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5. Classification
Ownership of Property
(Click as many boxes as apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category of Property (Check only one box)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td>building(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public - Local</td>
<td>district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public - State</td>
<td>site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public - Federal</td>
<td>structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing buildings</th>
<th>Noncontributing sites</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

The Woodland Tradition in Minnesota (ca. 1000 B.C. - A.D. 1750)
Precontact American Indian Earthworks, 500 B.C. - A.D. 1650

6. Function or Use
Historic Functions

FUNERARY: graves/burials: burial mounds
OTHER: antiquarian excavation area

Current Functions
RECREATION: Outdoor Recreation: park

7. Description
Architectural Classification

Materials

foundation: Earth
walls:
roof:
other: Earth, stone
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Narrative Description

Summary

The Indian Mounds Park archaeological site (21RA10) consists of six burial mounds on a 200-foot-high bluff in St. Paul overlooking a dramatic bend in the Mississippi River, surrounded by an archaeological area that once contained as many as thirteen additional earthworks. Sacred earthworks were initially built here sometime around 200 B.C. and were used for centuries as a traditional place of burial. The people of the nearby Dakota village Kaposia maintained a close association to the site even after they were relocated by the U.S. Government beginning in 1837. In 1856, the first documented archaeological excavation in Minnesota took place at the site. Between 1866 and 1883, sixteen of the mounds, then known as the “Suburban Hills Group,” were partially excavated in antiquarian investigations. The City of St. Paul began the process of purchasing the land for a 17-acre park at the site in 1890 to protect both the spectacular view and dramatic historical setting. The development of the park impacted all of the smaller mounds at this site while protecting the largest six mounds. The Indian Mounds Park site now preserves within a publicly owned park setting the only remaining burial mounds in St. Paul and Minneapolis, the core cities of the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The site is also significant in that it has provided the sole archaeological example of a distinctly Hopewell burial pattern in Minnesota and is the site of the most focused antiquarian archaeology in Minnesota. In 1982, the Indian Mounds Park site was recommended eligible in a letter from the Minnesota SHPO and determined eligible by the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places.

Location

The Indian Mounds Park site is a roughly linear group of earthworks positioned along the steep edge of Dayton’s Bluff, more than 200 feet above the Mississippi River floodplain in the S¼, NE¼, Section 4, T28N R22W (Map 1). Away from the bluff, the northern side of the site is bounded by Mounds Boulevard and a 1917 park pavilion building (Map 2). The mounds were built on the highest projecting point of the bluff edge where the Mississippi River turns from east to south, offering a commanding view both up and down the valley. The landform itself and the earthworks are prominent landmarks as viewed both from the bluff top as well as from the river below.

The Indian Mounds Park earthworks were recorded as “the Suburban Hills Group” of mounds in the first survey made in 1862 (Hill and Wallace 1866, Lewis 1881-1889: Notebook 1:56). In a later publication, Theodore Lewis referred to the site as “the group located at the lower end of Dayton’s Bluff,” with “lower” apparently referring to distance downriver from St. Paul and not altitude (Lewis 1896a: 314). After the first 17-acre land purchase by the St. Paul Park Department surrounding the central group of Mounds 1 to 12 at 21RA10 was made, the site became known simply as Indian Mounds Park, or the Mounds Park group.

Just a half mile northwest on Mounds Boulevard toward downtown St. Paul was the “Upper Group” of 19 burial mounds on Dayton’s Bluff, all of which were apparently destroyed by street grading, quarrying, and development before the area was brought within the boundaries of the park. 21RA5 was referred to in the first survey as “Dayton’s Bluff” (Lewis 1881-1889: Notebook 1:51). Confusion between 21RA10 (Suburban Hill or the “Lower Group”) and 21RA5 (“Upper Group”) has persisted as they are both historically-known mound groups on Dayton’s Bluff, and now both fall within Indian Mounds Park. This nomination is for site 21RA10.

Environment

Most of the Twin Cities is built atop a 30-foot-thick sheath of Platteville limestone that overlies 160 feet of St. Peter sandstone, which is softer and erodes easily. At the end of the last ice age, about 12,000 years ago, glacial meltwater created a massive falls that carved the huge, sharp-walled and broad-based valley where the Mississippi River now winds through St. Paul. Where the limestone was exposed along the bluff sides, it was mined for building materials in the historic era, and by the 1880s the upper mound group (21RA5) at Dayton’s Bluff was partially “demolished in order to strip the ledge for quarrying purposes” (Mossler and Bloomgren 1992, Lewis 1896a).

Soils in the site area are Kingsley sandy loams. These increase in grain size at greater depths, trending toward coarser sands and gravels. These gravel-based natural ridges likely served as the basis for mound construction (http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx, De Montreville 1866). At the base of the bluff below the site, a wider variety of soils have formed on different terraces deposited by river outwash. Mucky wetland soils developed on either side of the Mississippi River, where old meanders and oxbows filled with marshes and shallow lakes, such as Pig’s Eye Lake. At the western base of the bluff, Trout Brook and Phalen Creek flowed together and then into the Mississippi River, exposing and redepositing gravel and sand.
The St. Peter sandstone was also eroded by smaller tributaries to the Mississippi River, and water that percolated through the limestone carved underground channels exiting through caves at the bluff’s base. The Upper Mound Group (21RA5) was built just above one such cave, Carver’s Cave, which was used as a place of sacred gathering for the Dakota over hundreds of years (Terrell 2003; Carver 1799, Woolworth 1981).

When the area was first surveyed in the 1840s, the well-drained bluff top was dominated by a mixture of oaks mixed with other deciduous trees and scattered white pine, while the river bottoms had cottonwoods, ash, elm, basswood, maples, ironwood, willow, aspen, hackberry, and wild river grape (Woolworth 1981, Marschner 1930). In the early historic period, artistic depictions showed the upland vegetation as oak savanna, although most of the trees had been cut down by the late 19th century (Woolworth 1981). The diversity of water sources—creeks, lakes, marshes, and a large river—produced a variety of riverine and lacustrine systems rich with food sources, such as mussels, fish, ducks, geese, muskrat, and wild rice. The mature woods and open river bottom provided cover for mammals such as deer, bear, and rabbit (Woolworth 1981:12).

Physical Setting
The mounds of 21RA10 are located between the bluff edge and Mounds Boulevard. The view into the Mississippi River floodplain from Indian Mounds Park is now largely urban and industrial, dominated by train tracks, roads, highways, and the downtown core. Holman Field (St. Paul Downtown Airport) is visible just across the river built on the filled flood zone. Yet the view is still dominated by the Mississippi River and framed by wooded bluffs. Currently the steep bluff edge is covered with trees and brush and the park is planted in turf grass with scattered mature trees. Curvilinear concrete paths wind around the mounds to scenic overlooks. Just south of Mounds Boulevard a double sidewalk cuts through an open inter-mound area and then connects to the curved walkway. Two park benches face each other on either side of the sidewalk and a black metal interpretive sign stands next to the park benches (Map 2).

In preparation of this nomination, high-resolution topographic mapping was compared with 19th century maps to assess the condition of the mound group. Topographic maps of the mound group and its environs were constructed using data from the Minnesota Statewide LiDAR survey using both contour and hillshade imagery. This provided both precise metrics for existing mounds and other surface features, and a basis for intuitive interpretation of the historic landscape (Map 3).

The extant mounds are in two clusters. On the far eastern side are two brush-covered mounds. A low limestone retaining wall topped with iron fencing protects the mounds on the park side and blocks access to a narrow former path on the southern bluff edge. Just east of these mounds, in the location of former Mound 1, an overlook is built on fill supported by a retaining wall (Map 2). Moving 55 meters northwest, the second group of four mounds is separated into two groups of two by a walkway. Each group is enclosed by black iron fencing erected in 1989-1990. On the southern side of these mounds, a 5-foot-wide cement walkway has a limestone masonry knee wall supported by a retaining wall from 3 feet high on the east to 6 feet tall where it supports an overlook at the southeast side of Mound 10, on or near the former location of Mound 11. On the slope below the functioning retaining wall are the ruins of a previous limestone retaining wall at a lower elevation. The retaining walls and LiDAR elevation maps indicate that at least two broad roadways were once built on fill and supported by retaining walls that were constructed in two phases on the southern, bluff side of the mounds (Map 3). The roadways were removed in the 1980s and converted into paved walkways.

Seventy-five feet west of the westernmost earthwork, Mound 12, is the Airport Rotating Beacon and Tower built in 1929 and determined eligible for the NRHP in 1992 (Vogel 1992). The tower is built on former Lot 30 of Block 17, a lot that has been leveled by cutting on the mound side and extensive filling on the south and western side. On the north side of the site is Mounds Boulevard, which was moved to its present location around 1909 to relieve congestion within the park. The extant park pavilion was built in 1917.

