describe the motivations, cosmologies, and functions of pre-religion may prove useful. The way in which memes imitate natural selection and replicate themselves within cultural contexts may begin to shed light upon the prevalence of pre-religious memes and the transmission of said memes through time and space.

## **Approaching Pre-Religion and Ritual: Toward an Archaeological Methodology**

While memetics may begin to parse out the selection and transmission of the symbols used at Göbekli Tepe and Çatalhöyük, we must not solely rely on this method to produce reliable, archaeologically testable hypotheses. It may be adopted in order to change our perceptions of the cultural significance of material, but boots are needed on the ground. It is often noted that archaeology tends to lag behind other disciplines in adoption of theoretical models. It is necessary to contribute a viable methodology on our own end, even while pursuing extra-disciplinary cooperation. We can view these structures, features, and artifacts as memes in and of themselves yet that alone will not brighten such a dimly lit past.

"The production of figurines and pictures, which starts in the Upper Paleolithic, has created a new category of signs, icons whose visual modeling suggests a clear and seemingly direct reference to the object. In fact, they create a second level of reality, a world of pictures more manageable than reality and subject to willful creativity . . . [I]ater observers are left with the problem of interpreting these early representations . . . in a context of art, magic, or religion."<sup>6</sup>

Memeplexes of pre-religion and attendant ritual leave behind an abundance of physical evidence which may be able to answer general questions in regard to conjunctive ideas of the power of belief and shifting religious and social ideologies. For such all-encompassing features of human culture to be fully explored, a multitude of theoretical tools is necessary.

Viewing pre-religion's memes as being manifested within the physical space of a site begs us to ask, *what then?* How were these memes translated into socially meaningful ritual, and how did these rituals affect social order and reinforce social ideology and power structure? Verhoeven<sup>7</sup> offers an entry level approach to our first task: defining and framing ritual. Ritual in and of itself is difficult to define as it often can be approached by a multitude of theories, and its evocative nature is multi-tiered as a vehicle meant to locate initiants within complex cosmologies and social roles. Comprehensive analysis is required though, and Verhoeven cites Firth (1951)

for his definition of ritual as ". . . a kind of patterned activity oriented towards the control of human affairs, primarily symbolic in character with a non-empirical referent, and as a rule socially sanctioned."<sup>8</sup>

Following Verhoeven's methodology, five basic concepts are proposed to analyze PPNB ritual: *ritual framing*, *syntax*, *symbolism*, *dimensions*, and *analogy*. Ritual framing (**figure 1**) includes the largest number of properties to be analyzed due to the fact that ritual takes many forms and is visible within many contexts, death and burial preeminent among them. Ritual takes place at prescribed places and times, and viewing its properties—even within possibly dual-functioning arenas such as those found at Göbekli and Çatalhöyük—should take into account the varying roles and conditions in which structures and materials may have been used. We may be able to decipher the four remaining concepts in Verhoeven's methodology as:

**Syntax:** Context: chronological, cultural, and spatial reference of ritual remains.

**Object:** How were ritual objects and symbols *used*?

**Act:** A reconstruction of ritual practice.

**Symbolism:** Rituals are usually marked by an elaborate use of symbols. Basic sub-concepts within this sphere are dominant symbols (objects that both focus and evoke in a more persistent manner than conventional symbols), and metaphors (used to link different cultural domains, and positional meaning, *i.e.* the way a symbol is related to other symbols). This may be a way to employ memetics within an archaeological context.

**Dimensions:** Scientific measurement and reference to secular theories of power and ideology in order to provide a comprehensive analysis in regard to how rituals may have affected wider aspects of society.

**Analogy:** The use of ethnographic parallels when appropriate.

When we speak about religion, generally we are speaking of "complex religion," which is highly formalized, replete with a priest-class, and hierarchical structure. However, this paper does not attempt to discuss "complex religion" as described, but rather a "pre-religion" which in this paper should be understood as "a semi-formal way in which human beings attempt to locate themselves within the natural environment and the cosmos 'before the emergence of doctrinal and theistic religions.'"<sup>9</sup> Agriculture and domestication, like "complex religion," did not come about unrehearsed, but were slowly worked over long periods before they appeared in historical and archaeological contexts. Perhaps the widespread use of agriculture contributed to themes found in "complex religion" but it is likely that both systems grew independently of each other in some ways, yet inextricably in others. Evidence for this complex interplay can be seen throughout time within the Levant, starting at Göbekli Tepe, the earliest known site of complex human social organization.

