NPS Form 10-900-b
(Jan 1987)
Wisconsin Word Processor Format (441L)
(Approved 10/88)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

RECEIVED
FEB 25 1991
NATIONAL REGISTER

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
MULTIPLE PROPERTY DOCUMENTATION FORM

This form is for use in documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a) and identify the section being continued. Type all entries. Use letter quality printer in 12 pitch, using an 85 space line and 10 space left margin. Use only archival quality paper (20 pound, acid free paper with a 2% alkaline reserve).

A. NAME OF MULTIPLE PROPERTY LISTING

The Late Woodland Stage in Archaeological Region 8 (AD 650-1300)

B. ASSOCIATED HISTORIC CONTEXTS

The Late Woodland Stage in Archaeological Region 8

C. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Archaeological Region 8 covers the southwestern and southcentral part of Wisconsin. This includes Crawford, Grant, Richland, Sauk, Iowa, Lafayette, Columbia, Dane, and Green Counties (Figure 1).

___ See continuation sheet

D. CERTIFICATION

As designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Planning and Evaluation.

Signature of certifying official — Date: 12/4/90

State Historic Preservation Officer-WI
State or Federal agency and bureau

I, hereby, certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper of the National Register — Date: 4-10-91

E. STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXTS

Discuss each historic context listed in Section B.

ORGANIZATION OF THE MULTIPROPERTY GROUP

This multiproperty nomination is organized around a prehistoric cultural stage referred to as Late Woodland. The Late Woodland stage is recognized by archaeologists through a set of shared cultural characteristics that have broad spatial and temporal boundaries. This multiproperty nomination views Late Woodland in the geographical context of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin's archaeological Region 8 (Figure 1). This region takes in the southwestern and southcentral part of the state. A number of property types are recognized within this theme, although for the purposes of this nomination only one, mounds, is formally defined. Property types include habitation sites such as villages and camps, and non-residential resource extraction locales. Additional property types will doubtlessly be developed as new information is acquired.

The organization of this multiproperty nomination and the use of the regional concept follows the "Plan for the Protection of Prehistoric Sites" as outlined by the Historic Preservation Division of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. This plan is a three-step process by which information concerning archaeological sites is organized so that decisions regarding significance and research priorities can be made. The first step is to synthesize, on a general level, information concerning the prehistory of the state. This was accomplished with the publication of Introduction to Wisconsin Archaeology: Background for Cultural Resource Management (Green et al. 1986). A second step is to establish regional overviews for the state. For this purpose, the state has been divided up into nine archaeological regions. The third step is to develop in-depth studies of particular cultural manifestations within these regions. This information, among other things, can be used as the basis of multiproperty nominations.

Archaeological Region 8 covers parts of both glaciated and unglaciated portions of the state. The western part of the region lies within the Southwestern Mesic Forest, Oak Savanna, and Prairie Upland Natural Division (Hole 1983). Most of this hilly country is dissected by river and stream valleys, having been avoided by the Late Pleistocene glacial advances. This area is known as the Driftless Area (Martin 1965). Floristically, the area was a mosiac of prairie and forest. Bedrock outcroppings found throughout the area provided natural shelters for Indians throughout prehistory. Two major river systems are found here. These are the Mississippi and the Wisconsin, both of which have broad floodplains. There are numerous other rivers and streams in the region.

The eastern portion of Region 8 falls within the Southeastern Mesic Forest and Oak Savanna Glaciated Plain (Hole 1983). This is a level to gently rolling country that also includes glacial features such as moraines, kames, drumlins, and kettles. The area has extensive wetlands and a number of small and large lakes. Presettlement vegetation consisted of hardwood forests, oak-savannahs, prairies, and wetland plants. Two major drainages within Archaeological Region 8 are the Wisconsin and the Rock, both major tributaries of the Mississippi River.

x See continuation sheet

CULTURAL CONTEXT - REGION 8 CHRONOLOGY

Paleo-Indian (9500-8000 BC): The first human beings arrived in southern Wisconsin sometime after the last glaciation. Very little is known about these people besides the fact that they produced distinctive forms of stone projectile points and that they doubtlessly hunted now extinct forms of animals. It is widely believed that the Paleo-Indians were organized into small, highly mobile bands or family groups (Mason 1986).

Archaic (8000-500 BC): During this time, the climate gradually warmed, bringing about important changes in the composition of plant and animal life. Archaic populations were diversified hunters and gatherers that gradually evolved seasonal rounds within specific territories in order to optimize resource utilization. Elsewhere in the midwest, cultivation of indigenous plants has been documented for the later part of the Archaic. After 3000 BC, trade networks developed, involving exotic goods such as copper. Simultaneously, there was an elaboration of burial ceremonialism that often includes the interment of exotic goods with the dead (Stoltman 1986).