Period of significance
Indian Mounds Park mound group (21RA10) is broadly associated with the Middle Woodland Tradition and more particularly the Havana-Related/Hopewell Complex, 200 B.C.-A.D. 300 (Arzigian 2012:35). The archaeology indicates that use of the site likely continued into the Early Historic Period (A.D. 1700-1830).
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The Burial Mounds at Indian Mounds Park

Of the nineteen mounds that were surveyed in the 19th century at 21RA10, above ground expressions of six remain: Mound 2, Mound 3, Mound 7, Mound 8, Mound 9, Mound 10, and Mound 12 (Map 3). The table below summarizes the mounds at 21RA10. Historic heights are from excavation reports (Arzigian and Stevenson 2003) and modern heights were calculated from topographic maps created from the LiDAR data. Modern heights were figures from the nearby base to the summit and not from a site-wide base elevation. It is not clear how historic elevations were made. In this document, measurements are reported in the system they were made in, whether English, Engineers (tenths of feet), or Metric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mound Number</th>
<th>Hill &amp; Wallace Number</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Current Height</th>
<th>Historic Height</th>
<th>Current Diameter</th>
<th>Historic Diameter</th>
<th>19th Century Excavation/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>leveled ca. 1897, under concrete slab</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23 ft</td>
<td>Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>extant and intact</td>
<td>11 ft</td>
<td>not recorded</td>
<td>70 ft</td>
<td>not recorded</td>
<td>no excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>extant</td>
<td>7.5 ft</td>
<td>10 ft</td>
<td>66 ft</td>
<td>60 ft</td>
<td>De Montreville 1867, Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>leveled ca. 1897 geophysical evidence of associated anomalies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.5 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>28 ft with &quot;approach&quot;</td>
<td>Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>leveled ca. 1897 geophysical evidence of associated anomalies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ca. 4 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a possible approach</td>
<td>De Montreville 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>leveled ca. 1897; Goltz (1988) coring identified intact mound fill next to retaining wall</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>18 ft</td>
<td>Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>extant</td>
<td>9.8 ft</td>
<td>11.5 ft</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70 ft</td>
<td>Lewis and Gross 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>leveled ca. 1895</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.5 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>42 × 28 ft</td>
<td>Hill and Kelly 1866, 1895 landscaping crew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>minimal excavations to deep levels</td>
<td>12 ft</td>
<td>15-18 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>70 ft</td>
<td>Neill 1856, Hill and Kelly 1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>extant</td>
<td>6.5 ft</td>
<td>8 ft</td>
<td>42 ft</td>
<td>46 ft</td>
<td>Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>leveled ca. 1897 subsurface appears intact under western overlook and on bluff</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.5 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td>Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>extant</td>
<td>8 ft</td>
<td>8.5 ft</td>
<td>54 ft</td>
<td>52 ft</td>
<td>Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>leveled ca. 1911?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>leveled ca. 1901</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>36 ft</td>
<td>Lewis 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>filled over ca. 1901; Harrison (1994) may have documented partial mound subsurface under fill</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.5 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Lewis 1882, Harrison 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>destroyed ca. 1901?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.5 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Lewis 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>leveled ca. 1901? shown as contiguous to Mound 13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.5 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>destroyed ca. 1880 street grading pavilion construction</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no number</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>shown in field sketch between Mounds 15 and 16, leveled ca. 1901</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Lewis 1882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As a group, Indian Mounds Park had some of the highest mounds in Minnesota, with four mounds (Mounds 2, 3, 7 and 9) measuring more than 10 feet in height and five with heights of more than 4.5 feet.

As the table above shows, the extant mounds were primarily those that were at least 5 feet in height in the 1880s. The most indistinct mounds, not mapped by first survey team in 1862, were generally those that were at the periphery of the site or less than 1.5 feet in height. These mounds also became casualties of site development.

19th Century Investigations

The first excavation at 21RA10 was made in 1856 at Mound 9 by the missionary, educator, and historian Edward Duffield Neill. The first survey of the site, made by Alfred J. Hill and William Wallace on May 7, 1862, identified twelve mounds. Bearings and measurements were taken but heights were not recorded (Lewis 1881-1889: Notebook 1:51). The first sketch map was made in the reporting of excavations in 1867 (De Montreville 1867). This map showed 13 mounds but only numbered those recorded by the Hill and Wallace survey, excluding what became Mound 1. Around 1884, T.H. Lewis used these notes to complete the survey of the mounds’ dimensions, adding six smaller mounds to the survey (Lewis 1881-1889: Notebook 1:51, Lewis 1896a). Unfortunately, Lewis did not retain the original numbering system, probably because he started numbering the easternmost earthwork as Mound 1. His original survey drawings show eighteen mounds, one destroyed (Lewis 1881-1889: Notebook 1:52-53). These records are used to identify the locations of the original mounds, but they do not perfectly agree with later published maps. Lewis’s notes appear to have been removed from his notebook, while Hill and Wallace’s were copied in. Thus, no height measurements survive for all the mounds at the time of the Lewis survey. Winchell published a version of the Lewis map, eliminating Mound 17 and an elliptical approach to Mound 5. Because the Lewis numbers are more complete and have been used in the published materials of the site (Lewis 1896a, Winchell 1911: 262, Stevenson and Arzigian 2003: 473-477), they are used in this document. Of the eighteen mounds, fifteen were conical, two (Mounds 13 and 4) had contiguous features, and one (Mound 8) was oval.

In the 1860s, antiquarian investigations were initiated at the Suburban Hills Group by members of the Minnesota Historical Society Archaeological Committee. On May 19, 1866, Alfred Hill and William Kelley excavated part of Mound 8 themselves; on June 8, they oversaw limited excavations of Mound 9. The next year, on July 2, 1867, C. De Montreville oversaw the excavation of an indistinct Mound 5 and made a vertical shaft into Mound 3 (De Montreville 1867). The committee disbanded in 1873 (Gibbon and Anfinson n.d.), and the next excavations were made by T.H. Lewis between 1879-1883 (Lewis 1896a). These 19th century mound excavations were one-day events of limited extent.

Although archaeological excavation of the mounds ceased in the late 1880s, around the time that Indian Mounds Park was established, archaeological studies of the area surrounding the mounds were conducted in the late twentieth century for cultural resources compliance projects completed by Woolworth (1981), Anfinson (1981), and Harrison (1994), as well as coring performed by Goltz (1988) and the Office of the State Archaeologist (1995).

Park Development

Antiquarian excavations between 1856 and 1883 preserved information regarding the burial mounds, but also made intrusive trenches through portions of all but Mound 2. In mounds that were excavated a second time by antiquarians, archaeological materials were still abundant, indicating that their trenches were limited and material integrity was not substantially affected (Lewis 1896a). Antiquarian excavations at Indian Mounds Park ceased in 1883, and the City of St. Paul began buying land at the core of the site in 1892 (City of Saint Paul Board of Park Commissioners 1888).

Before the site was purchased as a park, the area was platted as a city subdivision, lots were staked, and some streets were graded. Although the street and sidewalk right-of-way was platted on the northern side of Mound 9, historic photos show that the street itself never extended onto the mound (Figure 3). After angling from the northwest to just north of Mound 9, the street turned due east, extending to where the pavilion was later built. Mound 18, at the original intersection of Mounds Boulevard and Earl Street, now under the southeast corner of the pavilion, was destroyed by street development sometime before the 1880s.

Block 17, Lots 30-38 of the Suburban Hills addition, was purchased in 1893, and in 1897 a landscaping and tree-planting program transformed the 17 acres into a park. Inclusion in the city park protected the site from further development and
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archaeological excavation, but landscaping projects and increased traffic introduced additional impacts. Over the next 84 years, a series of plans were created and executed that provided access to the mound area and bluff overlook.

There had always been a tension between the desires to improve the view, which the mounds sometimes blocked, and to protect one of the most "romantic and historic spots on the face of the green earth...the old Indian mound property which has borne to us the most delightful legends" (St. Paul Daily Globe, 6/1/1899:4). Apparently, the romantic imagination was most inspired by the largest mounds, and those less than a yard high were graded down or filled over to open the panorama and to create level surroundings to enhance the remaining mounds.

