1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: THE CLOVER SITE

Other Name/Site Number: 46Cb40

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: [redacted] Not for publication: X

City/Town: [redacted] Vicinity: __

State: WV County: Cabell Code: WV 001 Zip Code: [redacted]

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property
___:Private
___:Public-local
___:Public-State
X :Public-Federal

Category of Property
___:Building(s)
___:District
X :Site
___:Structure
___:Object

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Noncontributing
___:Buildings	___:Buildings
1 :Sites	___:Sites
___:Structures	___:Structures
___:Objects	___:Objects
1 :**Total**	0 :**Total**

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: N/A

Name of related multiple property listing: N/A

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this ___ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

Signature of Certifying Official — Date

State or Federal Agency and Bureau — Date

In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.

Signature of Commenting or Other Official — Date

State or Federal Agency and Bureau — Date

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I, hereby certify that this property is:

___ Entered in the National Register
___ Determined eligible for the National Register
___ Determined not eligible for the National Register
___ Removed from the National Register
___ Other (explain):

Keeper — Date of Action

6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic: Domestic Sub: Village Site

Current: Landscape Sub: Conservation Area

7. DESCRIPTION

Architectural Classification
N/A

Materials: N/A
Foundation: _____
Walls: _____
Roof: _____
Other: _____

DESCRIBE PRESENT AND HISTORIC PHYSICAL APPEARANCE.

Site Location and History

The Clover Archaeological Site (46Cb40) comprises an area of 11 acres located within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's [redacted] Cabell County, West Virginia (Figures 7.1 - 7.4). The site is located 550 feet AMSL (Above Mean Sea Level) [redacted] Clover occupies a broad level area of land approximately 33 feet above the present flood plain within the 50 year flood frequency zone. Ashton silt-loam series soils occurring at the site generally are deep, well drained, and possess neutral pH values.

Archeologists surveying the [redacted] area have located 18 sites representing components dating from Paleo-Indian to modern times (Figure 7.3). These findings show that people have been living within land presently comprising the Wildlife Management Area for more than 9,000 years. Three components have been identified within the 11 acre area of the Clover site itself. Two of these, represented by a single surface find of a fluted Paleo-Indian projectile point and small amounts of Late Woodland ceramics and lithics, are non-contributing properties providing evidence of brief sporadic occupation at the locale (Adams 1960; Adams and Durrett 1952). Remains of a substantial long-term occupation associated with the [redacted] horizon of the Fort Ancient culture are the sole contributing resources at Clover.

The Clover [redacted] occupation dating from 1550 to 1600 represents one of the best preserved townsites associated with the protohistoric phase of Fort Ancient culture. Although local collectors have gathered archeological materials at the site for more than 100 years, Clover first came to national attention when archeologist James B. Griffin published findings made at the site by avocationalists such as John J. Adams and S.F. Durrett in his general study of Fort Ancient culture (Griffin 1943). Griffin described the Clover site as a 5 acre area containing 3 "raised areas" or mounds surrounded by dark shell-littered soil. Five feet in height and 200 feet wide when Griffin worked at Clover, all 3 mounds have since disappeared.

Excavations conducted by Adams and Durrett at the site resulted in discovery of a sizable assemblage of lithics and ceramics, bone, shell, and copper implements and ornaments, and the grave of a young child interred in an extended position accompanied by funerary offerings of a small clay animal effigy, cut mussel shell discs and pendants, and Marginella shell beads. Contrasting these findings with others from then-known Ohio Valley locales, Griffin discovered that Clover site deposits collectively constituted a distinct and hithertofore unrecognized "Clover Complex." Today, many archeologists classify sites containing similar assemblages as components of the "Clover Phase" of the late prehistoric and protohistoric Fort Ancient Madisonville horizon. As the "type site" for this phase, Clover deposits have been used as benchmarks identifying and organizing temporal and cultural attributes of

similar assemblages subsequently found at such mid-Ohio River Valley sites as Buffalo (46 PU 31), Orchard (46 MS 61), Rolfe Lee (46 MS 51/123), Marmet (46 KA 9), and Hardin Village (15 GP 22).

Archeological Investigations

The Fort Ancient occupants of Clover had been long forgotten when Euro-American settlers began plowing Green Bottom lands during the first decades of the 19th-century. As mentioned earlier, existing records indicate that local collectors have gathered archeological materials at the site for at least 100 years. The collection of one of these avocationalists, John J. Adams, is curated at the Huntington Museum of Art. This collection contains numerous aboriginal lithic, ceramic, shell, bone, and antler materials, substantial numbers of copper or brass, tubular beads, cones, and scraps, several small metal effigy cut-out figures, and a small number of European glass beads dating to the late 16th or early 17th centuries.

These collections constituted the primary source for Clover site data reported in studies published during the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s (Griffin 1943; Mayer-Oakes 1955; McMichael 1960). Although local collectors continued to gather artifacts from areas exposed by plowing, no further systematic investigations were made at the site until studies for proposed enlargement of the State Route 2 right-of-way to the south of Clover began in 1974. Conducting pedestrian surface surveys along the proposed right-of-way in and around Green Bottom, West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey archeologists relocated Clover deposits in an area of darkened mussel-shell strewn soil located approximately 1,000 feet north of the projected impact area (Wilkins 1974). Surveying the surface of these deposits, these archeologists found that Clover was not threatened by project developments and recommended that site deposits be preserved in place.

