

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 Evansville Mounds (22-Tu-502)

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not for publication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	<input type="checkbox"/> in process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes: restricted	<input type="checkbox"/> government	<input type="checkbox"/> scientific
	<u>N/A</u> 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 R.W.Owen Estate

street & number Rt. 1, Box 110

city, town

Tunica

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 March 1971

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

Brown (1926:116-117) first described the Evansville site as consisting of "four or more mounds", [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] It has been badly abused by cultivation and erosion; it now measures on top approximately east and west 95 feet, north and south 55 feet. The height is from 14 to 18 feet, the west end being higher than the east." He adds that "north-west of the large mound is a smaller one [REDACTED] South-west of the great mound about 225 feet is a small mound in cultivation" (1926:117). Phillips, Ford, and Griffin later surveyed the site in 1940 and in their field record (on file, Peabody Museum) give the Mound A dimensions as approximately 100 feet east-west by 60 feet north-south, only five feet more than those given for the summit by Brown. This may indicate some degree of erosion from the summit or simply an inaccurate measurement on someone's part. They give the height as 12 feet at the west end and 10 feet at the east end, considerably less than Brown's estimate, and describe the shape as "steep sides and flat top with two levels...." They also contend that it had not been plowed over, contrary to Brown's statement. Mound B, with the schoolhouse upon it, is described as being 100 feet in diameter, 3 feet high, and eroded.

Later, in their publication, Phillips, Ford, and Griffin (1951:51) list the site as a "village site with large rectangular platform mound and small mounds" and further describe it as a small ceremonial center with a 12 foot rectangular stepped mound, possibly 3 other mounds, a 300 foot plaza oriented northwest (presumably between Mounds A and B), quantities of daub, and moderately abundant refuse (1951:323). The Mississippi Archaeological Survey (M.A.S.) site file (1971) gives the dimensions of 150 by 100 by 15 feet high for Mound A (Photo #1), slightly larger at the base than in 1940, but 3 feet higher. The dimensions for Mound B (Photo #2) are 40-50 feet in diameter by 5 feet high, again smaller but higher than the 1940 measurements.

At the present time (April, 1986) Mound A is so thickly overgrown with brush, vines, and trees that no attempt has been made to measure it. It appears to be essentially undisturbed since it was viewed in 1971. Mound B, which is covered with high grass [REDACTED] measures approximately 90 feet north-south by 60 feet east-west, and may be up to 6 feet high, depending on where one stands to view it. Grass cover made accuracy difficult in this effort. There is no evidence of the small mound Brown mentioned to the southwest of Mound A, but there is in this approximate area one of several higher knolls [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Phillips, Ford, and Griffin reported in their survey record quantities of daub indicating house sites along this same bankline. Many of these house sites are still evident today, [REDACTED]

During the recent 1986 M.A.S. visit to the site, 5 boreholes were placed on the various higher spots mentioned above (see Figure 1) in order to test for midden depth. Borehole #1, 150 feet southwest of Mound A, showed black midden to a depth of 1.5 feet, underlain by sterile yellow sand, as was the case in all the others. Borehole #2, 84 feet north of #1 and 150 feet west of Mound A, showed midden to 2 feet. About 96 feet further north and 186 feet west of the mound in the midst of a house site covered by abundant daub, borehole #3 revealed a midden depth of only a foot. To the north of

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 0 A.D.-1600 A.D. Builder/Architect American Indian

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)

The significance of the Evansville site lies in its potential to contribute valuable data to the definition of some ill-defined phases [REDACTED] during the Baytown through Mississippi periods. As was pointed out in the description, the site was placed in the Coahoma phase of Baytown (the most northern site in its distribution) where it seems to fit best with respect to pottery type counts in surface collections. Following this, however, it switches into the southern end of the subsequent Walnut Bend and Kent phases, presenting a somewhat puzzling continuity from Baytown into the Coles Creek and Mississippi periods. Phillips (1970) admits that most of these phases are tentative in this area and are in dire need of further refinement. Aside from this, the problem of such a large platform mound on a predominantly Baytown site presents many questions which could well be answered by further testing and analysis of remaining undisturbed midden and of the mound itself. Also, the nature of Mound B remains completely undetermined, and its relationship to one or another of the components present could well add valuable information to the solution of the above mentioned problems. Finally, the presence of burned houses, fairly deep midden (implying undisturbed features), and two relatively well preserved mounds opens up a whole spectrum of possibilities for future study of the way of life of the site's inhabitants.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only
received
date entered