Between 1897 and 1899, the area between Mounds 1 and Mound 12 was leveled and filled in with 1,414 cubic yards of loam and winding gravel paths were laid around all sides of the mounds (St. Paul Park Department Annual Report 1898-1899: 30). This process either removed and/or obscured the above grade remains of those mounds in the original park that had historic heights of less than 4 feet: Mounds 1, 4, 5, 6, and 11. Most likely, the mound fill was pushed into small drainages that originally separated the mound groups, especially between Mounds 4, 5, and 6. Some controlled excavations had taken place in all of these mounds by antiquarians before they were leveled (Hill and Kelley 1866, De Montreville 1867, Lewis 1896a, 1896b) and the documentation was synthesized by later researchers (Arzigian and Stevenson 2003).

Between 1897 and 1899, the area between Mounds 1 and Mound 12 was leveled and filled in with 1,414 cubic yards of loam and winding gravel paths were laid around all sides of the mounds (St. Paul Park Department Annual Report 1898-1899: 30). This process either removed and/or obscured the above grade remains of those mounds in the original park that had historic heights of less than 4 feet: Mounds 1, 4, 5, 6, and 11. Most likely, the mound fill was pushed into small drainages that originally separated the mound groups, especially between Mounds 4, 5, and 6. Some controlled excavations had taken place in all of these mounds by antiquarians before they were leveled (Hill and Kelley 1866, De Montreville 1867, Lewis 1896a, 1896b) and the documentation was synthesized by later researchers (Arzigian and Stevenson 2003).

The area of Mounds 4 and 5 was transformed into a level lawn. Mounds 6 and 11, two low mounds perched on the far southern side of the site, appear to have been separated from the core of the site by walkways on the bluff edge. A turn-of-the-century postcard appears to show the remains of Mound 6 on the southern side of an early walkway (Figure 4). The Park Department also installed 1,200 feet of water pipes and planted 285 trees before 1900 (Board of Park Commissioners 1898-1899).

In order to gain a better view, paths eventually wound up to the top of Mounds 2 and 7, resulting in additional surface damage. Numerous photos document the gradual effects of foot traffic on paths that wound up the mounds. The effects of erosion necessitated superficial filling and replanting of grass in the 1920s and 1930s.

In 1900-1901, lots on the western side of the park were purchased bringing Mounds 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 into the park boundary (Saint Paul Park Department 1903). The lots had to be acquired through condemnation as they were held at exorbitant prices with no valid title (BPC 1901: 7). On this side of the park, the natural surface sloped down to the northwest so that the base of Mound 15 was probably at an elevation of at least 7 feet lower than that of Mound 7 located at the site center (St. Paul Sewer Strip Map 1922). These mounds were probably less dramatic and only Mound 13 could currently be identified in a historic photo (Figure 5). Mound 17, as mapped, would have been on the bluff slope or next to Mound 13.

In the early 20th century, Indian Mounds Park became a major tourist attraction in St. Paul, bringing hundreds of thousands of visitors. To accommodate more sightseers, who increasingly came by bicycles, carriages and then cars, circulation features were expanded in size, especially on the bluff side of the site. Historical images and examination of retaining walls indicate that through time, the walkways were built up in at least two major building events. Fill was brought in and held in place with limestone retaining walls to support pathways built up along the former bluff edge between the mounds and the steep slope, and appears to cover lower levels of Mounds 1, 6, and 11. By the mid-twentieth century, the path was transformed into a roadway and parking lot.

The 1903-1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows a park pavilion roughly 250 feet west of Lot 29, in Lot 30 near the northern side of Mound 15. This initial pavilion is possibly the lavatory building mentioned in the 1898 Board of Park Commissioners report and is visible in a 1911 postcard (Figure 5). The pavilion was likely built on fill (including mound fill), as the lot sloped from a high elevation on the northeast side down to the southwest. It is suspected to have burned sometime after 1911. After that event, the lot appears to have been filled on the low (southwest) side and cut on the higher (northeast) elevation. By 1923, aerial photography shows Lot 30 as a level tennis or sport court built on fill (Wirth Miller and Williams 1923). The airmail beacon was then constructed on the earthen platform in 1929 (Vogel 1992).

Evidence of filling on the park pavilion lot indicates that remnants of Mounds 13, 14, and especially 15 could still exist, a supposition supported by soil coring performed on site (Goltz 1988) and excavation around the air mail beacon tower
In 1987, the St. Paul Winter Carnival medallion was hidden somewhere in the park encouraging treasure hunters to dig in the mound area. In response to this and other desecrations, the mounds were fenced off in 1990. Archaeologists monitored the excavation of post holes for human remains (OSA Site File). The same year, the repatriated remains of 61 Native Americans were reburied in a mound at Indian Mounds Park, probably within rehabilitated levels. No documentation of which mound was used, or the extent of the reburial, could be located in site files, but it was likely Mound 9.

**20th Century Archaeological Investigations**

In response to proposed reconstruction of Mounds Boulevard and the Park, archaeological investigations were resumed in 1981 after a 98-year hiatus (Anfinson 1981, Woolworth 1981). This project moved the road and parking lots away from the mounds and off the bluff edge, to somewhat restore the natural setting (Woolworth 1981). The Woolworth study excavated five 50×50 cm square test units at “specific locations which coincided with future land disturbances” within the present project area (Woolworth 1981). All were negative, and specific soil profile results were not reported.

Also in 1981, the Municipal-County Highway Archaeological Reconnaissance Study excavated two test units within the site boundary (Anfinson 1982). In a still-visible unit next to the former edge of Mound 8, historic fill was recorded in the upper 20 cm below surface (cmbs). Non-diagnostic lithic flakes were recovered in the 30-40 cmbs and at 50-60 cmbs, but could not be linked to any particular feature, culture, or era (Anfinson 1982: 47). Another unit excavated “300 ft SE of Mound 9 and 100ft N of Mound 3” had a roughly natural soil profile although an iron pipe trench containing historic materials cut through one side of the unit. A non-diagnostic lithic flake was recovered in each of levels 4 (30-40 cmbs) and 5 (50-60 cmbs). Anfinson (1982: 47) felt that the area south of the pavilion “contains some relatively undisturbed areas,” but the limited testing did not allow for more specific spatial analysis.

The last archaeological study made in the 20th century was completed by Christina Harrison (1994) in response to proposed rehabilitation of the airport rotating beacon footings. Because map evidence shows that the northwest corner of the beacon footings fall within the area of the western quarter of Mound 15, the investigation sought to determine whether there was evidence of mound fill within the footings area. Most of the excavation units had extensive evidence of historic materials used to level the site. Harrison also recorded a possible interface between historic fill and a “more consolidated mound fill” at 30 cmbs in the unit profiles that she interpreted as possible remains of Mound 15 buried under fill (Harrison 1994: 17). From the notes and photographs, it appears that a corner of the “mound fill” was excavated, uncovering a limestone block feature that was pedestaled but not removed as it was within the unit profile. The stone feature appears to be cut limestone block footings that were covered with fill. The interface between two different kinds of fill could be a contrast between the initial fill and builder’s trenches around the beacon footings that were refilled after the concrete was poured. In summary, the results of the Harrison investigation show that the terrace at the beacon was mostly built from historic fill, likely from at least two episodes. “There is also compelling evidence that the northeastern edge of the terrace was cut into the side of the lower portion of Mound 15 and that undisturbed mound fill appears to extend to within a couple of feet/approximately half a meter of the [eastern] tower footing” (Harrison 1994: 21, 28). No precontact artifacts with a clear association to intact levels were recovered. Even if the archaeological evidence of an intact mound within the fill is ambiguous, maps and the archaeology attest that well over a yard of fill exists on the western side of former Lot 30 in the vicinity of former Mound 15, potentially preserving some elements especially as features found here were buried at a depth of 2.5 feet (Arzigian and Stevenson 2003: 307).

Monitoring performed by the Office of the State Archaeologist of a trench dug for an electrical line found a similar pattern to Harrison’s study. The lower elevation segment of the trench north of Mound 16 and trending upslope to the southwest corner of the beacon showed an abrupt contact between the top 15 cm of loamy topsoil and the lower natural subsoils, indicating “that the top soil had been removed and then replaced for landscaping purposes” (Koenen 1995). At the filled and leveled platform, the trencher turned up demolition debris, including “bricks, limestone chunks, glass, wire and nails. Some of the material has been burned” (ibid). The fill with historic debris went to the depth limits of the trench excavation at 90 cm. These results correspond with the findings of Harrison that the area of Mound 15 is covered with extensive fill and preserves the demolition debris of a burned building, likely the first park pavilion.
Geophysical Testing

As part of this nomination, a geophysical survey of the intermound areas was undertaken in 2012 to determine the impacts, intrusive elements, and possible areas of archaeological potential within two areas of the mound site. Subsurface mapping was based on surveys with three different geophysical methods: ground-penetrating radar, electrical resistance, and magnetic gradiometry (Jones and Maki 2013).