Woodland (500 BC-AD 1300): The early part of the Woodland tradition in southern Wisconsin is differentiated from the Archaic by the appearance of pottery and the construction of burial mounds (Boszhardt et al. 1986). The Middle Woodland (100 BC-AD 650) is distinguished by elaborate burial mound ceremonialism and the expansion of long distance trade networks. Early in this time, prehistoric cultures are clearly influenced by the spectacular "Hopewell" societies to the south of Wisconsin. During the later part of the Middle Woodland, the "Hopewell Interaction Sphere" collapses and prehistoric cultures become more regional in character (Salzer 1986).

Late Woodland (AD 650-1300): This stage is characterized by the appearance of the bow and arrow, use of distinctive forms of cord-impressed pottery, construction of animal effigy and geometric earthworks, the gradual adoption of maize horticulture, and, in at least some areas, the appearance of semi-sedentary villages that are frequently encircled with stockades (Hurley 1986; Salkin 1987a).

Mississippian (AD 1000-Contact): In Wisconsin, Mississippian cultures are represented by intrusive Middle Mississippian sites from southern Illinois and distinctive local cultures referred to collectively as the Oneota. The Oneota maintained villages supported by maize-bean-squash horticulture and manufactured distinctive forms of shell-tempered pottery (Gibbon 1986). Outside of the recently discovered Fred Edwards Site in Grant County, evidence of a Middle Mississippian presence is scarce in Region 8 (Fred Finney, personal communication). Likewise, although Oneota pottery is found scattered at sites throughout the region, no major site has thus far been reported.

LATE WOODLAND IN REGION 8

Until fairly recently, conceptions of the Late Woodland stage in southern Wisconsin have been based, to a large extent, on excavations of burial mounds and seasonally occupied sites including rockshelters. As late as 1986, Late Woodland people in southern Wisconsin were still being characterized as hunters and gatherers who lived in fairly small bands and who were responsible for the construction of the ubiquitous effigy mound groups (Hurley 1986).

A new and more complex view of Late Woodland has emerged as a result of recent archaeological investigations throughout southern Wisconsin as well as in adjoining states. First, it is clear that at least some Late Woodland societies were relying on maize horticulture after approximately AD 800. Second, after circa AD 900 some Late Woodland people were living in fairly large, sedentary or semi-sedentary villages. These villages were frequently encircled with defensive stockades suggesting the existence of organized warfare. Finally, it is apparent that the Late Woodland stage can be subdivided into a number of phases that have cultural, temporal, and geographical parameters.

As presently conceived, the Late Woodland Stage emerges at approximately AD 650 from a local late Middle Woodland base. For the eastern part of southern Wisconsin, which includes the eastern part of Region 8, Salkin (1987a) has proposed a cultural sequence consisting of two phases. It is based on unpublished excavations at a number of sites and on previously published information.

Horicon Phase (AD 650-1200): The Horicon Phase is the earliest of the Late Woodland cultures to emerge and is partly contemporaneous with the Kekoskee Phase. The Horicon Phase people were hunters and gatherers that moved seasonally and inhabited the area of southern Wisconsin from the Driftless Area east to Lake Michigan. They produced cord-impressed pottery of the Madison series (e.g. Madison Cord/Fabric Impressed). Horicon Phase sites include base camps situated near the interface of wetlands and rivers/lakes, briefly occupied upland camps, and rockshelters, used primarily in winter. The Horicon Phase people made the effigy mounds of southeastern and southcentral Wisconsin. The construction of effigy and geometric earthworks was an important part of their ceremonial life. Aside from mound groups and rockshelters, Salkin specifically places the Airport Site, near Madison within the Horicon Phase (Baerreis 1953; Salkin 1987a). The Horicon Phase disappears from the archeological record by AD 1200.