Investigations conducted by Marshall University archeological field schools directed by Nicholas Freidin from 1984 to 1989 represent the first systematic study of Clover archeological deposits since Griffin's time (Freidin 1987). Surveying existing site collections and other documentation, Marshall University investigators have determined approximate site boundaries and assessed site assemblage scope and content. Indirect non-invasive survey techniques, such as aerial photography analysis, topographic survey, and electrical resistivity survey, have been used to determine approximate site dimensions and structure. Although wide-area excavations capable of revealing living floors, house patterns, stockade walls, or other large-scale features or deposits have not been undertaken, Marshall University investigators have excavated 50 test units. Ranging in size from 11 to 44 square feet, these test units have been placed randomly along transect lines and within areas believed to contain potentially significant site deposits (Figures 7.5 - 7.6).

These operations confirmed that well preserved and largely intact deposits dating from late prehistoric to protohistoric Madisonville horizon Fort Ancient times survive at Clover. Intrasite analysis has shown that most resources are concentrated in a 5 acre semi-circular zone within the 11 acre site area. As in other Madisonville horizon sites, few archeological materials have been found within the central core area of this zone. A zone containing pits, hearths, post molds, burials, and other intact features occurs along the central core area's

perimeter (Figures 7.7 - 7.9). A 10 to 14 inch thick midden layer extends outward 10 to 15 feet beyond this depositional ring.

Two soil levels have been identified within the site area (Figure 7.7). The uppermost of these levels contains the plowzone and the midden layer. This level, hereafter labelled "Level I," extends from 7 to 20 inches below the site surface. Although deep plowing has disturbed upper portions of midden deposits underlying the plowzone, undisturbed midden deposits have been found beneath the plowzone stratum. A feature-bearing zone referred to as "Level II" containing intact deep features such as pits, post molds, hearths, and burials intrudes into culturally sterile Ashton silt-loam subsoils occurring beneath Level I.

Shell-tempered Madisonville Plain, Cordmarked, or Smoothed Cordmarked wares overwhelmingly predominate the Clover ceramic assemblage (Figures 7.13). Z-twist direction cordage impressions have been identified on most analyzed cordmarked pots (Carr and Maslowski 1991). Rarely found in pottery from sites to the west, Z-twist cordage direction is commonly identified in analyzed pottery recovered nearby contemporary Fort Ancient locales to the east such as Buffalo, Rolfe Lee, Marmet, and Gue Farm (Maslowski 1984a). These findings strongly suggest that Clover people maintained closer ties with neighbors to the east than with others living farther west.

Several fired-clay animal and human figurines and a distinctive cylindrical clay object representing a pestle (McMichael 1960) or a pedestal-base similar to others identified at protohistoric and early historic Ohio Valley and Iroquoian sites (Latta 1987; 1990), also occur in site collections. Concave and straight-based chipped stone triangular projectile points, bifacially-flaked end-scrapers, quantities of debitage, and pecked stone celts, manos, and hammerstones comprise the lithic assemblage (Figure 7.10) (Maynard 1989a; 1989b). Other materials found at Clover include shell beads, a Citico-style shell gorget, cannel coal pendants, mussel shell knives, scrapers, and hoes, large amounts of bone and antler awls, needles, beamers, fish hooks, and harpoons, and perforated animal teeth (Figures 7.12 & 7.14).

Copper or brass tubular beads, cones, bear, fish, and other animal effigy cut-outs, a "salamander" or "beaver" effigy (Mayer-Oakes 1955), and quantities of metal scrap also have been recovered (Figures 7.15 - 7.18). Much of this material has been collected by avocationalists. Thirteen metal beads and fragments have been excavated from Level I plowzone or midden layers. Two small pieces of copper have been found under the right side of the cranium of the young girl buried in Feature 2.

Two blue milled star chevron glass beads and a number of small plain blue-turquoise and cobalt blue glass beads have been found by collectors or excavated from Level I soils (Figure 7.19).

Three radiocarbon dates thus far have been collected from intact site deposits (Freidin 1991; Maslowski 1991). The first, DIC-3087, comprising three small samples drawn from Feature 2 midden fill, presents a corrected date ranging from A.D. 1264 to A.D. 1276. This date represents a minute sample, and should be regarded as unreliable. The remaining samples, DIC-3367, drawn from undisturbed Level I midden deposits within test unit S18 E100, and

DIC-3366, recovered from Feature 30, provide corrected dates of A.D. 1450 and A.D. 1487 respectively. Each reflects dates ranging from the mid-15th century to the early 1600s at one sigma.

Although corrected radiocarbon dates suggest an earlier period of occupation, the Clover artifact assemblage closely resembles others identified in known 16th- and early 17th-century protohistoric mid-Ohio Valley Madisonville Fort Ancient sites. Excavation of copper or brass materials from intact midden deposits and the Feature 2 burial, as well as the discovery of glass beads dating to the late 16th-century within Level I plowzone deposits not containing deposits associated with later Indian or Euro-American occupations further suggests that Clover was occupied during protohistoric times.

Property Types and Site Descriptions

General Habitation Property Type:
Large Nucleated Town

Sixteenth Century

As mentioned earlier, archeologists surveying the Clover site locale have found evidence suggesting the presence of a semi-circular town plan consisting of a central plaza surrounded by an occupation area ringed by peripheral midden deposits. This town plan is similar to others encountered at contemporary Fort Ancient sites such as Buffalo and Hardin. Post mold patterns believed to represent remains of log stockade walls found at Buffalo, Hardin, and other contemporary Madisonville sites thus far have not been found at Clover.

Excavations conducted beyond the northwestern and southern peripheries of the central plaza suggest the presence of an encircling domestic occupation zone (Figure 7.6). Post molds, hearths, and pits containing lithic and ceramic materials, charcoal, calcined shell and bone, and carbonized corn cobs have been found within this zone.

