

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

For NPS use only

National Register of Historic Places  
Inventory—Nomination Form

received DEC 9 1986  
date entered JAN 7 1987

See instructions in *How to Complete National Register Forms*  
Type all entries—complete applicable sections

1. Name

historic Canon Site (22-Tu-523)

and/or common N/A

2. Location

street & number

[REDACTED]

not for publication

city, town

[REDACTED]

state

[REDACTED]

3. Classification

<b>Category</b>	<b>Ownership</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Present Use</b>	
<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	<b>Public Acquisition</b>	<b>Accessible</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> entertainment	<input type="checkbox"/> religious
<input type="checkbox"/> object	<input type="checkbox"/> in process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes: restricted	<input type="checkbox"/> government	<input type="checkbox"/> scientific
	N/A 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 John N. Canon

street & number Rt. 2, Box 87

city, town

Sledge

vicinity of

state Mississippi

5. Location of Legal Description

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

street & number P. O. Box 217

city, town

Tunica

state Mississippi

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

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

date 1969  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 N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> fair	<input type="checkbox"/> unexposed		

### Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

In 1926, Brown stated "a mound is reported [redacted], larger than the great Evansville mound" (1926:117). This is most likely the Canon mound recorded by Phillips, Ford, and Griffin (1951:51) as a "large village site with large mound." They further described the mound in their Table 11 (1951:313), under the classification "Sites With Conical Mounds" as measuring 100' x 30' x 12' high, with "material abundant." The 30 foot measurement must have been in error since the mound was then (see Figure 1) and remains today (Photo #1) essentially conical in shape and is by no means that narrow on any axis. They associated the site with period E-D (Middle Baytown), indicating that the mound was likely constructed for burial purposes.

As seen in Phillips, Ford, and Griffin's 1941 photos (Figure 1), the mound was rounded, presumably due to cultivation over its surface. Their original field notes were not available for any data along this line. The house [redacted]

[redacted], suggesting that it could have been cultivated for 33 years or more, resulting in a possible change from an original rectangular to a rounded appearance by the time Phillips et.al. visited it.

That this was originally a Mississippian ceremonial structure rather than an earlier burial mound was all but confirmed in July, 1985, when a crew from Mississippi State University cut a 3-meter long [redacted] profile trench through a large pothole in the top of the mound (Peacock 1985). The pothole was about one meter in diameter by 1.25 meters deep, with adjacent disturbed area up to 0.5 meter deep. It contained daub, burned clay, pottery, and charcoal. In the undisturbed levels adjacent to the pit were layers of daub separated by ash lenses, indicating burned Mississippian house structures. Although the collection of artifacts from the pit was small and relatively insignificant, most of the potsherds were Mississippi Plain, lending further support to a Mississippian origin.

Phillips (1970:Figures 445-447) places the occupation of Canon in the Coahoma phase of the Baytown period,<sup>1</sup> the Walnut Bend phase of the Coles Creek period,<sup>2</sup> and the Parchman phase of the Mississippi Period.<sup>3</sup> He defines Coahoma as "the main representative of Baytown culture in the Upper Sunflower region, lasting through the entire Baytown period (1970:905). [redacted]

[redacted]. The Baytown period occupation there appears to be the major component, with period ceramics representing 92.4% of the most recent surface collection (1986). The majority type, Mulberry Creek Cordmarked (56.6%) outnumbered Baytown Plain (22.6%) 2.5:1, which fits in nicely with Phillips (1970:906) defined ratio for the Coahoma phase.

An apparently relatively minor occupation is indicated during the Walnut Bend phase, a somewhat tenuously defined phase with Wheeler Check Stamped pottery being "the principal and only useful marker" (Phillips 1970:914). Examples of this type have been found in all surface collections made there over the years, but this in itself tells us little else about the phase or if in fact, it should even be considered as Coles Creek. [redacted]

[redacted], making its continuity out of the Coahoma phase [redacted] somewhat puzzling. Phillips tends to define Walnut Bend more by comparison to the preceding Baytown phase [redacted] rather than with Coahoma in which Canon was previously included.

Somewhat more puzzling is its inclusion in the subsequent Parchman phase,

# 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** AD 400 - AD 1200 **Builder/Architect** American Indian

**Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)**

The significance of the Canon site lies in its potential to contribute to the understanding and better definition of phase distributions [redacted] as well as the possibility of early ceremonial mound construction. Its borderline position in all three phases assigned it by Phillips (1970) places it in a strategic location for future research into phase definitions. Starr points out that "the presence of ceramic types associated with more northerly bordering phases suggests the possibility that contact between Parchman and Kent phases took place and could be studied at Canon" (1984:199), and adds that "the site also has the possibility of providing data to help better define the eastern limits of the Walnut Bend Phase, if Canon can be seen as fitting into the pattern of this phase" (1984:200). With respect to the probability that the mound was originally rectangular, Phillips, Ford, and Griffin (1951:340) had proposed the idea that such ceremonial mounds may have been established as early as the Middle Baytown period. As discussed in the "Description" section, more recent evidence points to a Mississippian origin for the Canon mound, but tests were not extensive enough to establish any specific dates. Construction might well have started earlier. In any case, further testing to the sub-mound level could shed new light on the Phillips, Ford, and Griffin suggestion and establish more conclusive data on the type, origin, and use of this mound with respect to its surrounding settlement, as well as its placement in the phase distributions discussed above.