The geophysical surveys were performed over two grids totaling 2,400 square meters. The locations of several former mounds and intermound areas were covered. Subsurface mapping with each of the instruments showed patterning relative to archaeological interpretation of the site (Figures 1 and 2).

The geophysical data show that the greatest impact to the site outside the extant mounds is directly associated with undocumented utility trenching south of the original 19th century alignment of Mound Street (Figure 1). All testing methods, even those that are not responsive to magnetic materials, revealed a pattern of trenches trending diagonally across the eastern survey area (Maki and Jones 2013). The linear patterns are highly magnetic and likely part of the 1,200-feet of water pipe installed in the park in 1898 or a fired clay drainage feature (BPC 1898). One of these lines intercepts an area of high electrical resistivity that appears to correlate to the 1981 Test Unit 3 (at the southern side of the eastern geophysical grid) made by Anfinson, in which he encountered an iron pipe at 30 cmbs (Anfinson 1982:47). The trench signal is greatest at a depth of about 50 cmbs. Assuming this archaeological data can be linked to the geophysics imaging, the signal for disturbance is large, but the pipe and trench area is contained and did not substantially affect the integrity of the nearby soils (Anfinson 1981: 47). The unit dug underneath the interpretive sign is also visible in both the radar and resistivity data (Woolworth 1981).

The most interesting area in terms of electrical resistance results is in the vicinity of Mounds 4 and 5 (Figure 1). In 1866, Mound 5 was on the edge of a small coulee that cut down to the main bluff edge and it appears that some of the mound may have even eroded into the ravine. According to a 19th century excavator, “The South side of the Mound had evidently been somewhat denuded—the detritus having been passed down the Bluff, which here is somewhat steep” (De Montreville 1867). This landform is visible on the Winchell map, although it is not shown contiguous to the mound and also seems to be visible in the electrical resistivity surveys as an area of high resistance south of Mound 4. If the mounds, which might have been built on a gravelly ridge, were pushed into the depressed area and then covered with fill prior to park development, the electrical resistance data could be indicating an area where the 19th century surface and the fill of Mounds 4 and 5 is preserved beneath more porous fill (Figure 1).

Precontact-age features would have much more subtle signatures. Another area of interest is the vicinity of Mound 4. This was a low mound (2.5 feet high by 23 feet in diameter) partially excavated by Lewis with four other mounds on August 18, 1882. Subtle geophysical patterning around and within the former location of Mound 4 at depths of 30-110 cmbs indicate that there could be undisturbed submound features in these areas. The east side of Mound 5 at depths of 100-123 cmbs shows patterning that could be significant (Figure 1). Although some of the geophysical signatures appear to have linear sides, it is not clear that they represent rectangular features. Instead, the imagery must at this time be interpreted simply as possible mound-related cultural activity. Similar patterning was detected by ground-penetrating radar at the peripheries of less disturbed burial mounds at other Minnesota sites using similar methods (Arnott, Brosowske and Maki 2013, Maki and Arnott 2013).

Although it is evident from the topography that a portion of the western survey area has been graded by cutting and filling, clear evidence of intrusive disturbance is limited to a single utility trench running roughly parallel to the bluff edge (Figure 2). This trench cuts through the recorded locations of Mounds 13 and 15 and across the northern edge of Mound 14. It is clearly detected by all three geophysical methods, but it is unclear whether it might represent a pipe or cable. The depth of the utility line appears to be about 50 cmbs. Its orientation leads directly toward the tower to the west of the survey area, and an electrical cable is suggested. It has a strong magnetic signature that differs from that of the pipes detected in the western survey area and is suggestive of lightning-induced magnetization (Jones and Maki 2005), perhaps by a lightning impact on the tower (Figure 2).

In the resistance data, strong resistance highs coincide with the location of Mounds 13 and 14, although this could also be associated with the adjacent sidewalk or former road. Resistance and GPR anomalies appear elsewhere within the survey area, although the signal and patterning are ambiguous and may be caused by disturbed soils or the remains of historic
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Contributing Resources
Mounds are described below. The results of excavations in the leveled mounds have been also been summarized by Lewis (1896a) and Arzigian and Stevenson (2003: 472-477), and are referred to in the statement of significance.

Mound 1
Mound 1 is underneath the eastern overlook, an area previously used as a parking lot. It is suspected that construction, removal of the parking lot, and reconstruction have destroyed all the remains of this mound.

Mound 2
Mound 2 sits at the eastern side of the group next to the bluff edge. It has never been excavated, thus no height measurement exists from the 19th century. At 12 feet in height, it is currently the second largest mound at Indian Mounds Park. The surface of the mound has likely been rehabilitated in the 20th century to fill in paths that once wound to the top. The southern side has an eroded scar, probably from being ascended. Small trees and brush cover the mound. Overall, integrity appears excellent.

Mound 3
Mound 3 is contiguous with Mound 2 and is also covered with brushy vegetation. Its height is currently 10 feet, about 30 inches lower than in the 1880s. Mound 3 was excavated twice: in 1867 under the supervision of De Montreville and then by Lewis in 1882. The De Montreville trench was 4 feet in width and extended to a vertical depth of 10 feet 3 inches (1867). Lewis did not record the size of his excavation.

This second trench did disturb a total of 21 secondary burials, most within five features at different depths of the mound fill. This suggests that the Lewis excavation was much larger than that of De Montreville and that the mound was both constructed and used over an extended period of time. Lewis noted that stratigraphic levels were visible but not well defined; this perhaps indicates that different basket loads of imported fill were visible but did not cross entire levels (1896a: 316)

At the base of Mound 3 (7.6 feet below surface), two large boulders were found placed over the remains of two individuals. Higher in the mound fill, at 3.3 feet below the surface, a child’s cranium was discovered with a clay death mask. “The facial bones of the skull in question had been covered with red clay, thus producing an image of the original face” (Lewis 1896a). This clay mask is one of the artifacts used to link this site to the Hopewell burial tradition in Minnesota.

Most of the human remains in Mound 3 (eleven crania) were found in three clusters at depths of from 5.8 to 3.3 feet deep. It appears that much of the mound was built up during successive burial events, although some may have been intrusive. The most recent burials may have been that of two crania found near the mound center at depths of 3.3 and 4.1 feet deep, the second with a 2 foot by 5 inch piece of partially decayed oak.

Mounds 4 and 5
Mounds 4 and 5 were low mounds excavated in the 19th century and graded down for park development in 1898. The Lewis field map showed a “mound approach” or linear appendage on Mound 5, but the Winchell Map, Map published with Lewis’s 1896 American Antiquarian article describes excavations as part of an “approach or graded way which extended outward from the base of [Mound 4] 20 feet, was 16 feet in width and 2 feet in height” (1896a). Burials were found in the fill, at the ground surface in Mound 4 and in a shallow submound feature in Mound 5 (De Montreville 1866; Lewis 1896a). It is suspected that the above-ground expression has been graded into a former draw. Submound features related to the mounds and an “approach” could be intact as described above.

Mound 6
The fate of Mound 6 is difficult to reconstruct. Lewis gave it a height of only 1 foot, but as it was on the edge of the bluff slope, the height measured from the southern side could have been a few feet higher. A postcard view that appears to show this mound suggests that it was more pronounced on the slope side and may have been largely intact well into the 20th century (Figure 4). The LiDAR imagery shows an extension of the natural terrace in this area below the walkway,
Mound 7
Mound 7 is extant, fenced and covered with turf grass. In 1879, Lewis and Gross made an excavation of undefined size in this mound. Considering that the excavation was completed in one day, it was likely a central trench of limited size. At that time, the mound was recorded as 12 feet in height, or ½ feet higher than at present. Mound 7 was unique in that it had an internal log and boulder-covered tomb with the top roughly 6 inches above the ground surface and over a secondary burial feature that must have extended about 1 foot below the original ground surface. The feature is noteworthy for its stratigraphy and evidence of burning. Below a thin layer of loam containing the secondary burial was a “stratum of charcoal and ashes one to two inches in depth, and beneath the latter a stratum of yellow clay five inches in depth, packed very hard and showing evidence of heat. Beneath this hearth—if the name is applicable—was a six inch stratum of loose, yellow, sandy clay, containing a few pieces of pottery composed of shell and clay, some small fragments of human bones and a few teeth” (Lewis 1896a: 315). About three feet above the burial was a sharpened stake in a vertical position that may have been the lower portion of a pole that initially extended above the mound.