The most extensive group of features thus far excavated at Clover occur in the stratigraphically complex N69 E4 area located within the postulated domestic occupation zone (Figures 7.8 - 7.9). Post molds with tapered, rounded, or flat bottoms surround a shallow circular clay-lined depression filled with thin lenses of ash and fire-cracked rock. A thick deposit of ash and clusters of charcoal interspersed with lenses of ash and red clay and two extended human burials have been found nearby. Collectively, these deposits suggest that N69 E4 contains remains of a post-built structure enclosing a bowl shaped hearth, scattered household debris, and at least two graves. Extended burials located beneath household living floors are documented at Buffalo and other contemporary Fort Ancient Madisonville horizon locales. Similar basin-shaped hearths and ash and red clay lenses also have been found in many Fort Ancient sites.

Midden deposits extending outward beyond the outer perimeter of the occupation zone contain most of the archeological materials thus far recovered at Clover. Visible in aerial photographs and detected during electrical resistivity surveys, test excavations show that

midden deposits at Clover generally appear as a layer of loose dark brown soil located between 4 and 8 inches beneath the site surface (Figure 7.7). Ranging from 10 to 14 inches in thickness, these midden deposits contain pottery sherds, finished stone tools, debitage, bone and shell implements, kitchen refuse, fire-cracked rocks, charcoal, and other materials. Analyses of midden depositional patterns suggest that Clover people employed a "sheet-type" of refuse disposal similar to that used by occupants at the Buffalo site.

Spiritually Significant Property Type:
Individual Burials

The Sixteenth Century

Seven human interments have been documented at the Clover. No exact provenance was suggested for the burial reported by Griffin (Griffin 1943). Another burial was washed out of an eroded riverbank wall located more than 500 feet east of the site datum during the December, 1985 flood. Marshall University investigators excavated five burials in the western sector of the occupation area. Three of these individuals, a young woman, an adult male, and an adult of undetermined sex, were found in extended positions with heads pointing towards the east. A fourth burial represented a secondary "bundle bone" interment of an infant. The fifth burial consisted of disarticulated bones believed to represent the grave of a young adult woman disturbed by later excavation. Two of these burials were accompanied by small amounts of funerary offerings of shell beads, pottery, and, in the case of one young woman, two small pieces of copper.

Each interment was located beneath layers of domestic refuse within occupation zone deposits. Two individuals found directly atop Level II soils were covered by midden material. The remaining three individuals were buried in graves excavated into Ashton silt-loam subsoils.

Site Integrity

Direct systematic surface survey and subsurface test excavations corroborate indirect aerial photography and electrical resistivity evidence indicating that lower midden levels and features intruding into Level II sub-soils are almost completely intact. Neutral pH values have resulted in excellent preservation conditions. These clearly are reflected in the large amounts of bone, shell, and other more perishable materials encountered in known Clover site deposits.

No known Fort Ancient site is completely undisturbed. Northernmost portions of Clover site deposits bordering on the Ohio River have eroded away. Collectors have removed artifacts at Clover for at least 100 years. Evidence of pothunting has been found along northernmost portions of the site eroding into the Ohio River. Like most other known Madisonville locales, plowing has disturbed upper portions of Level I soils at Clover and is believed to have played a major role in deflating the three "raised areas" documented by Griffin in his 1943 monograph. Recent test excavations conducted by Marshall University investigators have removed less than three percent of site deposits. Even with these disturbances, survey

investigations clearly indicate that as much as 90% of existing site deposits are intact, undisturbed, and well preserved.

Clover is not the only Fort Ancient Madisonville horizon archeological site known to contain deposits possessing high integrity. Larger and more extensive intact deposits have been found at such sites as Madisonville (Hooton and Willoughby 1920), Buffalo (Hanson 1975), Hardin (Hanson 1966), Bentley (Henderson 1990; Henderson, Jobe, and Turnbow 1986; Henderson and Turnbow 1987; Pollack 1990; Pollack and Henderson 1983 and 1984; Pollack, Hockensmith, and Sanders 1984), and Rolfe Lee (Graybill 1981; Youse 1965). Deposits found at several of these locales have been almost completely excavated. Others have been severely damaged or destroyed by construction or erosion. Substantial intact deposits survive at the somewhat later Rolfe Lee site. The temporal and cultural placement of other intact deposits at the Bentley site within the Lower Shawneetown complex currently remain the subject of scholarly debate. Deposits preserved within the Clover site thus represent one of the few intensively surveyed properties clearly associated with Clover phase Madisonville horizon occupation presently known to contain extensive intact deposits capable of yielding information of national significance.

Present Appearance

As mentioned earlier, the Clover site is 1 of 18 identified cultural resources currently being preserved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the [redacted] (Figure 7.3). Clover deposits are located in a rural area within an intensively patrolled and periodically mowed field that has not been plowed for at least 15 years. Prioritized preservation actions set out in the Area's "Historic Preservation Management Plan" call for:

1 -- Increases in outreach programs to encourage public awareness of the importance of site preservation.

2 -- Keeping a resident full-time Wildlife Manager with full authority to enforce state and federal historic preservation laws.

3 -- Encouragement and systematic regulation of research programs.

4 -- Riverbank erosion control.

The plan further specifically stipulates that "The Clover Site (46CB40)...will be periodically mowed to control trees and herbaceous vegetation. No plowing will be permitted without the written permission of the West Virginia Historic Preservation Officer and the Huntington District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers...Groundhogs pose a potential problem at the Clover Site. The site will be inspected at least once a year and the groundhog population will be reduced if damage increases." The planning document also directs that Clover site collections stored at Marshall University and the Huntington Museum of Art be maintained in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Curation and requires that access to investigators developing collection research and interpretive potential be maintained and encouraged (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1990:19-20).

SECTION 7 FIGURES

FIGURE 7.1: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Location.

FIGURE 7.2: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: General Location, Clover Site [redacted] (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1990: Figure 1).

FIGURE 7.3: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: [redacted] (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1990: Figure 4).