Kekoskee Phase (AD 800-1300): Between AD 800 and 900, Salkin believes that the Kekoskee Phase evolved from the Horicon Phase as a separate cultural entity under influences stemming from east of Wisconsin (Salkin 1987a). The basis of Kekoskee Phase economy was maize horticulture, although hunting, fishing, and gathering continued to be important. A feature of Kekoskee Phase Late Woodland life was the development of permanent villages that contain substantial houses. The villages were also frequently encircled with wooden stockades. Kekoskee Phase ceramics included the Madison series, but were dominated by new styles of cord-impressed and collared wares that were occasionally castellated (Goldstein nd). These included Aztalan Collared, Point Sauble Collared, and Hahn Cord Impressed wares. Aztalan Collared was defined from the Aztalan site in Jefferson County, Wisconsin (Baerreis and Freeman 1958) and has previously been dated to between AD 1000 and 1250. (Stoltman 1976). Village sites in Region 8 that relate to the Kekoskee Phase are all east of the Driftless Area. These include Stricker Pond I (Fay 1978; Salkin 1987b) which is located on an upland area south of Madison, the Dietz Site (Dietz et al 1956), and possibly the Camp Indianola Site (Dirst 1988), a stockaded village on the west shore of Lake Mendota. Salkin argues that the Kekoskee people were not responsible for construction of effigy mounds, although elsewhere Green and Behm (1980) have noted the occasional inclusion of collared ceramics in these mounds. The Kekoskee Phase disappears from the archaeological record by AD 1300.

Keyes Phase (AD 600-1000): In the far western portion of Region 8, along and near the Mississippi Trench, recent surveys and excavations conducted by the University of Wisconsin have gone far to help refine the nature of the Late Woodland Stage in the Driftless Area. Here the Late Woodland has been related to the Keyes Phase, a variant of the Effigy Mound Tradition and dated to between AD 600 and 1000, although Finney and Meyer (1989) have quite recently defined a possible late Keyes component (post AD 1000) at a habitation site near Richland Center in Richland County. Keyes Phase ceramics include Madison series types as well as early Late Woodland types common to Iowa. Theler (1987) has recently investigated the subsistence patterns of Woodland people in the Driftless Area through excavations of sites located near Prairie du Chien as well as through a synthesis of previously excavated information from open air sites and rockshelters. He concludes that the Late Woodland people maintained a subsistence base that was heavily oriented towards hunting and gathering, although corn and other crops were grown late in the sequence. Settlement systems involved a bipartite pattern consisting of warm weather camps and extraction locales for the exploitation of major riverine and floodplain resources associated with the Mississippi and Wisconsin Rivers, and cold weather use of rockshelters in the uplands for hunting of deer and other game. He concedes, however, that there may have been Late Woodland peoples living throughout the year in the interior of the Driftless Area to whom this model may not apply.

Arzigian (1987) has recently focused on the role of horticulture in Woodland cultures by studying floral remains recovered from sites in the Driftless Area. She concludes that cultivation of domesticated plants began as early as AD 200 and that this involved squash and sumpweed. Corn was first introduced from the south near the end of the Late Woodland sequence at circa AD 1000. Interestingly, she finds no evidence that the cultivation of maize immediately changed the mobile Late Woodland settlement patterns and suggests that cultivation was simply incorporated into existing patterns to help even out environmental variability. Theler has provided evidence that during this time Late Woodland populations were intensifying their resource extraction strategies, perhaps because of population increases or pressure (Theler 1987). The adoption of maize horticulture here and elsewhere may have been in response to a need to increase the productivity and reliability of the resource base.

Unlike the eastern portions of Region 8, sites with significant amounts of late Late Woodland collared ceramics are uncommon (Stoltman 1976; Theler 1987). Village sites analagous to those of the Kekoskee Phase appear to be lacking - with one notable exception. The Fred Edwards Site, located in Grant County, is a stockaded village occupied by people who were clearly intrusive to Wisconsin (Fred Finney, personal communication). Ceramics include Illinois and Iowa Late Woodland, and Middle Mississippian types from southern Illinois. The site is dated AD 1050-1150. As it stands, the post AD 1000 Late Woodland chronology of the southwestern part of the state needs further refinement.

In summary, early Late Woodland societies in Region 8 were a part of a larger cultural system that was characterized by a common material culture and a basic ideological system most visibly represented by the construction of Effigy Mounds. Within this system, evidence suggests that there was a great deal of local variation in subsistence and settlement patterns that reflected local environmental conditions as well as socio-economic relationships with other midwestern societies. Later in the sequence, at least some Late Woodland people adopted more complex socio-economic patterns that included maize horticulture and fairly large and occasionally stockaded villages. It is probable that this change reflected the infusion of new ideas and/or people from other regions. However, the specifics of synchronic and diachronic cultural variation within the Late Woodland Stage have yet to be adequately worked out.