Mound 8
Mound 8 was an elliptical mound located in a saddle between Mounds 7 and 9. It was partially excavated and then graded away by the park department in the late 19th century, exposing primary burials within the mound fill. This location is still roughly 20 inches (50 cm) higher than the walkway to the south, thus the lower levels or submound features could be preserved, but a unit dug on the northern side of the mapped location did not identify mound features (Anfinson 1982).

Mound 9
The current height of Mound 9 is 14 feet, just one foot lower than the 1866 height. Mound 9 was estimated at 18 feet in height by Neill in the 1850s, but later excavators measured the height at closer to 15 feet, and archaeological evidence that it was built on a slight rise suggests that there was 12 feet of fill. The historic diameter of the mound was recorded as 70 feet, close to the 73 feet today.

Mound 9 is the location of the first recorded mound excavation in Minnesota for reasons of inquiry. The 1856 “hasty excavation” extended 3-4 feet deep toward the center of the mound uncovering scattered cranial fragments (Neill 1858: 207, Hill 1894). Ten years later, Kelley and Hill reopened the tumulus, which they recorded at a height of 15 feet, excavating a trench toward the center (1866). The height of Mound 9 has given it prominence that has been difficult for visitors to resist. Numerous 19th and early 20th century photographs show a path spiraling to a leveled viewing spot at the summit and the upper 1-2 feet have since been rehabilitated by fill (e.g. Figure 3).

The Kelly and Hill 5×25 foot excavation in 1866 covered roughly 3% of the mound surface. At that time there was a metal stake in the northern side of the mound indicating the platted turn of Mound Boulevard, but there is no evidence that the street was ever graded into the mound (Kelley and Hill 1866). The 1866 excavation proceeded more slowly than anticipated and was further constrained in size. When the subsoils were encountered at 12 feet below the surface, the trench was only 5×3 feet in size, and covered just a tiny fraction of the mound base. The excavation recovered the jaw bone of a child, shells, and recorded a “continuous stratum of clay soil from ten to fifteen inches in thickness” at 7.7 feet below the mound surface (Kelley and Hill 1866). No other artifacts were recorded. Most of the interior of this mound is likely intact.

Mound 10
Mound 10 is currently 5 feet tall, 3 feet lower than the height recorded by Lewis in 1882. One feature was recorded at a depth of 4 feet 2 inches, a secondary burial consisting of a “human skull and two small arrowheads” next to another skull with three vertebrae (Lewis 1896a). Near the base of the mound Lewis recorded a stratum of charcoal and ashes and noted that mussel shells were “scattered throughout.” Lewis did not give the dimensions of his excavation units, but as the excavation was completed in one day, it was likely limited in scope. Most of the interior of this mound is likely intact.
Mound 11
Like Mound 6, Mound 11 sat on the very edge of the bluff. Lewis recorded a height of 1 1/2 feet and a diameter of 20 feet. He excavated the mound and recorded a submound burial pit that contained “the remains of one skeleton and two mussel shells” 1 foot below the original ground surface (Lewis 1896a). Unfortunately, there is no additional information provided. Examination of the area mapped by Lewis identified a possible remnant of the southern side of Mound 11 underneath the central overlook southeast of Mound 10 (Photo 5). The northern half of the mound base would be under the retaining wall and fill that supports the circulation feature.

Mound 12
Mound 12 is currently 7 feet 4 inches in height compared with a height of 8 feet 6 inches in 1882 (Lewis 1896a). It measures roughly 55 feet across currently, compared to 51 feet as measured by Lewis indicating that erosion from upper levels has increased the base size.

Mound 12 provides the northernmost evidence of Hopewell burial style in the Mississippi River Valley and the only clear example of the style in Minnesota (Arzigian 2003:85h). At a depth of 9 feet below the mound surface, and 6 inches below the natural surface, Lewis encountered the top of a feature of boulders and limestone in a conical arrangement 9 feet in diameter and 2 feet thick. Removal of that uncovered a large feature of rectangular cists dug 2 1/2 feet into the subsoil and lined with limestone slabs (Lewis 1896a: 317). Within each compartment were bones which were: “in fine condition, but had been gnawed by some wild animal. With each lot of bones were pieces of skull, which had also been gnawed, and in each case (four only) where there was a lower jaw, it was placed at the opposite side from the pieces of skull” (Lewis 1896a: 318). Lewis’s drawing of the chambers suggests that a central group of three was initially built and then additional boxes were added on through time for a total of eight boxes. Because the final shape was somewhat irregular, outside niches were created where four secondary burials were placed. The entire structure was, at its widest 6 by 6 feet, with most of the chambers roughly 1 1/2 by 2 feet.

Next to the stone boxes was a “ridge of fine sandy clay, seven feet in length, two feet in width, and about one foot in height, which had slightly flattened ends” (Lewis 1896a: 318) The controlled use of different colored soils to create internal patterns was continued in the upper levels of the mounds. The first three feet of the top of the mound was a highly colored sandy clay; the next three feet black loam and beneath the latter, clay, sand and loam intermixed” (Lewis 1896a:318).

The contents of the central three chambers consisted of Cist 4: 14 mussel shells, Cist 5: “a perforated bear’s tooth, small piece of lead ore, and small piece of red clay of irregular shape” and Cist 6: two mussel shells and a hammered and perforated oval copper ornament. To the north of these three central boxes were Cist 2 and Cist 3 with 12 and 5 mussel shells respectively. The northermost and largest box, Cist 1, contained two mussel shells and an “arrowhead.” South of the central three boxes were two more chambers, Cist 7 contained five mussel shells and three lithic artifacts and Cist 8, three mussel shells and nine lithics (Lewis 1896a:318). Due to the extensive nature of Lewis’ excavations, it appears as if the majority of the central feature was investigated.

Nine of the lithic artifacts recovered from these boxes are the only artifacts that remain from the excavation of Mound 12. The artifacts are mentioned in the Lewis publication synthesizing the results of his excavation and were labeled and catalogued at some point in the 19th century, likely when they were lent to Macalester College. A copy of the original artifact catalogue was used to identify artifacts from numbered mounds at “Mound Park” and was compared with the current catalogue. The possibility that the lithics were simply part of an earlier habitation site and were incorporated into the burial mound was considered. Typically antiquarian investigations dug expedient trenches to the mound center without taking much effort to recover lithics within the fill and Lewis does state that the lithics from Mound 12, at least, came from the submound, stone lined features. Evaluation of his elevations suggests that the pits could have been up to 3 feet below the natural surface, well within the natural gravel subsoil. This is consistent with his description of the cists: “All of them were filled with black loam, and the bones, relics, etc., were lying on the bottom which was the natural gravel of the bluff” (Lewis 1896a: 317, emphasis added). Thus, there is good documentation for provenience, but not absolute certainty. The lithics were reanalyzed for this nomination by Kent Bakken and discussed in more detail in Section 8. Interestingly, the typological analysis suggests a Late Archaic date (Bakken 2013).
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Mound 13
The location of former Mound 13 is in the turf grass area east of the beacon. The 4 foot tall mound is probably visible as the furthest mound in an early 20th century photo postcard (Figure 5). A minimum of four individuals were recorded in Lewis’s excavation including two secondary burials in fill and two primary burials in a submound pit (1896a). Visual inspection and LiDAR imagery shows that the immediate area has been graded down, but the postcard view shows Mound 13 at a lower elevation than surrounding mounds. In general, this side of the site appears to have had a lower initial elevation that was first raised with fill and then cut by a large landscaping project. Geophysical information indicates that former utilities pass through the southern half of the mound. Integrity at this location is likely poor.

Mound 14
Mound 14 which sat directly on the bluff edge was recorded by Lewis as having a height of 4 feet. It is not visible in any photographs and was probably leveled after the 1901 purchase of the lot. When excavated by Lewis, the mound contained five primary burials in a pit that extended 1 foot below the ground surface. Excavation, construction of walkways and utilities have likely destroyed most of this mound.

Mound 15
The location of Mound 15 falls beneath the Airport Beacon and is discussed above as it relates to the Harrison (1994) and Koenen (1995) investigation and monitoring. The area of mound 15 appears to have been filled over, built over with the original pavilion, filled again after the building burned, then leveled for construction of a tennis court and finally used as platform for the beacon. Lower levels of the mound and possibly other pits could be preserved underneath the episodes of historic-era fill, especially as the mound had a diameter of 40 feet. A nineteenth century excavation revealed a submound burial pit extending 2½ feet into the subsoil, with remains of three individuals (Lewis 1896a).