FIGURE 7.4: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Aerial Photograph of the Clover Site 1987 (Nicholas Freidin, photographer).

FIGURE 7.5: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Test Excavations 1986 (Nicholas Freidin, photographer).

FIGURE 7.6: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: 1984-88 Test Excavations (Freidin 1991).

FIGURE 7.7: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Stratigraphic Overview (Freidin 1987: Figure 2).

FIGURE 7.8: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: N69 E4 Area Excavation, 1986 (Nicholas Freidin, photographer).

FIGURE 7.9: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: N69 E4 Area Excavation, 1986 (Freidin 1987: Figure 3).

FIGURE 7.10: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Lithics, Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

FIGURE 7.11: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Madisonville Series Rim Sherds, Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

FIGURE 7.12: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Bone Flutes and Awls, Shell Beads, and a Perforated Tooth Pendant, Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

FIGURE 7.13: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Bone Fishhooks and Harpoons and Cannel Coal Pendants, Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

FIGURE 7.14: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Citico-Style Shell Gorget, Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

FIGURE 7.15: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Copper or Brass Tubular Beads, Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

FIGURE 7.16: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Copper or Brass Fish Effigy, Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

FIGURE 7.17: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Copper or Brass Fish Effigy and Cobble with Incised Fish Design, Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

FIGURE 7.18: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Copper or Brass Bear Effigy, Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

FIGURE 7.19: Clover Site, Cabell County, West Virginia: Millefiori Glass Bead (left) and Two Blue Glass Beads (right), Adams Collection, Huntington Museum of Art (Robert Maslowski, photographer).

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:
Nationally: X Statewide:___ Locally:___

Applicable National Register Criteria: A___ B___ C___ D X

Criteria Considerations
(Exceptions): N/A A___ B___ C___ D___ E___ F___ G___

NHL Criteria: 6

Area(s) of Significance	Period(s) of Significance	Significant Date(s)
Archeology/Historic-Aboriginal	1550-1600	N/A

NHL Theme(s):

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
1. Native Culturl Adaptations at Contact
i. Native Adaptations to Northeastern Environments at Contact.

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
2. Establishing Intercultural Relations.

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
2. Establishing Intercultural Relations.
i. Trade Relationships

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
2. Establishing Intercultural Relations.
e. Defending Native Homelands

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
2. Establishing Intercultural Relations.
h. New Native Military Alliances

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
2. Establishing Intercultural Relations.
f. Defending Native Religious Systems

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
3. Varieties of Early Conflict, Conquest, or Accommodation.

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
3. Varieties of Early Conflict, Conquest, or Accommodation.
a. Transfer of Technology to Native People

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
3. Varieties of Early Conflict, Conquest, or Accommodation.
b. Forced and Voluntary Population Movements

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
3. Varieties of Early Conflict, Conquest, or Accommodation.
c. The New Demographics

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations
D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations
3. Varieties of Early Conflict, Conquest, or Accommodation.
d. Changing Settlement Types

Significant Person(s): N/A

Cultural Affiliation: Madisonville Horizon, Fort Ancient Culture

Architect/Builder: N/A

STATE SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPERTY, AND JUSTIFY CRITERIA, CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS, AND AREAS AND PERIODS OF SIGNIFICANCE NOTED ABOVE.

Historic Context

Communities associated with Fort Ancient maize cultivators first appeared along the central reaches of the Ohio River Valley in southern Ohio, western West Virginia, northeastern Kentucky, and southeastern Indiana sometime between 900 and 1,000 years ago. The namesake of this culture, the Fort Ancient Site located in Fort Ancient State Memorial, near Lebanon, Ohio, and which was designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1964, is the site of a Hopwellian mound complex now known to predate Fort Ancient occupation of the area. Despite the fact that the name Fort Ancient was first applied to an earlier culture, modern scholars continue to use the term to identify later town-dwelling residents of the middle Ohio Valley associated with distinctive lithic and ceramic assemblages dating from A.D. 900 to 1750. Ironically, deposits associated with this Fort Ancient culture recently have been found at the Fort Ancient State Memorial.

Archeologists working in various areas of the Valley also continue to debate the origins of these people. Some claim that they represent an autochthonous manifestation proceeding from local Late Woodland developments (Graybill 1981). Others believe that the emergence of Fort Ancient culture reflects Mississippian influences or invasions (Essenpreis 1978). No matter how they feel about their origins, most scholars generally agree that diagnostic Fort Ancient artifact assemblages comprise distinctive shell- or grit-tempered pottery, clay and stone smoking pipes, chipped stone triangular projectile points, and a wide assortment stone, bone, antler, shell, and copper tools, weapons, and ornaments. Most investigators also agree that for much of their history, many Fort Ancient people lived in large towns of grass-roofed oblong or rectangular wattle-and-daub-walled houses. Many of these towns were fortified, and more than a few were planned settlements consisting of concentrically arranged houses surrounding large central plazas. Although direct evidence presently is lacking, known settlement patterns and discoveries of carbonized remains of cultivated plants in pits and middens suggest that most Fort Ancient people grew corn, beans, squash, tobacco, and other plants in fields located beyond town walls.

Archeologists also generally agree that the last known form of Fort Ancient culture, known in southwestern Ohio as the Mariemont phase, and as the Madisonville horizon everywhere else, first emerged in the central Ohio River valley sometime between 1400 and 1450. Sites associated with the earliest developments of this horizon, variously identified as the Clover or Gist phases, reflect an unprecedented degree of technological and systemic diversity. Large, planned, and often fortified towns such as Clover, Hardin, Larkin, and Madisonville appear. New forms of shell tempered Madisonville series globular jars, bowls, and pans are found in town deposits. Early Madisonville tool assemblages are dominated by straight-sided straight- or concave-based chipped stone triangular projectile points and unifacially-flaked tear-drop or snub-nose shaped endscrapers. New types of bone, antler, shell, and copper objects also appear.

