

Mississippi Mound Trail (Southern Region), Phase 1
Summary of Recommendations
(as of May 1, 2013)

Issaquena County

Hardee (22 Is 502)

Recommendations: Test excavations and/or coring should be conducted in this mound in order to confirm its date. The current dating is based on a collection obtained from uncontrolled excavations in 1934 and shown to Philip Phillips in the 1950s.

Aden (22 Is 509)

Recommendations: Test excavations and/or coring should be conducted in the mounds in order to confirm their construction date. Coring should also be done in the areas between the mounds to see if the apparent absence of village occupation is due to alluviation, i.e., to see if middens are present but deeply buried by flood deposits.

Warren County

Haynes Bluff (22 Wr 501)

Recommendations: Given the extensive previous excavations, no further work is recommended for the purposes of this project.

Dornbusch (22 Wr 510)

Recommendations: Although Mississippi period pottery and glass beads have reportedly been found nearby, virtually no hard evidence exists as to when the mound itself was built. This earthwork should therefore be investigated with test excavations and coring to determine its date.

Hinds County

Pocahontas (22 Hi 500)

Recommendations: Both mounds can be roughly dated based on existing collections, although the excavated pottery from Mound A comes from beside the mound (rather than in it) and the chronological position of the pottery from Mound B is a bit ambiguous. If time and resources allow, coring could be conducted in Mounds A and B to determine (if possible) the number of stages of construction and to obtain charcoal for radiocarbon dating.

Claiborne County

Windsor (22 Cb 508)

Recommendations: LMS investigations in 1971 recovered sufficient evidence for dating Mound A. Similar evidence should be obtained for Mounds B and C, either through test excavations or

coring. Investigations should also be conducted to see if Mound D is a natural rise or an artificial construction; and, if the latter, when it was built.

Bayou Pierre (22 Cb 534)

Recommendations: Test excavations in Mounds A and D should be a high priority, an important question being whether the two are contemporary, i.e., whether Mound D should be regarded as part of the same site. Excavations should also be conducted in the area of Mound B to see if any intact deposits remain and , if so, when they date.

Mangum (22 Cb 584)

Recommendations: Given that this site is a natural hilltop, rather than a mound, and that it has a long history of previous investigations, no further testing is required.

Jefferson County

Bates #1 (22 Je 514)

Recommendations: As a high priority, test excavations should be conducted in this mound in order to determine its date and its relationship to Bates #2. Coring in 2009 suggested the possibility that this mound might have been built during the Archaic period, which adds to the importance of determining its true age and potentially including it on the Mound Trail.

Bates #2 (22 Je 513)

Recommendations: As a high priority, test excavations should be conducted in this mound in order to determine its date and its relationship to Bates #1. There currently exists no evidence on either the age or the function of this earthwork.

Pumpkin Lake (22 Je 517)

Recommendations: As a high priority, test excavations should be conducted in this mound in order to determine its date. Previous excavations conducted by the LMS yielded ambiguous results, as they seem never to have reached undisturbed mound deposits.

Mount Locust (22 Je 522)

Recommendations: Atkinson's excavations confirmed that the Chamberlain cemetery sits atop an aboriginal mound (Mound B). Coring should be conducted to confirm whether the rise beneath the Mount Locust House (Mound A) is also an aboriginal construction, and if so to determine its date.

Adams County

Anna (22 Ad 500)

Recommendations: Coring should be conducted in Mounds 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 8 to obtain evidence of constructional history and dating. None of these mounds have previously been excavated.

Fatherland / Grand Village of the Natchez Indians (22 Ad 501)

Recommendations: Given the extensive work done previously, no further excavation is required.

Foster (22 Ad 503)

Recommendations: Additional excavations or coring should be conducted in Mound A to gain better evidence on its constructional history and date.

Emerald (22 Ad 504)

Recommendations: Given the extensive work done previously, no further excavation or coring is required.

Greenwood / Henderson (22 Ad 508)

Recommendations: Excavations and/or coring should be conducted in the surviving mound to better determine its date. Coring and/or hand-augering should also be done in the possible mound remnants along the railroad bed to determine their origin and date.

Wilkinson County

Lessley (22 Wk 504)

Recommendations: As a high priority, test excavations and/or coring should be conducted in the large mound to determine its constructional history and date. The smaller rises should be investigated to determine whether they are artificial mounds, and, if so, their dates.

Smith Creek (22 Wk 526)

Recommendations: As a high priority, test excavations and/or coring should be done in the mounds to gather evidence on their constructional histories and dates.