Mound 16
Mound 16 was at the western extremity of the site, well below the other mounds and was smaller than most with a height of 1½ feet and a diameter of 28 feet. Still, it was an important burial mound and the Lewis excavation recorded “portions of three skeletons, one of which was a child of about 6 years of age” at a depth of 6 inches below the ground surface (Lewis 1896a). There are currently no surface indications of the mound, and less historic fill than at the Mound 15 location, but it is possible that subsurface remains could be preserved.

Mounds 17 and 18 are not considered as contributing to the site. Mound 17 was opened by Lewis, but the location cannot be reliably determined. It was not reproduced in the Winchell map, and appears to be either well off the bluff edge or next to Mound 13. Mound 18 has been destroyed by road and pavilion construction.

Artifacts
Besides the artifacts recovered from Mound 12 and one lithic from Mound 15, the only artifact that was well described in the antiquarian literature is the clay mask found in Mound 3. This low-fired artifact was fragile and in the collections of the Minnesota Historical Society in the 1970s, but has since disappeared (personal communication, Scott Anfinson, Nov. 6, 2012). The MNHS catalogue lists other artifacts from this site but provenience is problematic. A small funerary urn is attributed to this site with a 19th century photo, with the notation: “Dug out of a mound at St. Paul, Minnesota, November 1, 1881 by T.H. Lewis.” Its number (812) corresponds to the Mitchell catalogue item “Clay Vessel” from “Mound No. 10, Upper Group” or 21RA5 (Macalester College Collections, Artifact catalogue in SHPO site file). The MNHS catalogue also includes trade beads that were donated to the MNHS in 1975, from somewhere in Indian Mounds Park, but the provenience cannot be linked to 21RA10. By 1901, Indian Mounds Park had expanded to more than 82 acres, to include the boundaries of the State Fish Hatchery on the river terrace (Board of Park Commissioners 1901), and the park has gradually expanded to bring in 21RA5 and 21RA27 as well as suspected locations of Kaposia, and other unverified sites.

Non-contributing elements
Non-contributing elements to the NRHP site include the park landscaping including the retaining wall around Mounds 2 and 3, protective iron fencing around all the mounds, the retaining walls at the southern side of the site, all concrete walkways, lighting and the overlooks, three park benches, and the interpretive sign. Note that removal of these non-contributing features could impact the archaeological site. In addition, the Air Beacon is considered to be individually eligible to the NRHP under separate significance and criteria (Vogel 1992), but does not contribute to this site.
The site boundaries are defined as the geographically continuous area as recorded by T.H. Lewis in 1882 and excluding Mounds 17 and 18. The peripheral western side of the site where Mounds 13 through 16 were located has impaired integrity but has yielded information important to prehistory and could contain additional subsurface elements. The six mounds with an above ground expression, Mound 2, Mound 3, Mound 7, Mound 9, Mound 10 and Mound 12, form the core of the site. They have yielded important information, preserve internal material integrity and convey the essential original visual site configuration.

**Site Integrity**

**Location, Design, Setting, Feeling and Association**

Visual inspection of the park clearly indicates that the site retains elements of human landscaping over the last 2,000 years. Most importantly, the central American Indian burial mound arrangement and its relationship to the space retains its iconic and powerful form. The establishment and maintenance of the park has preserved the central group of large mounds at 21RA10 within a roughly natural setting. Even with modifications into a park, the massive mounds on this unique landform, including the viewshed over the Mississippi River, have their integrity. While the particulars of the view from the site have changed, the overlook retains the essential geographic elements that have drawn humans to the site for millennia. Removal of roads and related features in the 1980s has improved the setting and the relationship of the site to the topography. Thus, the central earthworks retain their location and the park preserves the basic design, setting and feeling of the mound group site. Furthermore, the geophysical survey indicates that subsurface features remain at some of the mounds where the above-ground structure was removed in the past. These qualities of integrity communicate the site's association to a sacred place of burial, an aspect that persists into the present.

The site is also intimately associated with the earliest antiquarian investigations in Minnesota. The first documented excavation in Minnesota took place here, even before statehood and later excavations conducted between 1866 and 1883 were conducted by Minnesota's first antiquarian archaeologists. Again, the site would be recognizable to those who worked here in the 19th century. Some loss of integrity to the Woodland Tradition mounds is directly associated with this aspect of the site's history. In other words, the intrusive 19th century archaeological trenches have integrity as they relate to the series of antiquarian events, although this context is of secondary importance.

The outer layer of the extant mounds has eroded and has been rehabilitated with fill. The exact agreement between the 19th century mapping and the LiDAR elevation data show that the mound positions have not been altered by the additions. This is important because it demonstrates that the extant mounds are not reconstructed, a process defined as "the reproduction of the exact form and detail of a vanished building, structure, object or part thereof" (Shrimpton 1991:37). Instead, the rehabilitation can be understood as a superficial restoration of the exterior of a structure that retains the "majority of its original fabric" similar to replacement of damaged or decayed siding on a building (ibid).

**Materials and workmanship**

Overall, material archaeological site integrity at 21RA10 has been both preserved and compromised by the establishment of the park and landscaping. The original mound group has been altered by the removal or obfuscation of the above-ground expression of all the mounds with 19th century heights of less than 5 feet. The original connection of the mounds to the local topography has been modified by the process of leveling the site to emphasize the largest mounds and remove low areas. Yet, the basic site configuration and interrelationships within the intact mounds and the bluff top setting is largely intact. Mound condition is summarized in Table 1 above.

The extant mounds, by nature of their massive size, preserve their contents below tons of earth. Both historic photographs and comparison of historic and contemporary mound heights clearly show that the upper levels have eroded, sometimes by a few feet, but lower levels of mound fill as well as submound features are preserved in the mounds. Geophysical and archaeological testing confirms that the area around the extant mounds has been altered, particularly by the grading of mounds into depressions, use of fill to level the site, and the construction of circulation features. The data also indicates that natural strata are preserved at the level of about 1 foot below the surface in areas of the park not disturbed by major construction. The use of fill to create a level park has likely preserved some mound remnants. Thus, much of the site still has the potential to contain important information particularly as the individual mound locations are known through accurate 19th century maps, and many of the mounds had features that were dug from 6 inches to 3 feet into the ground surface.
The very size of these mounds has preserved sizable proportions of their internal integrity even though they have been subject to antiquarian investigations and later disturbances to the upper levels. Nineteenth century mound “openings” were usually a one day event. If it was suspected that the excavations could not be completed in a day, they were reduced in size. Thus, the size of the excavations was usually limited to a narrow trench aimed at the mound core. Figure 6 provides a rare plan view of the extent of typical antiquarian excavations as illustrated by Hill and Kelley in 1866.

Mound 2 is intact, never having been subject to excavation. Mound 3 has been excavated twice by trenches but likely preserves some internal integrity. Mound 7 was excavated in 1897 by Lewis and Gross, but no dimensions are given for the excavation. Excavations of Mound 9 covered less than 3% of the area. Lewis’s Mound 10 excavation trench size was not recorded. Lewis did record a rock feature of 9 feet in width within Mound 12 and the stone burial chamber of 6 x 6 feet which he completely excavated. It appears that Lewis may have expanded trenches when he encountered interesting materials, so this may have been one of the larger excavations. In conclusion, the records show that internal integrity of the mounds is quite variable, from significantly excavated Mound 12, partially impacted Mounds 7 and 10, minimally impacted Mound 9, to intact Mound 2. In all, there is a significant level of internal material integrity within the mounds that could contribute important archaeological information. Mounds in the Twin Cities area have been determined to still have significant integrity of both archaeological and sacred natures even with much greater levels of superficial damage (e.g. Bakken et al. 2006).

In 1878, St. Paul had 6 groups of recorded mounds, including this site, with a total 89 mounds (Lewis 1896b). Only the six mounds at 21RA10 remain, preserving just 6% of the mounds documented in St. Paul in the late 19th century—and many mounds had probably already been destroyed before that. The other 94% of recorded mounds were victims of development, road building, railroad construction and quarrying. No mounds remain in Minneapolis although there were historic mentions of earthworks at Pilot Knob, near Fort Snelling and on the east side of Lake Calhoun. The Minneapolis-St. Paul area in general, and the water features in particular, were important foci of the regional sacred geography, thus the fact that these six earthworks have survived into the present with an intact relationship to their natural setting is significant (Westerman and White 2012).