# 9. Major Bibliographical References

(see continuation sheet)

# 10. Geographical Data

Acreeage of nominated property [redacted]

Quadrangle name [redacted]

Quadrangle scale [redacted]

UTM References

A [redacted]  
Zone Easting Northing

B [ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]  
Zone Easting Northing

C [ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

D [ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

E [ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

F [ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

G [ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

H [ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

Verbal boundary description and justification

[redacted]

List all states and counties for properties overlapping state or county boundaries

state N/A code county code

state N/A code county code

# 11. Form Prepared By

name/title John Connaway, Survey Archaeologist

organization Miss. Dept. of Archives & History date May 1986

street & number Box 571 telephone 601-354-7326

city or town Jackson state Mississippi

# 12. State Historic Preservation Officer Certification

The evaluated significance of this property within the state is:

national  state  local

As the designated State Historic Preservation Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the National Park Service.

State Historic Preservation Officer signature *Kenneth H. P. Pool*

title Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer date December 5, 1986

For NPS use only

I hereby certify that this property is included in the National Register

entered in the National Register

*Alfred Byer*  
Keeper of the National Register

date 1/7/87

Attest:

Chief of Registration

date

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places  
Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only
received
date entered

Canon Site (22-Tu-523), Tunica Co., Miss.

Continuation sheet	Description	Item number	7	Page	2
--------------------	-------------	-------------	---	------	---

where it drops back down [redacted] e area occupying essentially [redacted] third of the earlier Coahoma phase area. [redacted]

[redacted] Continuity and the effects of outside influence come into question again here. Starr, in her discussion of Parchman phase sites, states with regard to her 1983 surface collection at Canon that "the presence of a sherd of Barton Incised var. Kent, together with the site's northern location and previous inclusion in the Walnut Bend Phase, possibly indicating continuous occupation during the transition to the Mississippi Period, is interesting. If Canon fits into the Parchman Phase, it certainly is located as a border region secondary ceremonial center" (1984:199). Unfortunately, the Peabody Museum's sherd counts from the 1941 survey were not available for comparison, and more definite conclusions cannot presently be made.

[redacted] If the Mississippi River or some tributary did meander that close to the mound, it only came as far as the present bankline bordering the west side of the site (Figure 4). Whether this is any indication of the presence of an active channel during the site's occupation at an earlier time remains undetermined. The soil along the bankline where the mound is situated is Bosket very fine sandy loam, level phase, a well drained soil found on old natural levees (Fowlkes et. al. 1956:20-21). In the eastern periphery of the site, [redacted], is Dundee silt loam and very fine sandy loam, level phases, which occur in intermediate positions on old natural levees and are derived from materials deposited by river floodwaters (Fowlkes et. al. 1956:32-33). According to Fowlkes et. al.(1956:32), the original forest cover consisted of "a fairly heavy growth of red oak, Spanish oak, live oak, red gum, tupelo gum, hickory, maple, and hornbeam", with a dense undergrowth of canes, briers, and vines.

The heaviest occupation, as determined from the 1986 surface collection, lies around the mound and extends [redacted] According to Starr, "burned daub is densest on the site on the surface of the mound, but is widely scattered in a two to three acre area [redacted] (1984:199). The mound is presently covered with trees and is in relatively good condition. Its height appears more on the order of 10 feet, though it has not been accurately measured, and it is approximately 90 feet in diameter at the base. The surrounding village area has apparently been leveled to some extent for the present rice crop and levee system. To refrain from disturbing the planted rice, no borehole tests were made in this field. As a result, the presence of subsurface features remains undetermined.

1. AD 400 - AD 850
2. AD 800 - AD 1200
3. AD 1000 - AD 1200

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places  
Inventory—Nomination Form

Canon Site (22-Tu-523), Tunica Co., Miss.

For NPS use only  
received  
date entered

Continuation sheet    References    Item number 9    Page 1

Brown, Calvin S.  
1926 Archeology of Mississippi. Mississippi Geological Survey. University, Mississippi.

Fowlkes, Thomas, C.G.Morgan, J.A.Herren, D.D.Mason, & L.A. Davidson  
1956 Soil survey of [REDACTED] Mississippi. Series 1942, No. 14.  
U.S.D.A., Soil Conservation Service.

Kolb, C.R. and others  
1968 Geological investigation [REDACTED] Lower Mississippi Valley.  
Corps of Engineers Technical Report No. 3-480. Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Peacock, Evan  
1985 "News". Tombigbee Chapter, Miss. Archaeological Association Newsletter.  
Vol.II, No.3.

Phillips, Philip  
1970 Archaeological survey [REDACTED] Mississippi, 1949-1955.  
Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology & Ethnology, Harvard University  
Vol. 60.

Phillips, Philip, James A. Ford, and James B. Griffin  
1951 Archaeological survey in the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley, 1940-  
1947. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology & Ethnology,  
Harvard University, Vol. 25.

Starr, Mary Evelyn  
1984 The Parchman Phase [REDACTED] a preliminary analysis.  
Appendix in: The Wilsford site (22-Co-516), Coahoma County, Mississippi,  
by John M. Connaway. Mississippi Dept. of Archives & History, Archaeologica  
Report No. 14.

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

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

Canon Site (22-Tu-523), Tunica Co., Mississippi

Continuation sheet Boundary Description      Item number      10

Page      2

For NPS use only

received

date entered

[REDACTED]

nil. This was based on a walk-over observation made during a visit there April 25, 1986, at which time the field surrounding the mound had been prepared with levees and planted in rice. Surface visibility was good since recent rains had exposed potsherds in the leveled field, so it is felt that the estimation of boundaries is relatively accurate. No boreholes were made since the field had been planted and interference with the crop was being held to a minimum.

[REDACTED]