Terminal forms of Madisonville horizon culture, variously known as the Late Clover, Montour, and Orchard phases, persisted from 1550 into historic times. Several changes

mark the emergence of these later phases. A new form of excurvate-sided concave-based triangular chipped stone projectile points becomes common. Shell maskettes, claw-shaped or diamond-shaped cannel coal pendants, and vasiform stone and clay pipes also are found in many sites (Brashler 1990). The appearance of paddle-decorated pottery forms at the Riker site, Neale's Landing, and other more easterly terminal Madisonville locales signals increased contacts with Whittlesey phase people from the north. Salt pans disappear as new forms of ceramic jars and fired clay animal and human figurines emerge. Clay pots become widely used as funerary offerings for the first time as terminal Madisonville people increasingly shift interment attitudes from flexed and bundle burials to extended positions. Existing evidence also indicates that many late Madisonville horizon people moved from earlier large highly centralized planned towns to more dispersed and less dense settlements. Glass beads, copper, brass, and iron objects, and other materials of European origin also appear in many of these sites.

A number of sites are known to contain deposits associated with 16th-century Clover phase Madisonville horizon occupations. All contain aboriginal assemblages nearly identical to preceding Madisonville occupations dating as far back as the first half of the 15th-century. Because of this fact, radiocarbon assays and the occurrence of small amounts of copper, glass beads, and other objects of European manufacture presently constitute the only clearly recognizable evidence of protohistoric occupation at most of these sites.

Archeologists studying Madisonville horizon material culture have observed two distinct developments. As mentioned earlier, Madisonville artifact assemblages tend to be larger and more diverse than those excavated from earlier Fort Ancient sites. At the same time, Madisonville assemblages display far less regional variation than those dating to earlier Fort Ancient times.

The unprecedentedly diverse range of distinctive shell or grit-tempered jars, pans, pots, figurines, and spoons first produced by 15th-century Madisonville horizon potters continues to be found in Clover phase sites dating to the 16th- and early 17th-centuries. An extensive inventory of lithic tools and objects dominated by narrow flat-based triangular chipped stone projectile points, distinctive disc-shaped smoking pipes, and a wide range of scrapers, knives, and pecked stone mauls, axes, and adzes also has been identified at many of these locales. Bone and antler projectile points, needles, hooks, and other implements occur in unprecedentedly large quantities. Distinctive engraved shell gorgets, similar to others more commonly found in more southerly Mississippian sites in Tennessee, also have been recovered from many Madisonville horizon site deposits dating to the 1500s (Brashler 1990).

Many archeologists analyzing presently identifiable site distributions think that formerly widespread Fort Ancient settlement patterns contracted dramatically into more limited areas of the Ohio Valley during early Madisonville times. All but the southwesternmost sections of the present state of Ohio, for instance, may have been completely abandoned during all but the latter years of Madisonville horizon occupation. Many scholars believe that contemporary developments in Iroquoian or Mississippian society effected these and other changes associated with the emergence of the Madisonville horizon. Others believe that local developments stimulated change. Although several theories have been advanced, direct

causes contributing to development of evidently more homogeneous and more localized forms of Fort Ancient society during the 15th- and 16th-centuries currently remain unknown.

Identifiable variations in settlement patterns and artifact assemblage types, styles, and attributes suggest that Madisonville horizon Fort Ancient culture may have consisted of a number of culturally or temporal distinct social, political, or linguistic groups. Much speculation, for example, focuses upon possible variations in Fort Ancient ethnic identity. Many scholars have believed that all Fort Ancient people were the ancestors of the region's historically chronicled Shawnee population since Earnest Hooton first published his thoughts on the subject (Hooton and Willoughby 1920; Graybill n.d.). Other scholars, citing similarities in burial practices such as inclusion of grave offerings and burials in positions facing east rather than the westward direction favored by Shawnees, suggest that Madisonville horizon people were ancestors of historic Siouans (Voegelin 1944; Maslowski 1984a).

More recent studies suggest the possible presence of several cultural groups in areas where Madisonville deposits occur. Discoveries of high percentages of simple stamped and tong wrapped pottery at Riker and other easterly Madisonville horizon sites has been seen as evidence of close connections between more easterly Fort Ancient people and Whittlesey folk from the north (Maslowski 1984a and 1984b). High frequencies of Z-twist cordage direction also have been noted in pottery assemblages found in more easterly upper Ohio River Valley sites. Similar forms of shell masks, gorgets, pottery, figurines, and burial shared by Central Ohio Valley Fort Ancient and Middle Tennessee Valley Mississippian people may indicate common origins or connections. Other pottery types found in deposits excavated at such western Fort Ancient sites as Madisonville and Devary, for their part, may reflect closer affiliations with more immediate neighbors (Maslowski 1984a and 1984b).

Small amounts of metal scraps, smelted copper and brass beads, cones, or animal effigy cutouts, iron knives, or glass beads have been found in all sites listed below. Most of these sites have been disturbed or destroyed. Intact deposits preserved at the nominated Clover site have high potential to reveal nationally significant information associated with this still incompletely understood period of late 16th-century Ohio Valley history.

Small amounts of European material have been found with Madisonville ceramics at a number of inventoried locales in and around the upper Ohio Valley. Most of these sites represent remains of large towns. Terminal Fort Ancient components at the Bentley site within the Lower Shawneetown site complex, for example, may provide insights into terminal Madisonville horizon town life in the heart of the Ohio Valley during the middle years of the 17th-century. Deposits preserved at the Snidow site may reveal new information on the influences of Fort Ancient culture on townlife in regions to the south of the Ohio Valley. Materials preserved at the Neale's Landing site, for their part, may further explicate presently poorly understood aspects of life in a small 17th-century Ohio Valley hamlet. Findings at all of these sites also may establish connections between Fort Ancient people and historically chronicled tribes.