## Göbekli Tepe

Göbekli Tepe is located roughly 16 kilometers outside of the southwestern Turkish town of Sanliurfa, close to the Syrian border. The site has been excavated since 1994 by its discoverer, Klaus Schmidt of the DAI (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut). The earliest constructed portions of the site date from the PPNA (Pre-Pottery Neolithic A) ca. 12,175-11,000 BP. These older stratigraphic layers (III and IIA) represent the zenith of architectural construction at Göbekli Tepe as far as monumentality, design, and symbology is concerned. It consists thus far of a group of monumental standing stone circles, comprised of bi-laterally symmetrical T-shaped monoliths similar to *sarsens* along the perimeter and two larger standing stones in the center facing each other, "twin-pillars" that are highly decorated with finely prepared surfaces.<sup>10</sup> The

monoliths range in size (2.5 up to 10.8 metric tons), and each monolith has been elaborately carved, with detailed *bas-relief* animals plainly visible. Based on GPR evidence, Schmidt reckons that only a small portion of the site has been uncovered and that as many as twenty of these stone circles may remain beneath the surface.

The vast array of plant and animal life depicted on the pillars lends a detailed richness to the awe-inspiring monumentality of Göbekli Tepe. Symbols include ithyphallic and/or headless humanoid figures, predatory animals, and water birds. This may serve to illustrate that "when Neolithic people first crafted monumental images, they chose subjects that focused on imagined beings and dangerous wild animals. . . note here that many of the subjects portrayed are carnivorous, flesh-eating species: lions, leopards, foxes, boars, bears, snakes, scorpions, spiders, and raptors."<sup>11</sup> This symbolism shows a marked difference from female fertility and fecundity motifs generally associated with the advent of agriculture, and instead seem to indicate a strong degree of "phallogentrism"—the privileging of maleness as a prime cultural signifier and the centrality of masculinity (both human and animal) as a source of power and authority within the material and symbolic repertoire of the Turkish Neolithic.<sup>12</sup>

Schmidt maintains that Göbekli Tepe was not actually an occupied site, but rather was used as a common worship center by a wide array of hunter-gatherer bands within an unspecified area. However, solid conclusions in regard to site usage may need to be regarded conjecturally as only approximately 3-5% of the site has been excavated to date. Subsequent ethnology by E.B. Banning has challenged Schmidt's claim by contending that the stone circles at Göbekli Tepe may in fact be houses, as well as temples. Banning asserts that "many of the archaeological interpreters of Neolithic structures appear to have presumed that the inhabitants of PPN sites made a strong distinction between sacred and profane and have often overlooked or given insufficient attention to the alternative that PPN cosmology infused everyday life – including its residential or domestic buildings, activities, and spaces – with meaning and spirituality."<sup>13</sup> He claims that the ubiquity of symbols across the site do not necessarily equate to each building functioning as a temple. It is not that "temples" are incompatible with domestic rituals *per se*, but that prominent symbolism should not imply specialized and solely spiritual ritual structures.

Some carvings located on the uppermost portion of T-pillars seem to represent structures at the site – "box-like objects with handle-like attachments" – with each representation containing a particular glyph (waterbird, boar, scorpion, etc). Schmidt has maintained that he believes these were open-air temples, though it may be possible to interpret these carvings as "clan or house emblems." Banning asserts that the structures were most likely roofed, and offers, "it is conceivable that the pillar records a story in which three clans or houses had prominent parts or perhaps documents three lineages that have some part in the house's heritage."<sup>14</sup> We may also posit that if these are lineage-based symbols, that they perhaps document the groups that worked together in erecting the monoliths, as it certainly seems as though some degree of cooperation would be needed in the construction of these structures. It could be that for the sake of efficiency these buildings had more than one use.