Evansville Mounds (22-Tu-502)
Tunica County, Mississippi
Continuation sheet Description

Item number 7

Page 2

this 90 feet and 75 feet west, in borehole #4, the midden was confined to the plowzone. Finally, only 30 feet west of the mound, borehole #5 yielded a midden depth of 3 feet, the most promising of all with regard to possible undisturbed subsurface features.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] this is apparently the area suggested by Phillips, Ford, and Griffin to be the plaza. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. Soil types there consist of Bosket very fine sandy loam, level phase, on most of the site, and Bosket sandy loam, undulating phase, on the more irregular surfaces at the northern end around Mound B. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. The chronological position of the occupation of the site presents a problem similar to that encountered at Dundee (22-Tu-501), that is, the presence of a large platform mound on a predominantly Baytown site. There are, of course, quite evident but seemingly minor Mississippian components at both sites. In the case of Evansville, Phillips, Ford, and Griffin (1951: 51) placed it in their E-C period (middle through late Baytown), postulating that such ceremonial centers may have become established in the area at this early period (1951:340). This is debatable, and since the mound has not been tested to determine its origin, such a theory has yet to be proved. It may just as well have originated during the Mississippi period which is represented to some extent there. The major occupation remains, however, according to pottery collections from the 1940 survey and the M.A.S. visit in 1986, strongly Baytown. Ironically, Baytown period sherds in the two collections made up 89.4% and 89.8% of the total respectively, while Mississippian sherds constituted 8.6% and 9% respectively.

Phillips (1970: Figures 444-447) places the site in the Helena phase of the Marksville period,¹ the Coahoma phase of the Baytown period,² the Walnut Bend phase of the Coles Creek period,³ and the Kent phase of the Mississippi period.⁴ Other than the presence of 3 Baytown Plain var. Bowie and 5 Withers Fabric Marked (which lasts into the subsequent phase) sherds in his collection and the geographical location, it is unclear just why Phillips included the site in the Helena phase. Whatever the case, it represents a very minor occupation. The Coahoma phase, on the other hand, seems to fit fairly well here since the majority of pottery types and numbers are of Baytown origin in both Phillips' and the M.A.S. collections. Minority types of Withers Fabric Marked, Larto Red Filmed, and Alligator Incised vars. Oxbow and Alligator are present. In Phillips' collection, Mulberry Creek Cordmarked predominates over Baytown Plain, as it should in this area of the phase. The latter two types, however, are about even in number in the M.A.S. collection. The Walnut Bend phase of Coles Creek seems to be represented here by 15 sherds of its "principal and only useful marker" (Phillips 1970:914) type Wheeler Check Stamped. Otherwise, this relatively ill-defined phase seems

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

Evansville Mounds (22-Tu-502)

Tunica County, Mississippi

Item number 7

Page 3

For NPS use only
received
date entered

to have little to substantiate it at present. As is the case with the Walnut Bend phase, Evansville is situated at the southern end of the Kent phase area. This Mississippian component is represented by only 8.6% and 9% of the two collections, a disturbingly small amount for a site with such a large platform mound and evidence of a substantial number of burned houses with daub (a Mississippian trait). In the M. A.S. collection, Mississippi Plain and Bell Plain count about even, as they should in Kent, but in Phillips' count, Mississippi Plain predominates over Bell 3:1. Only a handful of other minority types are present to indicate a Kent component. Once again, the problem of somewhat nebulous phase definitions and the lack of adequate collections and testing on this and nearby sites presents itself.

1. 0 - AD 200
2. AD 300 - AD 850
3. AD 850 - AD 1000
4. AD 1400 - AD 1600

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only
received
date entered

Evansville Mounds (22-Tu-502)

Tunica County, Mississippi
Continuation sheet, References

Item number 9

Page 1

Brown, Calvin S.

1926 Archeology of Mississippi. Mississippi Geological Survey,
University.

Fowlkes, Thomas, C.G.Morgan, J.A.Herren, D.D.Mason, and L.A.Davidson

1956 Soil survey of [REDACTED]. U.S.Dept. of
Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Series 1942, No. 14.

Phillips, Philip

1970 Archaeological survey [REDACTED] Mississippi,
1949-1955. Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and
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
and Ethnology, Harvard University, Vol. 25.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form

Evansville Mounds (22-Tu-502), Tunica Co., Miss.

Continuation sheet Boundary Description Item number 10

For NPS use only
received
date entered

