

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only

received **AUG 15 1986**

date entered

See instructions in *How to Complete National Register Forms*

Type all entries—complete applicable sections

1. Name

historic Spendthrift Site (22-Co-520)

and/or common N/A

2. Location

street & number [REDACTED] not for publication

city, town [REDACTED]

state [REDACTED]

3. Classification

Category	Ownership	Status	Present Use	
<input type="checkbox"/> district	<input type="checkbox"/> public	<input type="checkbox"/> occupied	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> museum
<input type="checkbox"/> building(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> private	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unoccupied	<input type="checkbox"/> commercial	<input type="checkbox"/> park
<input type="checkbox"/> structure	<input type="checkbox"/> both	<input type="checkbox"/> work in progress	<input type="checkbox"/> educational	<input type="checkbox"/> private residence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> site	Public Acquisition	Accessible	<input type="checkbox"/> entertainment	<input type="checkbox"/> religious
<input type="checkbox"/> object	<u>N/A</u> in process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes: restricted	<input type="checkbox"/> government	<input type="checkbox"/> scientific
	<input type="checkbox"/> being considered	<input type="checkbox"/> yes: unrestricted	<input type="checkbox"/> industrial	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation
		<input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> other:

4. Owner of Property

name Mrs. M. H. Shields

street & number 39 Yazoo Ave.

city, town Clarksdale N/A vicinity of state Mississippi 38614

5. Location of Legal Description

courthouse, registry of deeds, etc. Office of the Chancery Clerk
Coahoma County Courthouse

street & number First Street

city, town Clarksdale state Mississippi

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

title Miss. Archaeological Survey has this property been determined eligible? yes no

date 1968 federal state county local

depository for survey records Miss. Dept. of Archives & History

city, town Jackson state Mississippi

7. Description

Condition		Check one	Check one
<input type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> deteriorated	<input type="checkbox"/> unaltered	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> original site
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> ruins	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> altered	<input type="checkbox"/> moved date <u>N/A</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> fair	<input type="checkbox"/> unexposed		

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

Phillips, Ford, and Griffin first recorded the Spendthrift site in 1940 during their Lower Mississippi Valley survey. In their publication (1951:53, 320) they describe the site as a village site with a single, large, rectangular mound 15 feet high, very abundant daub, and moderately abundant refuse. No plaza length or mound orientation was given. The site description given on the 1940 Peabody Museum site inventory record is as follows:

Mound has been cultivated which has probably converted it from an original rectangular or square shape to an oval. Main part is now covered with weeds and Johnson grass, but has been cultivated in the past. Tremendous quantity of daub all over the mound, great massive chunks, and in the fields to the east and south. Sherds not particularly abundant. Best collecting on bare patches in the corn, west of the mound, and in the cotton where not too thick south of it. Probably more material to the east, but high cotton and burdocks in the corn discouraged search. Extent of site in this direction was not determined. Maybe smaller mounds, but if so they are not high enough to show in the corn and cotton. Take it all around about the most bedaubed site we have seen yet. Bone fragments and very large sherds show where burials have been plowed out recently on the western slope of the mound. There were a few shell fragments in this area also, but these were not general over the site.

Their site map (Figure 1) gives the mound dimensions of 160 feet east-west by 120 feet north-south by 15 feet high, and also shows a house, barn, and garden that no longer existed in 1968.

When visited by Mississippi Department of Archives & History archaeologist John Connaway in December, 1985, the mound appeared to be in essentially the same condition as described by Phillips, Ford, and Griffin 45 years earlier,

. Both appear to have been there for some years before having first been noted by M.D.A.H. archaeologists in 1968. The large trench is 18 feet wide by 30 feet long and reaches a depth approximately equivalent to the mound base. Its origin is undetermined, but its size and straight sides suggest excavation by mechanical equipment, perhaps as a storm cellar or for farm garbage disposal (though never filled). Such a trench is unusual for pothunting efforts in this area, though this is a possibility.