PROPERTY TYPES AND RESEARCH ISSUES

A number of property types are associated with the Late Woodland in Region 8. These include villages, open air campsites, rockshelters, specialized resource extraction areas and mound groups. Collectively, these site types have a potential to yield important information concerning the following research topics:

1) Origins of Late Woodland. As presently conceived, Late Woodland in the Driftless Area of Region 8 is perceived as an in situ development from a Middle Woodland (Millville Phase) base. Further work at early Late Woodland sites will help define ceramic styles that will identify the roots of Late Woodland societies. Analysis of ceramic and lithic artifacts, as well as of faunal and floral remains will help explain cultural changes that distinguish Late Woodland from its Middle Woodland antecedents. Information from all site types, with the possible exception of specialized resource extraction sites, can be used to answer this question.

2) Late Woodland Phases and Chronology. At present, radiocarbon dates for Late Woodland sites in Region 8 support range between AD 650 and 1300, although both earlier and later dates have been advanced. Additional radiometric dating will help refine Late Woodland chronology. Further excavations at Late Woodland sites will also help to better define geographic and temporal variation among Late Woodland societies. Data from all site types can potentially contribute to an answer to this problem.

3) Settlement and Subsistence Practices. Until fairly recently, Late Woodland populations in the Region were generally characterized as mobile hunters and gatherers with a settlement pattern consisting of seasonal encampments of variable duration. Recent work has demonstrated that maize horticulture was being practiced late in the Late Woodland sequence and that some Late Woodland people were living in at least semi-permanent villages. The reasons why human populations at various times in various parts of the world shifted to horticulture has long been an important anthropological research question. The Late Woodland case can provide further insights into the problem. Analysis of Late Woodland habitation sites can help document the shift from hunting and gathering to horticulture, internal settlement organizational plans, and the structure of the overall Late Woodland settlement system . In so doing, it can identify changes in the functions of different settlement types. Analysis of bone and teeth from human burials can provide information on dietary emphasis, including changes in health patterns. Data from all site types are needed to answer these questions.

4) Interregional Relationships. The appearance of collared cord-impressed ceramics late in the Late Woodland sequence indicates influences from south and east of Wisconsin. Additionally, after about AD 1000 ceramics and other characteristics of the complex Middle Mississippian culture of southern Illinois appear at sites throughout the state. At about the same time, the Oneota culture emerges and dominates some parts of the state, although apparently not in Region 8. The relationships among contemporaneous Late Woodland, Oneota, and Middle Mississippian cultures is one of the most intriguing research problems in late prehistoric studies in the midwest. Further investigations of ceramic styles and non-local artifacts found at Late Woodland sites can can help clarify these relationships. Information from all site types can be used to answer this question.

5) Fate of the Late Woodland People. There is currently little evidence that the Late Woodland Stage in Region 8 persisted beyond ca. AD 1300. No habitation sites have been located that post-date this time, and Benn's (1979) analysis of radiocarbon dates from effigy mounds suggest that construction of these monuments ceased by AD 1100. What exactly happened to Late Woodland people and when is not clear. Stoltman (1985) has suggested that they all evolved into the Oneota through direct and indirect Middle Mississippian influences. While this may be so, the virtual absence of Oneota sites in Region 8 suggests a more complicated scenario. Continued research at Late Woodland sites, especially habitation and mound sites, as well as surveys for other late prehistoric occupation sites is clearly needed to resolve this important dilemma.

CONDITION OF LATE WOODLAND SITES IN REGION 8

According to Wisconsin's Archaeological Site Inventory, several hundred archaeological sites with Late Woodland components have been recorded in Region 8. Seventeen of these, mostly mound groups and rockshelters, are currently on the National Register of Historic Places. Because the site inventory spans nearly 80 years of reporting, and because only a few areas of the region have been systematically surveyed, an accurate assessment of the condition of Late Woodland sites is difficult to make. However, a number of observations can be made. First, Region 8 is heavily agricultural. Over a century of intensive farming has damaged, to one extent or another, the vast majority of prehistoric archaeological sites. Second, urban residential and recreational development in the region has concentrated on major river valleys and lakes as well as on adjacent upland areas - the very locations where substantial Late Woodland habitation areas and mound groups can be expected to be found. Thus modern development has undoubtedly destroyed many key sites - and continues to do so.

One specific study undertaken by Robert Peterson (1979) and funded by a Historic Preservation subgrant illustrates the points outlined above. Peterson conducted an archival search and a limited field survey investigating the present condition of all effigy mound groups recorded by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin for the southern part of the state. He determined that at least 80% of these sites had already been destroyed. In Dane County alone, he found that only 209 of an original count of 1094 individual mounds survived, and many of the remaining mounds have been damaged by construction, landscaping, and looting. Mounds have continued to disappear even after his study.

F. ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

I. **Name of Property Type:** Late Woodland Mounds

II. **Description:**

Late Woodland mound groups consist of low earthen tumuli that are conical, linear, or constructed in the shapes of birds, reptiles, amphibians, mammals, and other as yet unidentified forms. Typically mound groups contain a variety of these forms. Wisconsin is the heartland of the so-called Effigy Mound Tradition, although these mounds have been found in eastern Iowa, southeastern Minnesota, and northern Illinois. Effigy mounds are typically located on high places overlooking major bodies of water, although there are many important exceptions. Archaeological excavations have indicated that some mounds contain human burials, while others do not. The mounds also occasionally contain artifacts, pits, hearths, and stone concentrations or "altars" (Hurley 1986). Radiocarbon dating indicates that effigy mounds were constructed between AD 650 and 1300, although both wider and more restricted temporal ranges have been suggested (Benn 1979).

III. **Significance:**

X See continuation sheet

IV. **Registration Requirements:**

Studies have indicated that over 80% of the effigy mounds that once existed in the region have been destroyed (Peterson 1984). As a result of this, all surviving mounds are potentially eligible for listing on the National Register either singly or in groups. To be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, Late Woodland mounds must meet the following requirements.

1. Physical Appearance: The site must have an effigy, conical, or linear earthern mound, or a group of such mounds.

2. National Register of Historic Places Criteria: The site must be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places on the basis of Criterion D, in that it yields or is likely to yield information important in prehistory.

3. Establishment of antiquity: The site must be of demonstrably prehistoric construction, on the basis of associated artifact types, radiocarbon assays, history of discovery, comparability to dated mounds, or by other reasonable and appropriate means.

4. Integrity: It must be demonstrated that single mounds or mound groups maintain sufficient integrity to have the potential to provide important information on the Late Woodland Stage and the Effigy Mound Tradition, as outlined in Section E. Integrity considerations shall be evaluated at either the level of both individual mounds and the mound group as a whole, when applicable, taking into account the fact that a portion of the original mounds in a mound group still has the potential to yield information about the mound group as a whole. Reconstructed mounds are not eligible for listing in that they lack integrity.

_____ See continuation sheet for additional property types

SIGNIFICANCE: Late Woodland Mounds

Effigy mounds are among the most visible yet enigmatic prehistoric manifestations on the Wisconsin landscape. It is estimated that at one time individual mounds associated with the so-called Effigy Mound Tradition numbered in the thousands and could be found in groups of highly variable sizes (Hurley 1986). However, recent studies have also indicated that over 80% of effigy mounds that once existed have been destroyed by modern land use (Peterson 1984).

Wisconsin effigy mounds have been studied by archaeologists for over a century. Yet, as Hurley has recently pointed out in an article in Introduction to Wisconsin Archaeology: Background for Cultural Resource Planning (1986: 283-301), very basic questions still remain, such as: When were they built? Why were they built? What do the effigies represent? Additionally, while archaeologists are confident that the mounds were built by Late Woodland people, the socio-economic systems of these people and regional and temporal differences in these systems have not been fully described and explained. The study of surviving mound groups will help address all of these important issues.

As for the dating of effigy mounds, Hurley (1975) has garnered evidence to suggest that effigy mounds first appeared as early as AD 300 and were still being built at the time of European contact. Benn (1979) has analyzed radiocarbon dates from mound excavations and argues for a more restrictive temporal range of AD 650-1200. Recently, James Stoltman (personal communication) has suggested an even more narrow dating of between AD 800 and 1100. Mounds and mound groups can be expected to contain radiometrically datable material such as charcoal and human bone and therefore have the potential to contribute to the resolution of the problem.

Several of the most vexing questions relating to effigy mounds concern the function of effigy groups and the meaning of the effigies themselves. That they are at least to some extent associated with mortuary behavior is clear from the fact that many contain human burials. However, the fact that not all mounds even within a particular group have human interments suggests that mound building in this prehistoric society transcended simple concern for burial of the dead. In light of the fact that mounds are now protected as burial places under Wisconsin state law, it is relevant to point out that significant information concerning Late Woodland peoples can be gained from Effigy Mound groups through non-destructive studies.

One prevalent hypothesis is that each mound group represents a periodic, perhaps even annual, gathering place for a social group that for most of the time is dispersed in small family groups over a wide territory (Mallam 1976). In this view, mounds are constructed in the context of a variety of religious, social, political, and economic activities that broadly served to integrate an otherwise fragmented social group. Burial of the dead is simply one of these activities. The mound groups themselves serve as visual signifiers of a particular territory and of the social group that occupied it.

