| NP& Form 10-800 (3-82) | States Department of the Interior Park Service For WFS use only mal Register of Historic Places Ribory—Nomination Form received attors in How to Complete National Register Forms received attors in How to Complete National Register Forms received attors in How to Complete National Register Forms received attors in How to Complete National Register Forms (VHLC 52-18) attors in How to Complete National Register Forms (VHLC 52-18) attors in Formation (VHLC 52-18) attors in Complete National Register Forms (VHLC 52-18) atto |
|--|--|
| United States Department of the Interior National Park Service | 그는 아이들은 것이 아이들을 가지 않는 것이 많이 |
| National Register of Historic Places | beviscen |
| Inventory-Nomination Form | |
| See instructions in <i>How to Complete National Register Forms</i> Type all entries—complete applicable sections | |
| 1. Name | |
| historic ELY MOUND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE (44LE12) | |
| and/or common ELY MOUND (Preferred) | (VHLC 52-18) |
| 2. Location | |
| street & number | X_ not for publication |
| city, town | · |
| state Virginia code 51 county Lee | code 23 |
| 3. Classification | |
| district public occupied X_ag building(s) X_private X_unoccupied co structure both work in progress ed X_site Public Acquisition Accessible en object in process X_yes: restricted go being considered yes: unrestricted in | riculture museum mmercial park ucational private residence tertainment religious vernment scientific dustrial transportation |
| 4. Owner of Property | |
| name Mr. S.C. Hobbs | |
| street & number N/A | |
| city, town Rose Hill <u>X</u> vicinity of | state Virginia 24281 |
| 5. Location of Legal Description | |
| courthouse, registry of deeds, stc. Lee County Courthouse | |
| street & number N/A | |
| city, town Jonesville | state Virginia 24263 |
| 6. Representation in Existing Surve | ys |
| Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission Hile Site Survey Form 441E12 has this property been | determined eligible?yes Xno |
| | |
| depository for survey records P.O. Box 368 | |
| city, town Yorktown | state ^{Virginia} 23690 |

7. Description

| Condition | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|
| <u> </u> | excellent | | | |
| | good | | | |
| | fair | | | |

Check one deteriorated X unaltered ruins X_ unexposed

Check one altered moved

X original site date _

N/A

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

The Ely Mound Archaeological Site

It dates to the Late Woodland/Mississippian Period (ca. AD 800 to AD 1750). Approximately one-sixth of the mound was excavated in the 1870s by the late Lucien Carr, Assistant Curator of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University. Since then, no further excavation has occurred. Recent inspections of the site by archaeologists from the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission's Research Center for Archaeology indicate that the mound and associated occupation areas are in excellent state of preservation.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

The Ely Mound (44LE12) stands on a gentle slope

The mound is presently covered with clover. A modern barn has been constructed to the north of the mound.

In the early 1870s the mound was tested by Lucien Carr, Assistant Curator of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University, who named it after its owner, Robert Ely. Carr, in a report written in 1877, described the mound, which had been in cultivation for many years, as a "truncated oval...about three hundred feet in circumference at the base, and nineteen feet in height, as measured in the excavation or shaft, sunk through the centre. On the top there was a level space, oval in shape, the diameters being respectively about fifteen and forty feet. At a distance of eight to ten feet from the brow of the mound, on the slope, there were found, buried in the earth, the decaying stumps of a series of cedar posts which I was informed by Mr. Ely at one time completely encircled it" (Carr, 1877:75). From the posts Carr surmised "that the summit of the mound had at one time been occupied by some sort of a buildingpossibly a rotunda or council chamber" (Carr, 1877:76).

According to Carr's report, his testing of the Ely Mound consisted of sinking a shaft, 6' x 4', from the center to the circumference. Two graves were encountered during the first day of excavation. Grave number one, ten feet deep in the central shaft, contained the remains of two children. Associated with the children were a black bear canine tooth, two quarts of shell beads of various sizes and shapes, two shell ear pins, and a shell gorget with a weeping eye motif. Grave number two, six feet deep in the side trench, held the remains of an adult woman and contained shell beads.

While Carr's excavation was in progress, Professor Lucius H. Cheney, a student in the Harvard Summer School of Geology, and Mr. Charles B. Johnson, of Gibson's Station, Virginia, who were excavating these human remains, were inundated by falling earth from the collapsing soil profiles, which descended when a discovery caused spectators to rush suddenly to the edge of the excavation. Although the men were rescued, Mr. Johnson was severely bruised and Professor Cheney was dead, for apparently the weight of the cave-in had broken his back or neck.