James B. Griffin's 1943 monograph, which first described the Clover phase, remains the indispensable starting point for all investigators interested in Fort Ancient culture (Griffin 1943). Useful recent examinations of Madisonville horizon Fort Ancient culture include

Cowan (1986), Essenpreis (1978), Graybill (n.d.; 1981), Hanson (1966 and 1975), Henderson, Jobe, and Turnbow (1986), Henderson and Turnbow (1987), Maslowski (1984a), and Prufer and Shane (1970).

Inventoried archeological properties associated with the late prehistoric and protohistoric Fort Ancient Madisonville horizon include:

Site Name	Location	Date		National Register Source
Fox Farm	Mason Co, KY	1410-1630		Henderson, et al 1986; Smith 1910
Calumet Farm Burial	Fayette Co, KY	1500s		Henderson, et al 1986
Pyles	Lewisburg, KY	1500s		Funkhouser & Webb 1928; Henderson, et al 1986
15JS16	Jessamine Co, KY	1500s		Van Niewerburgh 1971
Marmet	Kanawha Co, WV	1500s		Barnett & Paxton 1955
Riker	Tuscarawas Co, OH	1500s		Vietzen 1974
Gue Farm	Cabell Co, WV	1500-1560		Maslowski 1984a
Devary	Clark Co, KY	1530-1650		Henderson, et al 1986; Turnbow, et al 1983
Clover	**Cabell Co, WV**	**1550-1600**		**Freidin 1987; Hughes & Niquette 1989**
Buffalo	Putnam Co, WV	1550-1600		Hanson 1975
Augusta	Augusta, KY	1550-1750		J. Hale 1981; Henderson, et al 1986; Pollack 1990
Goolman	Clark Co, KY	1550-1750		Henderson, et al 1986; Turnbow, et al 1983; Turnbow & Jobe 1984; Pollack 1990
Hardin	Greenup Co, KY	1550-1750		Hanson 1966; Henderson, et al 1986; Pollack 1990
Larkin	Paris, KY	1550-1750		Henderson, et al 1986; Pollack 1990
Madisonville	Madisonville, OH	1550-1750		Hooton & Willoughby 1920; Pollack 1990
Rolfe Lee	Point Pleasant vic, WV	1640		Graybill 1981; Youse 1965
Orchard	Mason Co, WV	1600s		Graybill 1981
Neale's Landing	Wood Co, WV	1640-1680		Graybill 1981; Hemmings 1977
Bentley	Greenup County, KY	1640-1690	+	Henderson 1990; Henderson, Jobe, & Turnbow 1986; Pollack 1990; Pollack & Henderson 1983 & 1984; Pollack, Hockensmith, & Sanders 1984
Snidow	Kegley, WV	1650-1690		Fuerst n.d.; Jones 1987
Logan	Logan, WV	1660		Maslowski 1984a

Significance and Thematic Representation

Clover site archeological resources meet National Historic Landmark Program significance criterion 6 by yielding or having the potential "to yield information of major scientific importance by revealing new cultures, or by shedding light upon periods of occupation over large areas of the United States" (35 CFR Part 65.4). Clover site deposits meet this criterion by yielding and having the potential to yield information of major scientific importance by shedding light upon a period of occupation, the Fort Ancient Period (A.D. 1000 to 1750), over a large area of the United States centering around the Middle Ohio River Valley regions of southern Ohio, northwestern West Virginia, northeastern Kentucky, and southeastern Indiana.

The SunWatch National Historic Landmark presently thematically represents earlier phases of Fort Ancient culture. Fort Ancient NHL, by contrast, almost entirely represents values documenting Middle Woodland Hopewellian culture. The Clover site represents the only property associated with late prehistoric and early protohistoric Madisonville horizon Fort Ancient culture currently being proposed for designation as a National Historic Landmark under Criterion 6.

Facet I.D.1.i: Native Adaptations to Northeastern Environments at Contact.

No currently designated National Historic Landmark represents this facet in the Northeast. Dating to the earliest period of protohistory, Clover site deposits contain information capable of providing new insights into presently poorly understood Fort Ancient lifeways as they existed at the earliest point of indirect contact in the Ohio River Valley. The survival of exceptionally well preserved intact village deposits at Clover represents a unique opportunity to more fully understand protohistoric Fort Ancient intra-site village organization, demography, socio-political life, and technology during this poorly known initial phase of cultural contact.

Facet I.D.2: Establishing Intercultural Relations.

No National Historic Landmark property presently documents the roles of Fort Ancient people in establishing intercultural relations in the mid-Ohio region during the late 16th-century. Clover site resources thus have the potential to yield nationally significant information associated with each of the below listed sub-facets associated with this facet:

Sub-Facet I.D.2.i: Trade Relationships

The Clover site assemblage contains artifactual evidence of indirect trade relationships. Exotic lithics, small amounts of "foreign" aboriginal ceramics, and shell beads and gorgets associated with Indian people living to the south and east, for example, testify to continuing Woodland era economic ties with other tribesfolk. Discovery of glass beads, smelted metal scraps, and copper or brass beads, cones, effigies, and other objects made from metals of possible European origin have the potential to document initial stages of trade relations between Fort Ancient people and other Indian people during the final decades of the 16th-century and the first years of the 1600s.

Sub-Facet I.D.2.e: Defending Native Homelands
Sub-Facet I.D.2.h: New Native Military Alliances

Studies examining types and frequencies of triangular chipped stone projectile points, analyzing pecked stone axes and celts, or focusing upon determining the presence or absence of stockade walls at Clover have the potential to yield significant new information on Madisonville horizon military affairs. Further analyses of cordage impression twist directions and other ceramic attributes also may reveal important data on terminal Fort Ancient Madisonville horizon alliance systems.