For instance, Clark Mallam has studied the location and arrangement of Effigy Mound groups as well as Effigy Mound types in Iowa and has gained some insights into Late Woodland social systems and ideology as a result. By analyzing the geographical distribution of Effigy Mound types, for example, he concludes that a number of separate social groups were responsible for Effigy Mound construction in northeastern Iowa (Mallam 1976).

In a more recent essay, Mallam (1984) suggests that the meaning and function of Effigy Mound groups can be addressed through such analysis aided by ethnographic analogy. He observes, for example, that Effigy Mound groups tend to be located near zones of predictable and annual occurring resources. This suggests to him that a complex set of ideological, social, political, and economic relationships may be involved in mound construction. He suggests that mounds "are not so much burial sites as they are metaphorical expressions about the idealized state that should exist between nature and culture-----balance and harmony." In his view, the Late Woodland people were expressing their "cosmological convictions" by "sacralizing the earth" (Mallam 1984:19), through the construction of mounds,

> In other words, they consecrated the mosaic environment with its varied resources and ecological relationships by defining it as sacred space. If the rhythm -balance and order--of this region could be maintained, the resources on which humans depended would continue. In this sense, mound building may be perceived as an ongoing world renewal ritual, a sacred activity humans entered into in order to insure regular and consistent production of natural resources. (Mallam 1984:19)

As to the effigies themselves, researchers have speculated that they represent clan affiliations (Radin 1923; Benn 1979), star constellations (Hurley 1986), or elements of nature critical to life - air (birds), earth (bears and other mammals), and water (lizards, turtles, etc.) (Mallam 1976). Less interpretive work has been done on the meaning of conicals and linears.

The mapping of mound groups and mound alignments have convinced others that they functioned primarily as calendric devices and recorded symbolic geometries. (Scherz 1987).

Clearly, much additional research is needed to clarify these important issues. Such research must consist of comparative analysis of mound groups, analysis of the internal structuring of the groups, investigation of activities associated with the mounds, and the careful application of ethnographic analogies drawn from more recent American Indian culture. Surviving mounds and mound groups can contribute important archaeological information to this research concerning the nature of the Effigy Mound Tradition in southwestern Wisconsin.

Archaeologists have linked effigy mounds to Late Woodland people who made a distinctive form of pottery broadly referred to as Madison Ware, and whose material culture also included such elements as bows and arrows. However, the socio-economic system or systems of these people is not well understood. For example, the social system of Effigy Mound people have been characterized as small bands of highly mobile hunters and gatherers (Mallam 1976; Storck 1974). However, there is increasing evidence to suggest that at least some Late Woodland people had adopted maize horticulture and a more sedentary existence (Arzigian 1987; Salkin 1987a; Goldstein nd).

A clearer picture of Late Woodland society will emerge as more habitation sites are investigated. Analysis of the styles of artifacts which are occasionally found associated with the mounds will also help clarify regional and temporal social relationships. This is important, since it has recently been proposed that not all Late Woodland populations participated in the construction of effigy mounds (Salkin 1987a). Charcoal and other organic material associated with ceremonial activities can provide radiocarbon dates that will further refine the temporal span of mound construction. Since Late Woodland mounds frequently contain burials, analysis of teeth and bone chemistry can provide insights into the changing diet of the Effigy Mound people.

Benn (1979) and Goldstein (Ritzenthaler 1985) have suggested that the actual locations of mound groups may provide clues to population movements related to seasonal resource exploitation. Benn (1979) has hypothesized that Late Woodland people gathered during the summer in such areas where there would have been abundant floodplain and lacustrine resources, and has suggested that mounds were constructed at that time. Further analysis of mound group locations along with the information from Late Woodland habitation sites will help identify patterns of land use and subsistence for the effigy mound builders in Region 8.

G. SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS

Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.

The multiproperty listing is based on information from the Wisconsin Archaeological Site Inventory as well as published and unpublished manuscripts, including the results of excavations and numerous surveys conducted throughout the region and the state. An overview of these sources is provided below.

__X__ See continuation sheet

H. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Arzigian , Constance
1987 The Emergence of Horticultural Societies in Wisconsin. In Emergent Horticultural Societies of the Eastern Woodlands, William F. Keegan (ed), pp. 217-242. Southern Illinois University Center for Archaeological Investigations, Occasional Paper No. 7, Carbondale, Ill.

Baerreis, David A.
1953 The Airport Village Site, Dane County. The Wisconsin Archeologist 34(3):149-164.

Baerreis, David A. and Joan E. Freeman
1958 Late Woodland Pottery in Wisconsin as Seen from Aztalan. The Wisconsin Archeologist 39(1):35-61.