**Conclusion**

Following the guidelines of the Precontact American Indian Earthworks 500 B.C.- A.D. 1650 Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF), sites can be considered eligible under Criterion A “if their setting and size are consistent with broad patterns of mound distribution and placement, if they can be associated with a defined Historic Context, if they represent the type site for a specific culture, or if they are associated with a key event in the history and development of archaeological method and theory” (Dobbs 1996). The Woodland Tradition in Minnesota MPDF identifies similar registration guidelines for mortuary mound sites under Criterion A: “if it can be associated with a specific Woodland complex, is the type site for a specific Woodland complex, or is associated with a key event in the history of archaeology in Minnesota or the development of archaeological method and theory” (Arzigian 2012:154). In addition, the Woodland Tradition in Minnesota MPDF identifies mound sites whose “setting and size are consistent with an ethnographic and historically identified pattern suggesting association of distinctive mounds in prominent settings with individuals who were important in their community” and whose study was linked “the evolution of attitudes and relationships between Native and Euro-American peoples” as significant under Criterion A (Arzigian 2012:154).

Indian Mounds Park has been recognized for having the strongest Hopewellian characteristics in Minnesota and as a type-site for the Havana-Related/Hopewell in Minnesota (Johnson 1957, Arzigian 2012: 45, Arzigian and Stevenson 2003: 85). The size, internal structure, and prominent setting of the mound group is distinctive of the Havana-Related/Hopewell in Minnesota and visibly preserves the burials of significant, if unnamed, members of a social group. The site is significant to the history of Minnesota archaeology for a series of events, for the information that was collected by antiquarian investigations by the MNHS Archaeological Committee and T.H. Lewis between 1862-1883, and for its connection to the changing relationships between European Americans and American Indians.
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In summary, the Indian Mounds Park Mound Group (21RA10) preserves the integrity of location, design, setting, feeling, and association to convey its significance under Criterion A as for the role it played over centuries in "the historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices" associated with a "series of events significant to the cultural traditions of a community" (Shrimpton 1991: 13) and for its association to the evolution of cultural and racial perceptions toward American Indians and their ancestors especially as it related to the antiquarian and archaeological inquiry of burial places.

Under criterion D, the Indian Mounds Park burial mound site (21RA10) is eligible to the National Register of Historic Places for its potential to yield information regarding mortuary practices and ideology in the Middle Woodland Period (Arzigian 2012:154). In particular, this site has the potential to continue to inform our understanding of the cultural relationships between peoples linked through the regional Hopewell Interaction Sphere, the geographic patterns of mound site location in Minnesota, and ritual subsurface site features identified through non-invasive imaging methods and compared to documented features.
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8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- [x] A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- [ ] B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- [ ] C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- [x] D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Areas of Significance (Enter categories from instructions.)

- Social History
- Religion
- Archeology- Religion

Period of Significance
ca. 1000 B.C.- A.D. 1837
1856-1900

Significant Dates

Period of Significance (justification)
ca. 1000 B.C.- A.D. 1837 is period of precontact significance under Criteria A and D. 1856-1900 is period of historic significance under Criterion A.

Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)

This property is a cemetery but is nominated for its direct association to events that illustrate broad patterns in history and information potential.
The Indian Mounds Park site (21RA10) in St. Paul, Minnesota is unique for preserving the only remaining burial mounds within the Minneapolis-St. Paul urban core, which roughly overlies the traditional cultural hub of the Dakota. The site is also significant for providing evidence of the northermost examples of Hopewell-style earthworks along the Mississippi River. The eighteen mounds originally constructed at 21RA10 were prominent features within a much larger cultural landscape highly visible along the margins of the Mississippi River Valley. This sacred site provided a nucleus for burial rituals over thousands of years throughout the Middle Woodland Tradition and likely into the early historic period (Johnson 1957). Following the displacement of the Dakota from the area in the 1830s-1850s, the site became the focus of antiquarian archaeologists who repeatedly excavated the mounds searching for clues of the lost "Mound Builder" race they believed were responsible for constructing the "ancient monuments." This burial mound site is eligible to the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A for its persisting association with Traditional Cultural Values, its direct association with a prominent setting and significant community members, and its status as the type site for the Havana-Related/Hopewell in Minnesota (Shrimpton 1991, 2012:154, Arzigian and Stevenson 2003: 85). Under Criterion D, the Indian Mounds Park site is eligible for its regionally significant potential to inform our understanding of Middle Woodland Tradition (Arzigian 2012:154). Indian Mounds Park is also eligible to the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A for its direct and recurrent association to antiquarian archaeology in Minnesota (1856-1890), including the information it yielded from those antiquarian excavations (Shrimpton 1991).

More than 2,000 years ago, people in the upper reaches of the Mississippi River Basin began practicing the tradition of building substantial earthen structures over graves. Communities gathered together to inter the remains of loved ones with some offerings, and then laboriously mounded tons of soil on top. Sometimes burials were made in pits or chambers in or on the earth’s surface, with a human-made hill then built over the tomb. Other burials were placed within these little hills. Burial sites were created to meet the needs of both the living and the dead, and their construction, use and reuse over time gave the sites a permanence that lasted has through millennia.

The mound building tradition was widespread in North America, and appears to have originated in the complex funeral ceremonies of the Ohio River Valley during the Late Archaic Period, almost 2,500 years before the present (Dobbs 1996:5). Around the same time that mound building began, people in the region that became Minnesota began to mold and fire clay into ceramics, to garden and to more intensively manage wild plant sources such as wild rice (Arzigian 2012). These changes took place sometime after 500 B.C. within established local cultures that survived by hunting and gathering, and mark the archaeological transition to the Woodland Tradition (Arzigian 2012). All of the hallmarks of the Woodland Tradition indicate a shift to less mobile and larger communities that came together to live in semi-permanent camps, particularly during summer months when gardens required tending.

The construction of earthen mounds over burials; the mining, molding, and firing of clay to create ceramics; the manipulation of the soil to increase plant food yields; and the construction of semi-permanent settlements all significantly changed people’s relationship to the earth. These activities created visible signs of a village’s enduring connection to the landscape, but monumental mounds, often built on prominent places, were perhaps the most obvious expression of this change. Often the mound burials were secondary (bundle burials) and finalized a series of ritualized funeral ceremonies. In this tradition, bodies were first well-wrapped and placed in trees on burial scaffolds with offerings, and left until only the bones remained. In spring, the skull and long bones were
gathered into bundles that were carried to more permanent summer camps. There, a scheduled reburial of several band members could take place. This final burial ceremony released spirits from the bundles while bringing together the souls that remained with the bones (Hall 1997:24-31).

Earthworks built for this purpose appear to have been added to, re-used and perhaps even maintained within bounded sacred areas over centuries. Located near places that made good homes, the mounds were likely recognized of as the burial places of the local people’s immediate ancestors.

The construction of earthworks in the area of present-day Minnesota is a trait that lasted throughout the Woodland Tradition, but the most regionally distinct earthworks date to the Middle Woodland (Arzigian and Stevenson 2003: 79). The unique variations in mound construction were likely expressions of local spiritual beliefs. Woodland peoples in what became Minnesota designed and constructed earthen structural complexes in all parts of the region, but the highest densities were built along the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers, in the vicinity of Mille Lacs, and overlooking the Otter Tail chain of lakes (Anfinson 1984, Dobbs 1996: 6). Indian Mounds Park is representative of mound sites in the Mississippi River Valley, as it was built within an area of deciduous forests and on a prominent river terrace (Anfinson 1984: 23). Also, as noted in a study of mound locations, “There is an almost exact correlation between early historic Dakota distribution in Minnesota and the mound area of Minnesota” (Anfinson 1984: 22). Three different locations of the historic Mdewankanton village of Kaposia were close to this group of burial mounds. According to the 19th century archaeologist T.H. Lewis, evidence of eight prehistoric village sites could still be seen on this side of the river in the 1880s, all of which could have had a connection to the burial site (1896b: 207).

The importance of mound location in general, and this spot in particular, was not that it had a good view but that was always in view of nearby villages. The missionary Riggs presented the historic Dakota reason for mound location that also indicates the long-term association between people and burial grounds:

"Why do the Dakotas prefer these mounds as the places of deposit of their dead? I answer: First that it may be seen from a distance all around. As they wail morning and evening they can conveniently look to the abode not only of the body of their departed friend, but as many of them believe, one of the spirits also. Secondly, all pahas are under the guardianship of their god Heyoka. And thirdly, a hill may be regarded as a more congenial place of rest for a spirit than a valley: and thence, too, the earthly spirit may better hold communion with the one... making progress on the ‘wanagi tachanku,’ or spirit’s road (Riggs 1872:118)."

This passage shows that the mounds were not simply burial places, but a place of where the world of the dead and the spirit world were connected. In the 20th century, this site’s prominence in the regional landscape made it a chosen location for an easily seen airplane beacon.