## Çatalhöyük

Until the discovery of Göbekli Tepe in 1994, the site at Çatalhöyük had enjoyed a prominent position in the discussion of the early Neolithic Levantine world. First excavated by James Mellaart in the late 1950s and early 1960s, projects there were discontinued due to scandal until picked up again in 1993 by Ian Hodder, a former student of Mellaart. Hodder spearheaded the post-processual movement and has used Çatalhöyük as a way to ground-truth post-processual

theory. The dates of occupation for Çatalhöyük are ca. 7400 - 6000 BCE (9400 - 8000 BP, respectively), and the site is situated roughly 100 kilometers to the southwest of Cappadocia on the Konya Plain in south-central Turkey. It may well have been an important center during the transition from the Late Neolithic Pre-Pottery B (PPNB/C) phase into a period of more full-scale agricultural production and animal domestication typically associated with what would have been considered to be the "Neolithic Revolution."<sup>15</sup>

The inhabitants of Çatalhöyük subsisted on a limited number of domesticated cereals such as einkorn and emmer, pulses, and also on domesticated sheep and goats. Wild game, such as bulls and deer, were also exploited.<sup>16</sup> The site itself has no semblance of public architecture; domestic spaces abound and are arranged in a honeycomb-like fashion with entrances to domiciles on the roof of each respective living space. Thus far it has been difficult to outline discernible hierarchies within the settlement based on house size or grave goods, and because no public architecture – in the form of temples, or otherwise – has been discovered, proximity to such buildings and how that might relate to social inequality remains a difficult to infer.

Çatalhöyük has yielded a relatively large amount of material culture: stone-carved statuettes, figurines, animal remains (mostly horns, antlers, claws, and teeth), and articulated human remains which were deposited within living spaces beneath the floors. Most houses contain human remains, and some articulated bodies have had crania removed post-mortem and postdeposition.

The current theory regarding these graves is that those ancestors deemed important or powerful had their heads removed as acts of veneration, or perhaps to be used in creating lines of ancestry or sodality. Çatalhöyük exhibits similar symbolic motifs as Göbekli Tepe despite a noticeable difference in architecture. However, the symbols at Çatalhöyük seem to have taken on more concrete functions. We still see a blatant phallocentrism and depiction of predatory animals – "the basic relation expressed was between humans and male wild animals"<sup>17</sup> – spread evenly throughout residences, though these motifs become systematically placed within each structure.

Çatalhöyük displays three major themes in its symbolic content, according to Hodder and Meskell: maleness, wild and dangerous animals, and the piercing of human and animal flesh and the decapitation of human and animal heads.<sup>18</sup> Hodder and Meskell introduce what some scholars have described as a "bull cult" or, at times, a "skull cult"<sup>19</sup> as symbolizing what they describe as a "history house" motif. After venerated skulls are unearthed by subsequent generations the previous house is filled in and a new residence is built on top of the extant structure. Lineages, however constructed, are tangible towers linking present ownership to past exploits.

The symbolic content may represent a link between the living and the dead (bucrania often delineate spaces where remains are kept), along with linkages between humans and the natural environment. The antlers, horns, claws, and teeth uncovered at Çatalhöyük are seen to have been actively re-plastered into the interior walls of the houses, and current theory is that these may be representative of ritual or hunting commemoration, or both. Viewing the residences at Çatalhöyük as active places as well as temples to ancestry *via* skull removal from graves seems to indicate that one's ancestral past provided opportunity for contemporary linkage within kin-based or cross-community groups. It may also bode well for Banning's interpretation of the symbols in Göbekli Tepe III and Çatalhöyük.

The study of these two sites in relation to each other sheds light not only on the possible role of their common symbols but also on the movement of people socially and geographically. Construction at Göbekli Tepe seems to decline in monumentality and detail as time moves

forward,<sup>20</sup> and this may be due to increasingly complicated group linkages. As kin-based groups and other social groups grow demographically, it may necessitate splintering off and relocating to other growing centers such as Çatalhöyük, Nevalı Cori, and others. This increasing social complexity, coupled with ever-advancing subsistence techniques may at least partly explain the rapid creation and growth of towns and villages throughout Anatolia during the PPNB into the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age. What we do know for certain is that both of these sites in particular have played an important role in providing a viable framework of PPN Anatolia, devoid of over-arching and fantastical fringe theories. It is certain that they will continue to offer valuable insight for future research.

## Conclusion

If we are to engage in proper discussion in regard to social development—*i.e.* power, hierarchy, heterarchy, ideology, agency—throughout the Neolithic Levant (or elsewhere), finding a methodology capable of describing pre-religious ritual and ideology will enable us to garner a more holistic view of early human social and spiritual culture. To begin this work, we must first view sites such as Çatalhöyük as having not existed in a vacuum; the archaeological record attests that these Neolithic sites were engaged in complex networks of contact and trade. That, in a sense, is why analysis of these sites in space and through time is so valuable not only materially, but also in terms of the immaterial exchange of ideas.