Sub-Facet I.D.2.f: Defending Native Religious Systems

Discovery of extended burials, bundle bone interments, and disturbed secondary inhumations have the potential to yield significant new information associated with terminal Fort Ancient spiritual beliefs and practices. Analyses of engraved shell gorgets, cannel coal pendants, ceramic and metal effigies, and other objects found at Clover may provide further insights into poorly understood aspects of Madisonville horizon spiritual and symbolic systems.

Facet I.D.3: Varieties of Early Conflict, Conquest, or Accommodation.

Sub-Facet I.D.3.a: Transfer of Technology to Native People

Discovery of glass beads and copper or brass beads, cones, effigies, and scrap of possible European origin at Clover can potentially more fully explicate presently poorly understood aspects of technological transfer of European manufactures to Indian people not in direct contact with Europeans.

Sub-Facet I.D.3.b: Forced and Voluntary Population Movements
Sub-Facet I.D.3.c: The New Demographics
Sub-Facet I.D.3.d: Changing Settlement Types

Distinctive aspects of the Clover artifact assemblage, such as the prevalence of Z-twist direction cordage, the presence of ceramic effigies, and the eastward orientation of burials, have the potential to provide significant data capable of distinguishing social or ethnic identities of site occupants. Such data may also reveal new information bearing upon still poorly known aspects of relations between people living in and around the Ohio River Valley during late prehistoric and protohistoric times.

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Key Citations

Adams, John J.
1960 "A Fluted Point from Cabell County, West Virginia." West Virginia Archaeologist 12:24-25.

Adams, John J. and S.F. Durrett
1952 "Fort Ancient(?) Art in Cabell and Mason Counties." West Virginia Archaeologist 5:24.

Barnett, R.E. and C.L. Paxton
1955 "Notes on Glass and Shell Beads from 46KA9 (Marmet)." West Virginia Archaeologist 7:31-33.

Brashler, Janet C. and Ronald W. Moxley
1990 "Late Prehistoric Engraved Shell Gorgets of West Virginia." West Virginia Archeologist 42(1):1-10.

Carr, Christopher G. and Robert F. Maslowski
1991 "Cordage and Fabrics: The Relationships Between Form, Technology, and Social Processes." in Style, Society, and Person, edited by Christopher G. Carr and Jill Neitzel. Cambridge University Press, New York, N.Y. In Press.

Cowan, C. Wesley
1986 Fort Ancient Chronology and Settlement Evaluation in the Great Miami Valley. 2 vols. Unpublished Manuscript on File, Ohio Historic Preservation Office, Columbus, Oh.

Essenpreis, Patricia S.
1978 "Fort Ancient Settlement: Differential Response at a Mississippian-Late Woodland Interface." in Mississippian Settlement Patterns, edited by Bruce D. Smith, pp. 141-167. Academic Press, New York, N.Y.

Freidin, Nicholas
1987 Report on the Investigations at Clover (46-Cb-40), West Virginia, by the Marshall University Archaeological Field School. Unpublished Report on File in the State Historic Preservation Office, Charlestown, W.Va.
1991 Personal Communication.

Fuerst, David N.
n.d. Late Prehistory of the Bluestone River Valley, A.D. 1000-1600. Manuscript in Preparation.

Funkhouser, William D. and William S. Webb
1928 Ancient Life in Kentucky. Geological Report 34 (6th Series). Kentucky Geological Survey, Frankfort, Ky.

Graybill, Jeffrey R.
n.d. Fort Ancient-Madisonville Horizon: Protohistoric Archeology in the Middle Ohio Valley. Unpublished Manuscript in the Author's Possession.
1981 The Eastern Periphery of Fort Ancient (A.D. 1050-1650): A Diachronic Approach to Settlement Variability. Ph.D Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Washington, Seattle, Wa.

Griffin, James B.
1943 The Fort Ancient Aspect, Its Cultural and Chronological Position in Mississippian Archaeology. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, Mich.
1978 "Late Prehistory of the Ohio Valley." in Handbook of North American Indians 15: Northeast, edited by Bruce G. Trigger, pp. 547-559. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Hale, John R.
1981 A Fort Ancient Village at Augusta, Kentucky. Report on file, Office of State Archaeology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

Hanson, Lee H., Jr.
1966 The Hardin Village Site. Studies in Anthropology 4. University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, Ky.
1975 The Buffalo Site--- A Late 17th-century Indian Village Site (46PU31) in Putnam County, West Virginia. Report of Archeological Investigations, No. 5. West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey, Morgantown, W.V.

Hemmings, E. Thomas
1977 Neale's Landing: An Archeological Study of a Fort Ancient Settlement on Blennerhasset Island, West Virginia (Pre-liminary). Manuscript on file, West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey, Morgantown, W.V.

Henderson, A. Gwynn, editor
1990 Continuity and Change: Fort Ancient Cultural Dynamics in Northeastern Kentucky. Report on File, Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort, Ky.

Henderson, A. Gwynn, Cynthia E. Jobe, and Christopher A. Turnbow
1986 Indian Occupation and Use in Northern and Eastern Kentucky during the Contact Period (1540-1795): An Initial Investigation. Report on file, Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort, Ky.

Henderson, A. Gwynn and Christopher A. Turnbow
1987 "Fort Ancient Developments in Northeastern Kentucky." in Current Archaeological Research in Kentucky, Volume One, edited by David Pollack, pp. 205-224. Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort, Ky.

Hooton, Earnest A. and Charles C. Willoughby
1920 "Indian Village Site and Cemetery near Madisonville, Ohio." Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 8(1).