Barrett, S.A. and Alanson Skinner
1932 Certain Mounds and Village Sites of Shawano and Oconto Counties, Wisconsin. Bulletin of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee, Vol. 10, No. 5.

Benn, David
1979 Some Trends and Traditions in Woodland Cultures of the Quad-State Region in the Upper Mississippi River Basin. The Wisconsin Archeologist 60(1):47:82.

__x__ See continuation sheet

Primary location of additional documentation:

__x__ State historic preservation office
_____ Other State agency
_____ Federal agency
_____ Local government
_____ University
_____ Other

Specify repository: _____

I. FORM PREPARED BY

name/title	Robert Birmingham, State Archeologist		
organization	State Historical Society of Wisc.	date	April 1989
street & number	816 State Street	telephone	(608) 262-0991
city or town	Madison	state WI	zip code 53706

The earliest surveys of mounds in Wisconsin were non-systematic undertakings by antiquarians, but they did produce many excellent site maps of mounds and mound groups that are extremely useful today. Many of the mounds mapped in the mid to late 19th century have been destroyed and others altered by land use practices, making these early documents our only source of information on many sites. Foremost among these early investigators are Lapham (1855), Lewis (n.d.), Thomas (1894) to a lesser extent, and later Brown (n.d.).

Hurley (1975) provides an excellent overview of this early period of mound exploration in Wisconsin. The main question asked by investigators at this time was "Who made the mounds?" Thomas' investigations (1894) effectively answered that question, demonstrating that mounds were constructed by Native Americans. Increasingly, questions turned to a discussion of which particular Native American groups made mounds (cf. Radin 1911, 1923).

By the 1920's, the Milwaukee Public Museum began a systematic survey of mounds in Wisconsin (Barrett and Skinner 1932; McKern 1928, 1930; Nash 1933; among others). Excavations were conducted at both effigy and non-effigy mounds. From these investigations, McKern concluded that the Winnebago did not exclusively construct the effigy mounds. The research also culminated in the publication of a trait list material culture items associated with the Effigy Mound Tradition (McKern and Ritzenthaler 1949).

After the Second World War, research continued at mound sites, but increasingly shifted toward Late Woodland habitation sites. Baerreis (1953a) excavated the first habitation site felt to be associated with the Effigy Mound Tradition, the Blackhawk Village site. Hall (1950) also contributed to the classification of Woodland ceramic types. Rowe (1956) synthesized the extant data on Effigy Mound Tradition burial practices using ethnographic analogy. Finally, Hurley (1975) investigated both mound and habitation sites and provided new interpretations of dating and cultural processes for the Effigy Mound Tradition.

Recent research has focused on archival investigation such as Peterson (1979) and mapping of previously identified mound sites. Still, unkown mounds continue to be reported (Lowe 1989). Excavations at habitation sites has increased (Baerreis 1953b; Finney and Meyer 1989) and has contributed to the identification of a new site type, the palisaded village (Dirst 1987; Salkin 1987) for the Late Woodland Stage.

Boszhardt, Robert F., James L. Theler and Thomas F. Kehoe
1986 The Early Woodland Stage. The Wisconsin Archeologist 67(3-4):243-262.

Brown, Charles E.
n.d. Register of the Charles E. Brown Papers, 1889-1946. Archives Division, The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Dietz, E.F., David Baerreis, Robert Nero and Hugh Cutter
1956 A Report on the Dietz Site, Dane County, Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Archeologist 37(1):1-20.

Dirst, Victoria
1988 Research in Pursuit of the Past at Governor Nelson State Park, Dane County, Wisconsin. Department of Natural Resources. Manuscript on file with the State Historical Society, Madison.

Fay, Robert
1978 An Archaeological Survey of the Stricker and Tiedman Ponds, Middleton, Wisconsin. Report on file with the State Historical Society, Madison.

Finney, Fred and Scott Meyer
1989 Archeological Testing at the Syttende Mai (47RI190) and Nancy-Nancy Sites (47RI189), Richland Center, Wisconsin. Manuscript on file with the State Historical Society, Madison.

Gibbon, Guy
1986 The Mississippian Tradition: Oneota Culture. The Wisconsin Archeologist 67(3-4):314-338.

Goldstein, Lynne
nd The Implications of Aztalan's Location. In New Perspectives on Cahokia: Views from the Peripheries., James B. Stoltman (ed). In Press.

Green, William and Jeffrey Behm
1980 Excavation of the Du Pont Mound, Dane County, Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Archeologist 61(4):452-479.