The PPNA and PPNB in Anatolia saw an explosion of symbolic (and possibly memetic) narratives and representation. While it is important to view Göbekli Tepe and Çatalhöyük as products of this, we must be careful to give each their due space. There are, as mentioned above, significant differences between these sites, not only through time and space, but also in terms of site structure and ritual construction. However, there are commonalities between them that seem to suggest an overarching "ritual culture," in that they are memetically connected. Viewed in this way, we can say that the memplex created at Göbekli Tepe adapted to changes brought on by early agricultural development and may have served as a foundation for a changing social ideology. Human-animal linkages are prevalent, as is a sense of communality, and the dominant memes at these two sites may provide a primitive chronology of social development within the Neolithic Levant.

In employing these memes as a backdrop in Hodder and Meskell's "history house" theory, we may begin to parse out traces of social hierarchy at Çatalhöyük. The hunting of dangerous animals and their depiction within ritual contexts as seen at Göbekli (either for worship, initiation, hunting success, *et al*) is translated into the domestic spaces at Çatalhöyük, not merely as art, but as being actively built into the physical environment. That the burials are placed within sacred space delineated by such powerful symbols, we may cautiously assume that the deceased individuals were seen as important figures during their lives. The removal of their skulls may suggest that the display of a long history of powerful group members was a concern to the inhabitants of Çatalhöyük, which may indicate a growing complexity within village social life. Further examination of these burials using the comprehensive analysis proposed by Verhoeven<sup>21</sup> may begin to infer more in regard to the ritualistic meaning and social function of these "history houses," and how pre-religious and social ideologies may have intersected.

As the oldest known example of monumental architecture and ritual, Göbekli Tepe offers us a unique window into deep prehistory in terms of spiritual ideology and social relation. As a comparative case study, Çatalhöyük may be seen as a continuation of what may have evolved ritualistically at Göbekli. We have inferred that forms of social hierarchy are (so far)

inconclusive based on ritual evidence, however, we have not employed new methodologies (as discussed in this paper) in order to comprehensively analyze existing or forthcoming data. This paper is meant to introduce memetics as a method to be explored in relation to these sites and the many others like them in the region. While examining secular avenues of power and ideology, we must be careful to remember that our conceptions of boundaries between the sacred and profane tend to be anachronistic, and that religious thought almost surely permeated every aspect of early human social organization. When we are dealing with such early forms of human culture, in a deep prehistory without written language, we must rely on such natural symbols like those seen at Göbekli Tepe and Çatalhöyük to shed light on the values and beliefs of our ancient ancestors. Viewing pre-religion's memes as being manifested within the physical space of a site begs us to ask, *what then? How were these memes translated into spiritually meaningful ritual? And how did these rituals serve to reinforce and evolve social ideologies?* While memetics may begin to parse out the selection and transmission of the symbology used at Göbekli Tepe and Çatalhöyük, we must not solely rely on this method to produce reliable theories. We may be able to view these structures, features, and artifacts as memes in and of themselves, yet that alone will not brighten such a dimly lit past.

As archaeologists, we analyze material culture in order to paint a detailed picture of the past. We use a wide array of methodologies to do this, yet we tend to find it difficult to discuss pre-religion, which may be the catalyst for human culture, in a comprehensive and inspiring way. Viewing religion as not only something borne out of, but also shaping both nature and culture, can enable us to understand the evolution of human culture more fully. However, to successfully do this will require continued interdisciplinary cooperation. Embracing ideas such as "memes," from the field of evolutionary biology may begin to allow us a fresh perspective. Göbekli Tepe offers us a unique window into deep prehistory, in terms of pre-religious spiritual ideology, and as a comparative case study, Çatalhöyük may be seen as a continuation of what may have evolved, memetically-speaking, at Göbekli. These sites allow us the opportunity to discuss the evolution of the experience of religion and the transition of hunting and gathering to civilization in ways that we have previously not been able to, and the questions they raise may require some of the most thoughtful and thought-provoking answers we can offer.