Hughes, Myra A. and Charles M. Niquette, Editors
1989 A National Register Evaluation of the Jenkins House Site and a Phase One Inventory of Archeological Sites in the Gallipolis Mitigation Site at Greenbottom, Cabell County, West Virginia (Final Report). Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc., Lexington, Ky.

Jones, Emory E., Jr.
1987 "Archeological Investigations at the Snidow Site (46MC1), Mercer County, West Virginia." West Virginia Archeologist 39(1):1-20.

Latta, Martha A.
1987 "Iroquoian Stemware." American Antiquity 52(4):717-724.
1990 "The Stem of the Matter: Reply to Ramsden and Fitzgerald." American Antiquity 55(1):162-165.

Maslowski, Robert F.
1984a "Protohistoric Villages in Southern West Virginia." in Upland Archeology in the East, Symposium 2, edited by Michael B. Barber, pp. 148-165. Cultural Resources Report 5. USDA Forest Service, Southern Region, Atlanta, Ga.
1984b "The Significance of Cordage Attribute in the Analysis of Woodland Pottery." Pennsylvania Archaeologist 54 (1-2):51-60.
1991 Personal Communication.

Mayer-Oakes, William J.
1955 "Prehistory of the Upper Ohio Valley." Annals of the Carnegie Museum 34. Pittsburgh, Penn.

Maynard, Angela D.
1989a Lithic Analysis of Clover Artifacts. Unpublished Manuscript on File in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Marshall University, Huntington, W.Wa.
1989b Lithic Analysis of Clover Triangular Points. Unpublished Manuscript on File in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Marshall University, Huntington, W.Wa.

McMichael, E.V.
1960 "Another 'Pottery Pestle' from the Waterworks Site, Hamilton County, Ohio." West Virginia Archaeologist 12:17-21.

Pollack, David
1990 Personal Communication.

Pollack, David and A. Gwynn Henderson
1983 Contact Period Developments in the Middle Ohio Valley. Paper Presented at the 48th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Pittsburgh, Penn.
1984 "A Mid-Eighteenth Century Historic Indian Occupation in Greenup County, Kentucky." in Late Prehistoric Research in Kentucky, edited by David Pollack, et al., pp. 1-24. Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort, Ky.

Pollack, David, Charles D. Hockensmith, and Thomas N. Sanders, editors
1984 Late Prehistoric Research in Kentucky. Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort, Ky.

Prufer, Olaf H. and Orrin C. Shane, III
1970 Blain Village and the Fort Ancient Tradition in Ohio. Kent State University Press, Kent, Oh.

Smith, Harlan Ingersoll
1910 "The Prehistoric Ethnology of a Kentucky Site." Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 6(2):173-234.

Turnbow, Christopher A. and Cynthia Jobe
1984 "The Goolman Site: A Late Fort Ancient Winter Encampment in Clark County, Kentucky." in Late Prehistoric Research in Kentucky, edited by David Pollack, Charles Hockensmith, and Thomas Sanders, pp. 25-49. Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort, Ky.

Turnbow, Christopher A., Cynthia Jobe, Nancy O'Malley, Dee Ann Wymer, Michelle Seme, and Irwin Rovner
1983 Archaeological Excavations of the Goolman, Devary, and Stone Sites in Clark County, Kentucky. Archaeological Report 78. Department of Anthropology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1990 Green Bottom Wildlife Management Area Historic Preservation Management Plan. Unpublished Report on File in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, Huntington, W.Va.

Van Niewerburgh, Paul
1971 Salvage Excavations at JS16. Manuscript on file, Office of State Archaeology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

Vietzen, R.C.
1974 The Riker Site. Archaeological Society of Ohio.

Voegelin, Erminie W.
1944 "Mortuary Customs of the Shawnee and Other Eastern Tribes." Prehistory Research Series 2(4). Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis, Ind.

Wilkins, G.R.
1974 Archeological Survey and Test Excavations in Cabell County, West Virginia. Unpublished Report on File, West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey, Archaeology Section, Morgantown, W.Va.

Youse, Hillis J.
1965 "Excavation at Rolf Lee Farm Site 46-Ms-51." West Virginia Archeologist 18:15-24.

PREVIOUS DOCUMENTATION ON FILE (NPS):

___ Preliminary Determination of Individual Listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
___ Previously Listed in the National Register.
___ Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
___ Designated a National Historic Landmark.
___ Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: #_____
___ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: #_____

PRIMARY LOCATION OF ADDITIONAL DATA:

___ State Historic Preservation Office
___ Other State Agency
___ Federal Agency
___ Local Government
X University: **Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia**
X Other: Specify Repository: **Huntington Museum of Art, Huntington, West Virginia**

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: 11 (eleven) acres

UTM References: Zone Northing Easting Zone Northing Easting

A [redacted] B [redacted]
C D

VERBAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION:

[redacted]

BOUNDARY JUSTIFICATION:

Distributions of features, midden deposits, and shell tempered pottery associated with the terminal Fort Ancient Madisonville horizon revealed during test excavations, electrical resistivity surveys, strip plowing of sample transect areas, and intensive surface reconnaissance conducted by Marshall University investigators between 1984 and 1989 justify site boundaries as described above. This area includes archeological deposits located within the main village area and a deflated area immediately beyond the village perimeter containing scattered sherds of Madisonville horizon ceramics and other materials.

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Prepared by: Robert F. Maslowski, Archeologist
US Army Corps of Engineers
Huntington District
502 Eighth Street
Huntington, West Virginia 25701
Telephone: (304) 529-5712

Edited by: Robert S. Grumet, Archeologist
Cultural Resources/Planning Branch
NPS/Mid-Atlantic Regional Office
US Custom House, Room 251
Second & Chestnut Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
Telephone: (215) 597-2337

Date: November 16, 1991