8. Significance

| Period X. prehistoric X. 14001499 X. 15001599 X. 16001699 X. 17001799 | Areas of Significance—C _X_archeology-prehistoric _X_archeology-historic agriculture architecture art commerce communications | | re religion science sculpture social/ humanitarian theater transportation other (specify) |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Specific dates | AD 800 - AD 1750 | Builder/Architect N/A | |

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Ely Mound Archaeological Site, 44LE12, in Lee County, which dates to the Late Woodland/Mississippian Period (ca. AD 800 to AD 1750) represents the only example of a clearly identified substructure or town house mound in Virginia. As such, the mound and associated occupation areas have great potential for archaeological research on the development of increasingly complex societies in southwestern Virginia during the Late Woodland/Mississippian Period and the interactions of those societies with the more complex societal groups in the adjacent states of North Carolina and Tennessee. Moreover, human remains present at the site provide direct data for studies in human osteology. The Ely Mound is also significant in the history of archaeology, for based upon his excavations in the 1870s, Lucien Carr emphatically rejected the so-called "lost race" hypothesis for mound builders in eastern North America, a popular theory among 19thcentury American archaeologists.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Ely Mound is the only positively identified substructure or town house mound in Virginia despite the documented occurrence of numerous mounds of this type in the adjacent states of Tennessee and North Carolina. Site inventory files at the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission's Research Center for Archaeology note the existence of only one other possible example, although it is smaller in size and has never been verified through archaeological testing. The Ely Mound, which dates to the Late Woodland/ Mississippian Period, is probably attributable to people either closely related to or in direct contact with the ancestors of the Cherokees. Being in an excellent state of preservation and as the only archaeologically identified example in Virginia of the secular/sacred utilization of a town house center, the Ely Mound and associated occupation areas have exceptional archaeological significance.

The acreage nominated is particularly significant for archaeological investigations documenting the spread of Mississippian chieftain cultures up the Powell, Clinch, and Holston rivers and their interface with the typically less complex societies in southwestern Virginia. Such studies are especially critical to understanding the development of the increasingly couplex socio-cultural institutions in southwestern Virginia which culminated during the Late Woodland/Mississippian Period. Further, the structural and spatial plan of the Ely Mound and surrounding occupational features provide invaluable comparative data relating to the Cherokee town house centers investigated in Ternessee and North Carolina. Human remains at the site also offer direct data for studies on human demography, nutrition, heredity, and cultural/pathological alterations.

9. Major Bibliographical References (See Continuation Sheet #2)

Carr, Lucien. <u>Report on the Exploration of a Mound in Lee County, Virginia</u>. Tenth Annual Report, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. Cambridge: Harvard University, (1877).

Holland, C.G. An Archaeological Survey of Southwestern Virginia. Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology, No. 12.

10. Geographical Data

Chief of Registration

| Acreage of r | iominated prope | erty 14 acres | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------|
| Quadrangle UT M Referer | name <u>Ewing</u> | KY-VA | | | Quadrangle s | cale 1:24000 | |
| | | | 8 | | | | |
| Zone E | asting | Northing | | Zone Easting | B No | orthing | |
| | | | D | | | |) |
| ┋└╌╌┛└ | <u></u> | | F | | ┶┷┷┥└╌ | | |
| ₃ू ⊢ | | | н | | ╶ ┥┙┙ └╴ | | |
| /erbai bou | ndary descrip | tion and justification | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| list all sta | tes and count | iles for properties over | apping state | e or county b | oundaries (Se | e Continuatio | n Shee |
| | N/A | code | county | N/A | | code | |
| state | N/A | code | county | N/A | | code | |
| | | epared By | | | | | |
| | | | | Choff | | | |
| name/title | | listoric Landmarks C | | | | | |
| organization | Virginia H | listoric Landmarks (| commission | date ^{Ma} | rch 1983 | · | <u> </u> |
| street & num | ber 221 G | Governor Street | | telephone | (804) 786 | 5-3143 | |
| ity or town | Richn | pond | | state | Virginia | 23219 | |
| 12. S | tate H | istoric Pres | ervati | on Offi | cer Ce | rtificatio |)n |
| | | of this property within the | | | | | · |
| | national | | local | | | | |
| 665), I hereb according to | y nominate this the criteria and | toric Preservation Officer f property for inclusion in ti procedures set forth by ti Officer signature | he National R he National P | egister and cer | tify that it has b | | 89- |
| | | ll, Executive Direct ic Landmarks Commiss | tor // | 1 | | PR 1 9 1983 | |
| | | iš property is included in t | he National R | | date | | |
| | f the National I | Register | | | | | |

Attest:

بغية أرجعها

11517

Constant and the second s

NPS Form 10-900-a (3-82) OMB No. 1024-0018 Exp. 10-31-84

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form

ELY MOUND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE, LEE COUNTY, VA (44LE12) Continuation sheet #1 Item number 7



Page 1

7. DESCRIPTION--Archaeological Analysis

Excavations were resumed one week later. Two days of steady digging extended the central shaft and trench down to original soil. For the sake of safety, profiles were stepped up, opening a larger portion of the mound than had been originally intended, or approximately one sixth. During this work, grave number three was encountered, which held the remains of an adult male. Associated with these remains were two large projectile points; a small pile of white quartz pebbles the size of peas, believed to be the contents of a turtle shell rattle; and a large, polished, sandstone bi-concave discoidal used to play the Indian game of "chungke." Carr noted that the lower half of the mound was almost void of all evidence of human occupation, whereas the upper half contained beds of ash, burnt earth, shell beads, small gaming disks of stone or pottery, and fragments of pottery, animal bones, and charred corn and cob. In order to interpret the use and age of the mound, Carr drew heavily on historical accounts of Indian culture, directly linking the substructure mound, shell gorget, and "chungke" stone to historic period Indians, specifically the Cherokees.

In 1963 C.G. Holland conducted a survey of southwestern Virginia under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution, at which time he referenced the existence of the Ely Mound. Holland was unable to locate Lucien Carr's excavated material at the Peabody Museum and mistakenly associated the mound with the Adena-Hopewell cultures of the Midwest.

In 1979 Alan Crockett from Rose Hill, Virginia, an anthropology student at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, conducted a surface survey of two small cultivated fields directly southwest and northwest of the mound, the first time those fields had been plowed in more than fifty years. In the small field to the southwest of the mound, he recorded a heavy concentration of cultural material dating from the Early Archaic through the Late Woodland/Mississippian Period. Artifact density in the small field to the northwest was considerably lighter, consisting principally of lithic flakes. Based on artifacts recovered by Carr, the mound itself dates to the Late Woodland/Mississippian Period. Crockett reported that neither the mound nor the fields to the east and south have been plowed by the present landowner, whereas the field to the west is occasionally cultivated.

Archaeologists from the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission's Research Center for Archaeology visited Ely Mound in 1982. At the top of the mound they observed a slight depression which extended northwest to its edge, probable surface evidence of Carr's excavations during the 19th century. Ely Mound has retained much of its nineteen feet height. It has an apron of soil fill that extends to the southeast, likely evidence of a ramp or series of steps ascending the southeast side of the mound. During the 1982 Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission visit, the landowner reported finding subsurface cultural features during maintenance work around the barn located immediately to the north. Based upon the Crockett survey, the principal occupation area associated with the mound likely encompasses the area directly to its south. Given minimal previous disturbances within this southerly area, there is a high probability that intact cultural features would also be present there.

 NPS Form 10-900-e
 OMB No. 1024-0018

 United States Department of the Interior
 Exp. 10-31-84

 National Park Service
 National Register of Historic Places

 Inventory---Nomination Form
 ELY MOUND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE, LEE COUNTY, VA (44LE12)

 Continuation sheet #2
 Item number 7, 8, 9, 10
 Page 2, 1, 1, 1

7. DESCRIPTION--Archaeological Analysis

Although the mound is well known to local people and professional archaeologists,

owner has never permitted excavations of any type in the mound or the area adjacent to it.

KE/ERT

8. SIGNIFICANCE--Historical Background

The Ely Mound Archaeological Site is also historically significant as a result of Lucien Carr's 19th-century excavation. During the 19th century there was substantial controversy regarding whether mounds in the eastern United States were built by a "lost race" of moundbuilders or whether they had been constructed by the ancestors of Native Americans. By the examination of numerous historical references, Lucien Carr, in reporting on his excavations at the Ely Mound, was one of the first individuals to definitively link the Native Americans at the time of European contact with the mound centers and the artifacts associated with them. It was not, however, until 1894 when Cyrus Thomas published his monumental <u>Report of the Mound Explorations of the Bureau of Ethnology</u> that the "lost race" hypothesis was finally viewed as invalid by most archaeologists.

KE/ERT

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Thomas, Cyrus. Report of the Mound Explorations of the Bureau of Ethnology. Washington: Bureau of Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, [1894].

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA--Verbal Boundary Description and Justification

thence extending approximately 700' WSW approximately 50' N of Louisville and Nashville Railroad track; thence extending approximately 800' WNW to S side of fence line, the point of origin.

Boundary Justification: The bounds have been drawn to include the mound itself and from available data, the principal portion of the associated inhabited area which encompasses fourteen acres.