Green, William, James B. Stoltman, and Alice B. Kehoe
1986 Introduction to Wisconsin Archaeology: Background for Cultural Resource Planning. The Wisconsin Archeologist 67:3-4.

Hall, Robert L.
1950 A Style Analysis of Wisconsin Woodland Pottery. The Wisconsin Archeologist 31:1-42.

Hole, Francis D.
1983 Natural Divisions of Wisconsin. Natural Areas Journal 3:2.

Hurley, William M.
1975 An Analysis of Effigy Mound Complexes in Wisconsin. University of Michigan, Museum of Anthropology, Anthropological Papers No. 49, Ann Arbor.

1986 The Late Woodland Stage: Effigy Mound Culture. The Wisconsin Archeologist 67(3-4): 283-301.

Lewis, T.H.
n.d. Unpublished Manuscripts, Northwestern Archaeological Survey. On file with the Minnesota State Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn.

Lowe, David
1989 The Sawle Mound Group National Register of Historic Places Nomination form. Document on file, The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Lapham, Increase A.
1855 The Antiquities of Wisconsin, as Surveyed and Described. Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Mallam, R. Clark
1976 The Iowa Effigy Mound Tradition: An Interpretive Model. Report 9, Office of the State Archaeologist, The University of Iowa, Iowa City.

1984 Some Views on the Archaeology of the Driftless Zone in Iowa. Proceedings of the Iowa Academy of Science 91:16-21.

Martin, Lawrence
1965 The Physical Geography of Wisconsin. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wi.

Mason, Ronald
1986 The Paleo-Indian Tradition. The Wisconsin Archeologist 67(3-4):181-206.

McKern, Will C.
1928 The Neale and McClaughry Mound Groups. Bulletin of the Public Museum of Milwaukee, Vol. 3, No. 3.

1930 The Kleitzen and Nitschke Mound Groups. Bulletin of the Public Museum of Milwaukee, Vol. 3, No. 4.

McKern, Will C. and Robert E. Ritzenthaler
1949 Trait Lists of the Effigy Mound Aspect. The Wisconsin Archeologist 30: 39-48.

Nash, Philleo
1933 The Excavation of the Ross Mound Group 1. Bulletin of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee, Vol. 16, No. 1.

Peterson, Robert
1979 The Wisconsin Effigy Mounds Project, I. Unpublished report on file with the State Historical Society, Madison.

1984 Survey of Destruction of Effigy Mounds in Wisconsin and Iowa - A Perspective. The Wisconsin Archeologist 65:1-31.

Radin, Paul
1911 Some Aspects of Winnebago Archaeology. American Anthropologist 13: 517-538.

1923 The Winnebago Tribe. Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, No. 37, pp. 35-560, Washington, DC.

Ritzenthaler, Robert
1985 Prehistoric Indians of Wisconsin. Milwaukee Public Museum, Milwaukee. Revised by Lynne G. Goldstein.

Rowe, Chandler W.
1956 The Effigy Mound Culture of Wisconsin. Milwaukee Public Museum, Publications in Anthropology No. 3.

Salkin, Philip
1987a The Late Woodland Stage in Southeastern Wisconsin. Wisconsin Academy Review, 33(2):75-79.

1987b Archaeological Mitigation Excavations at the Stricker Pond I Site (47DA424) in Middleton, Dane County, Wisconsin. Report Number 353, Archaeological Consulting and Services, Madison.

Salzer, Robert
1986 The Middle Woodland Stage. The Wisconsin Archeologist 67(3-4):263-282.

Scherz, James
1987 New Surveys of Wisconsin Indian Mounds. Wisconsin Academy Review 33(2):63-66.

Stoltman, James B.
1976 Two New Late Woodland Dates from the Rosenbaum Rockshelter (47-DA-411) and Their Implications for Interpretations of Wisconsin Prehistory. The Wisconsin Archeologist 57(1):12-28.

1985 The Appearance of the Mississippian Tradition in the Upper Mississippi Valley. In Prehistoric Mound Builders of the Mississippi Valley, James B. Stoltman (ed). The Putnam Museum, Davenport.

1986 The Archaic Tradition. The Wisconsin Archeologist 67(3-4):207-238.

Storck, Peter L.
1974 Some Aspects of Effigy Mound Subsistence and Settlement Patterns During the Late Woodland Period in Wisconsin. Arctic Anthropology 11:272-279.

Theler, James
1987 Woodland Tradition Economic Strategies. Office of the State Archeologist, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Thomas, Cyrus
1894 Report on the Mound Explorations of the Bureau of Ethnology. 12th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D.C.