The mound is no longer cultivated, but is grown up in trees, weeds, and brush (see Photo #1), even more so now than when the photo was taken in 1968. According to the Lower Mississippi Survey inventory record, it has not been cultivated at least since 1940. There is a large spoil bank just to the west of the mound (see Figure 2)

The large quantities of daub mentioned in the L.M.S. inventory record are still present to the east and south of the mound (see Figure 2), but more scattered and generally smaller in size. A number of heavy concentrations outlining house sites can still be seen in

(see continuation sheet)

8. Significance

Period	Areas of Significance—Check and justify below			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> prehistoric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> archeology-prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> community planning	<input type="checkbox"/> landscape architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> religion
<input type="checkbox"/> 1400-1499	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-historic	<input type="checkbox"/> conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> law	<input type="checkbox"/> science
<input type="checkbox"/> 1500-1599	<input type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> economics	<input type="checkbox"/> literature	<input type="checkbox"/> sculpture
<input type="checkbox"/> 1600-1699	<input type="checkbox"/> architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> education	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> social/
<input type="checkbox"/> 1700-1799	<input type="checkbox"/> art	<input type="checkbox"/> engineering	<input type="checkbox"/> music	<input type="checkbox"/> humanitarian
<input type="checkbox"/> 1800-1899	<input type="checkbox"/> commerce	<input type="checkbox"/> exploration/settlement	<input type="checkbox"/> philosophy	<input type="checkbox"/> theater
<input type="checkbox"/> 1900-	<input type="checkbox"/> communications	<input type="checkbox"/> industry	<input type="checkbox"/> politics/government	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation
		<input type="checkbox"/> invention		<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify)

Specific dates Baytown;¹ Miss.² **Builder/Architect** American Indian

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)

The significance of the Spendthrift site lies in its potential to contribute important data toward solving a number of problems concerning not only the site itself, but several entire phases which are presently ill-defined, both spatially and temporally. (A) A refinement of the chronologically extensive Coahoma phase definition might be accomplished by a more detailed collection and analysis of sherds, and by more comprehensive inter-site comparisons with other Coahoma phase sites, including those not recorded in the earlier Peabody Museum surveys. (B) This, along with some excavations at Spendthrift, could also help disclose the reason for the apparent gap (a Peabody phase occupation, [REDACTED] to Coles Creek culture) between the Coahoma and Hushpuckena-Oliver phases at the site. (C) Knowledge of the changes in dietary and subsistence patterns between the two phase occupations could be enhanced by study of refuse pit contents from the site. Evidence of plowed-through pits may be seen around the village, especially in the areas to the south and southwest of the mound. Surface collections of charred floral remains include beans, corn grains, hickory nut and pecan shells, and persimmon seeds. Concentrations of this material, along with fish and animal bones and some mussel shells are visible, and no doubt portions of these pits remain beneath the plow zone, as they have at other such sites. (D) Assuming that wattle and daub houses are of Mississippian origin, as indicated by excavations at other sites, then the study of house remains indicated by heavy daub concentrations at Spendthrift could yield significant information on house construction and settlement pattern during the Hushpuckena-Oliver phase occupation. (E) As with the Coahoma phase, a refinement of Phillips' Hushpuckena-Oliver phase combination might be accomplished by more inclusive sherd collections, controlled surface collection, and further inter-site comparisons with Belmont's separated phases at the Oliver site. (F) Another problem associated with this site is the distribution of negative painted pottery in the Southeast. A single body sherd found and reported by Phillips, Ford, and Griffin (1951:173, 215) is apparently the only negative painted specimen from the state of Mississippi. The two major North American centers of negative painting are in the Tennessee-Cumberland and Lower Ohio River regions, with the Lower Mississippi Valley left as a marginal area of distribution (Phillips 1970:139). The presence of a sherd at Spendthrift remains a mystery. Again, a more intensive study of ceramics from the site might shed some light on this problem, especially if it yielded new insight into inter-regional trade or social contact. (G) Finally, investigations of the mound, which remains in good condition, could yield valuable information on ceremonial life, various stages of construction and social progression, and a possible sub-mound intact Baytown component, which might help answer the question of the Peabody phase gap. The bottom of the large trench on the east face may have undisturbed features, and excavation there would not affect the rest of the mound. Also, a profile of mound construction stages might be gained from the trench walls without the necessity of further disturbance of the mound itself.