**Table 1.** *Properties of framing.*<sup>22</sup>

<b>Location</b>	The building, deposit or object is located in a special area, e.g. on a promontory, clearly separate from domestic buildings and areas, etc.
<b>Shape, Texture and Color</b>	The form, texture and color of buildings or objects may differ significantly from that of other domestic buildings and objects.
<b>Size</b>	The size of buildings or objects may differ significantly from that of other domestic buildings and objects.
<b>Orientation</b>	The orientation of buildings or objects may differ significantly from that of other domestic buildings and objects.
<b>Construction Material</b>	The construction material of buildings or objects may differ significantly from that of other domestic buildings and objects at the site.
<b>Presence of Special Features</b>	The building or object may be marked by some unusual features that are not found in other domestic buildings or at other objects
<b>Inventory</b>	The building or deposit is marked by finds that do not occur normally
<b>Association</b>	The association of objects is uncommon, and cannot be explained functionally
<b>Number</b>	The building, object or deposit is special in that it is either single or rare
<b>Functionality</b>	The building, object or deposit cannot be interpreted in direct functional, domestic, terms
<b>Knowledge/Analogy</b>	From the researcher's frame of reference it is known that a building, object or deposit such as the one under investigation is usually ritual.

<sup>1</sup> Burkert, Walter. *Creation of the Sacred: Tracks of Biology in Early Religions*. (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1996.) 1

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, xii.

<sup>3</sup> Dawkins, Richard. *The Selfish Gene*. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom, 1976.)

<sup>4</sup> Dawkins, Richard. *The God Delusion*. (Bantam Press, London, United Kingdom, 2006.) 231

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 230

<sup>6</sup> Burkert, 1996, 165-66

<sup>7</sup> Verhoeven, Marc. "Ritual and Ideology in the Pre-Pottery Neolithic B of the Levant and Southeast Anatolia." *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 12.2 (2002): 235

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 234

<sup>9</sup> Renfrew, Colin. "Religion in the Emergence of Civilization: Book Review Forum." *Current Anthropology* 52.6 (2011), 915

<sup>10</sup> Banning, E. B. "So Fair a House: Göbekli Tepe and the Identification of Temples in the Pre-Pottery Neolithic of the Near East." *Current Anthropology* 52.5 (2011), 620

<sup>11</sup> Hodder, Ian and Meskell, Lynn. "A 'Trifle and Sometimes a Trifle Macabre Artistry': Some Aspects of Symbolism in Neolithic Turkey." *Current Anthropology* 52.2. (2011), 236

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 237

<sup>13</sup> Banning, 2011, 619)

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 640

<sup>15</sup> Goring-Morris, Nigel A. and Belfer-Cohen, "Neolithization Processes in the Levant: The Outer Envelope." *Current Anthropology* 52.S4. (2011), S196

<sup>16</sup> Hodder and Meskell, 2011, 235

<sup>17</sup> Verhoeven, 2002, 252

<sup>18</sup> Hodder and Meskell, 2011, 236-237

<sup>19</sup> Bender, Barbara. "Gatherer-Hunter to Farmer: A Social Perspective." *World Archaeology* 10.2 (1978), 215

<sup>20</sup> Mann, Charles C. "The Birth of Religion." *National Geographic Magazine* 219.6 (2011), 48

<sup>21</sup> Verhoeven, 2002

<sup>22</sup> Verhoeven, 2002, 234, *figure 1*

Additional Works Cited:

Belfer-Cohen, Anna and Goring-Morris, Nigel. "For the First Time." *Current Anthropology* 50.5 (2009): 669-672.

Frangipane, Marcella. "Different Types of Egalitarian Societies and the Development of Inequality in Early Mesopotamia." *World Archaeology* 39.2 (2007): 151-176.

Gérard, F., and L. Thissen. "The Neolithic of central Anatolia: internal developments and external relations during the 9th–6th millennia cal BC." In *Proceedings of the International CANeW Round Table, Istanbul, 23–24 November 2001*. F. Gérard and L. Thissen, eds. (2002): 181–192.

Hayden, Brian. "The Proof Is in the Pudding: Feasting and the Origins of Domestication." *Current Anthropology* 50.5 (2009): 597-601.

Hodder, Ian. "Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: The Example at Çatalhöyük." *McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research BIAA Monograph* 28 (2000): 3-15.

Kornienko, Tatiana V. "Notes on the Cult Buildings of Northern Mesopotamia in the Aceramic Neolithic Period." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 68.2 (2009): 81-102.

Marston, John W. "Agricultural Strategies and Political Economy in Ancient Anatolia." *American Journal of Archaeology* 116.3 (2012): 377-403.

Price, Douglas T. and Bar-Yosef, Ofer. "The Origins of Agriculture: New Data, New Ideas: An Introduction to Supplement 4." *Current Anthropology* 52.S4 (2011): S163-S174.