1. AD 300 - AD 800
2. AD 1000 - AD 1700

(see continuation sheet)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

Spendthrift Site, Coahoma County, Mississippi

For NPS use only
received
date entered

Continuation sheet	Description	Item number	7.	Page	1.
--------------------	-------------	-------------	----	------	----

this area. One such concentration, 120 feet due south of the mound, recently yielded a large quantity of charred beans (*P. vulgaris*) on the plowed surface. Recent removal of dirt for fill from the west side, between the mound and Cassidy Bayou, exposed large masses of daub, indicating numerous burned houses

All of the area [redacted] of the mound is in cultivation, most recently cotton. To test for midden depth, borings were made in four areas of heavy midden concentration (see Figure 2). Borehole #1, southeast of the mound revealed midden to a depth of two feet. The second borehole, southeast of the mound, revealed midden up to two feet, three inches. The third, to the southwest of the mound, was placed on a low ridge running northwest by southeast where there is a large concentration of midden debris and refuse, such as bone and some shell. This also showed a two-foot depth. Borehole #4 was placed in the area recently scraped for fill dirt and revealed midden up to three feet deep. Most of the village area around the mound has been subsoiled and, thus, the midden has probably been disturbed to some extent down to at least 18 inches. Numerous houses and refuse pits are suggested by the masses of daub and debris.

Potsherds, as noted by Phillips, Ford, and Griffin on the L.M.S. inventory record, are not abundant. L.M.S. sherd counts show a majority of ca. 85% Mississippi period types and a minority of ca. 15% Baytown period types. Of this, 73% were type Mississippi Plain. From analysis of the 1940 sherd collection, Phillips (1970:Figures 445 & 447) places the Spendthrift occupations in the Coahoma phase of the Baytown period and the Hushpuckena-Oliver phase of the Mississippi period.

The Coahoma phase is defined by Phillips (1970:905) as "the main representative of Baytown culture in the Upper Sunflower region, beginning sometime before the end of the Marksville period and carrying on through the entire Baytown period." It is apparent from recent surface collections that Spendthrift had a relatively heavy Baytown (Coahoma) occupation, perhaps even more so than is indicated by the L.M.S. sherd counts. There is an apparent gap at Spendthrift between this and the later occupation during the Hushpuckena-Oliver phase of the Mississippi period. Phillips (1970:941-942) has combined two phases that Belmont (1961) had previously defined separately with regard to excavated material from the Oliver site (22-Co-503). In Phillips' case, the sherd counts from related sites did not show the clear distinction seen in the Oliver material, hence the combination phase. The presence of masses of daub on the mound reported in the 1940 record would suggest a likely Mississippian origin, as is probably the case with the burned, daub-covered houses in the surrounding field.

The L.M.S. inventory record indicated burials evidenced by plowed-up bone fragments. Presently, there may be seen a few scattered such fragments in the village area, but human burials have not been revealed in any abundance. This may indicate deeper, sub-plowzone interments; cremations leaving little evidence; or burial elsewhere, such as in the mound, as indicated by the L.M.S. report.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only
received
date entered

Spendthrift Site, Coahoma County, Mississippi
Continuation sheet Significance Item number 8.

Page 1.

In all, there appears to be a wealth of potential data available at this site which could be invaluable in future research, especially with regard to the problems listed above.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form**

Spendthrift Site, Coahoma County, Mississippi

For NPS use only
received
date entered

Continuation sheet Bibliographical Reference Item number 9

Page 1

Belmont, John S.

1961 The Peabody excavations, Coahoma County, Mississippi, 1901-1902.
Unpublished Honors Thesis, Dept. of Anthropology, Harvard College.

Phillips, Philip

1970 Archaeological survey [redacted] Mississippi,
1949-1955. Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and
Ethnology, Harvard University, Vol. 60, Parts 1 & 2.

Phillips, Philip; James A. Ford; and James B. [redacted]

1951 Archaeological survey in the [redacted] Mississippi
1940-1947. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology
and Ethnology, Harvard University, Vol. 25.