Sites with large mounds, between 5 and 45 feet in height, are not evenly distributed throughout what became Minnesota, but cluster along the Minnesota River near its confluence with the Mississippi River and in the eastern half of the deciduous woodlands area north of the present-day Twin Cities. These large mound sites often correlate with Havana-related ceramics and are the most likely to have diagnostic Havana-Hopewell materials (Gibbon 2012: 98). Compared to other mound groups recorded in the 19th century, Indian Mounds Park had far more large mounds than any other group in Minnesota, with four higher than 10 feet and five between 4.5 and 10 feet tall for a total of nine “very tall” mounds (cf. Anfinson 1984: 11). No other recorded Minnesota site had more than three mounds higher than 4.5 feet. Thus, Indian Mounds Park site accounts for roughly 14% of all the mounds in Minnesota over 10 feet tall and is singular for having more than four mounds at 10 feet or taller.

Mound size is significant because it indicates the amount of labor that could be organized to construct an
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The tradition of mound building at Indian Mounds Park was part of a much larger Woodland Tradition, but the traditions of burial were not static: particulars varied greatly through both time and space. Two mounds at Indian Mounds Park, Mounds 12 and 3, are unique in Minnesota for having produced collections of burial goods and construction styles that link them to larger, external Hopewell traditions, albeit with a distinctly local expression (Arzigian and Stevenson 2003:85, Johnson 1957).

“Hopewell” is named for the family farm in Ohio where the archaeological culture was first defined. It is characterized by the use of exotic materials gathered from throughout a huge network known as the Hopewell Interaction Sphere, and the use of elaborate earthworks built over logs or stone crypts (Birmingham and Eisenberg 2000: 84-85). Middle Woodland Hopewell artifact assemblages in the Midwest show that the people were participating in large-scale trade networks over a huge geographic area and placing exotic goods from these transactions within burials (Emerson et al. 2005). Typical Hopewell goods found in burials outside of Minnesota included blades of Knife River Flint from North Dakota, ceremonial stone tools from obsidian and jasper acquired in Wyoming, hammered ornaments from Lake Superior copper, drilled bear canines, pearls, galena, carved Catlinite pipes, mica sheets from the Carolinas, shells, and elegant ceramics including clay death masks (Birmingham and Eisenberg 2000, Bozhardt 1998). Even when high quality and locally available raw materials were available, exotic goods—especially minerals—were often preferred (Emerson et al. 2005).

Mound 12 at Indian Mounds Park was built over 8 stone-lined sub-mound burial compartments covered with flat slabs of limestone. Hopewell-style burials frequently contained sub-mound pits overlain with logs or stone that were used as crypts for bones and burial offerings for multiple people—perhaps over some time—before being covered over by a mound of earth in a large group endeavor (Birmingham and Eisenberg 2000: 85). The stone crypt dug well into the subsoil at Mound 12 fits this pattern, and from the presence of secondary burials both inside and outside the boxes, many with evidence of having been “gnawed by some animal” it is possible that the burials were left covered with stones but unburied for some time and that some bones were moved outside of the cists after they were full (Lewis 1896a). Later, in some large event, the subterranean pits with the limestone slab covers were piled over with boulders and then the entire feature appears to have been covered in a single episode. The offerings made with individuals interred at Mound 12 also reveal an artifact pattern aligned to Hopewell: mussel shells, galena, a perforated bear tooth, and a hammered copper ornament were found in association with the burials. Of interest is the fact that the excavator, T.H. Lewis, did not mention or collect any ceramics from the mound. Although it is possible that he did not find sherds he considered worthy of his collection, he was typically careful to at least mention ceramic finds.

Instead, Mound 12 had a strong association to lithic tools. One stone box, in fact, contained 8 of the 11 lithics collected by Lewis, or 72% from this entire site. Some characteristics of the lithic collection are noteworthy. First, the collection does not share characteristics of the nearest collections from Wisconsin Hopewell lithic assemblages, which are dominated by striking exotic materials (Birmingham and Eisenberg 2000: 85, Gibbon 2012: 98). For example, Hopewell mound excavations in the Trempealeau-La Crosse area, just 100 miles down river from 21RA10, included large ceremonial blades made from quarzite and jasper raw materials originating from the eastern Wyoming/Black Hills region rather than local stone of equal quality (Bozhardt 1998).
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In contrast, the materials recovered from Mound 12 are mostly local and the manufacture unremarkable. Lithic analysis identified 4 items of Prairie du Chein Chert, 2 Grand Meadow Chert, 1 Hixton Group Quartzite, 1 possible Burlington Chert, and two unidentified cherts. The lithic analysis done for this nomination provided information about the sources of the stone tools:

Prairie du Chein Chert is available from sources within a few tens of kilometers of 21RA10, and should be regarded as local. Grand Meadow Chert is regionally available in southeastern Minnesota. Burlington and Hixton are both classified as exotics and come from more distant sources, but both are often found at archaeological sites in this part of Minnesota (for additional context, see Bakken 1997, 2011). The occurrence of two unidentified cherts is not unusual, especially in the form of projectile points. In short, the raw material composition of this assemblage does not seem unusual for this location (Bakken 2013).

Yet the collection does seem atypical compared to other Hopewell burials. Although some materials such as copper, Catlinite, and Knife River Flint must have been passed out of or through present-day Minnesota to distant destinations, the assemblage as a whole suggests that past inhabitants of this area maintained a more local lifeway, both materially and culturally, integrating limited aspects of Hopewell exoticism within their own communal burial traditions (cf. Arzigian 2010: 35, Emerson et al. 2005).

Another interesting aspect of this collection is the ordinary nature of the artifacts. Whereas Hopewell sites farther south contain ceremonial blades that are stemmed and non-utilitarian, none of the individual lithics recovered at 21RA10 reveal a ceremonial function. Furthermore, two of the bifaces were not even completed, apparently due to technical difficulties in the reduction process. One was used in its unfinished state, as evidenced by use wear. The other was not only unfinished, it was unused, yet never discarded. Both seem an odd choice to place in a burial feature unless considered from a non-utilitarian perspective. The only shared attribute of the collection appears to be heterogeneity. As the lithic analysis notes: “Another striking—and related—characteristic of this assemblage is its stylistic diversity. None of the projectile points seem to have much if anything in common with any other, whether in terms of style, typology, or even manufacture. Even the three bifaces seem to have little in common in terms of form or manufacture” (Bakken 2013). Yet the nature of the lithics from Mound 12 at Indian Mounds Park do make sense if understood not as representations of personal wealth or as a functional toolkit of a particular person or place, but rather as a collection of disparate items expressing connectivity between people or groups within a burial.¹

As populations grew during the Woodland Period in the larger Mississippi River Valley, territorial boundaries became more defined and likely restricted people’s access to both raw materials and foods, making trade a more important means of reducing risk, exchanging ideas, and building alliances (Miller 1989). The pattern evidenced at this type site for Hopewell in present-day Minnesota reaffirms that people here adopted some classic horizon markers that evidence new ideas within their rituals—in this case using trade and the gifting of tokens to create ties of interdependence—without fully engaging in pan-regional Hopewell trading networks (Arzigian 2009: 35).

Less emphasis may have been placed on exotic materials while the Hopewellian concept of a particular burial style was retained. In particular the idea of placing symbolic mementos—whether mussel shells or stone tools—with honored social members in segregated burial chambers seems to have remained central. In this situation the placement of token lithic artifacts in burials may have expressed an idea of cultural and even cosmological connectivity. The value of human connections may have become attached to the objects as they were handed from person to person, across space, and across cultural boundaries. Finally, the intrinsic significance may have been transferred to the dead and their kin group when offered to the burial or to a deity in their honor. Although the

¹ Although interpretation is our own, we must acknowledge Kent Bakken for his generously offered insights into this collection of lithic artifacts and its connection to the greater context.
individuals at this site may not have been actively participating in the trade of rare and exotic materials throughout the huge Hopewell Interaction Sphere, they were likely engaging in the core idea of using transactions in the preservation of relationships throughout the region. This process was not new—lithic materials had been traded for centuries—but the Hopewell burial ceremonies embedded the connections into new communally reaffirmed rituals that extended beyond death. Handed between people through boundaries of space and time, the objects were now given to those crossing new limits.

Much later, in the early historic period, the exchange of gifts among the Dakota was recorded as the key to establishing relationships between people who were unrelated. As a familial connection was central to most relationships, “kinship ties were regularly reaffirmed by the exchange of presents, fostering a sharing of resources. It was exceedingly uncivilized to hoard food or fail to give presents to one’s relatives” (Anderson 1997: 11). Symbolic kinships could be established by giving tokens to an outsider, or sometimes even to the bundled bones of their ancestor (Anderson 1997: 56, Hall 1997: 26).

The time period that these tools were made and likely offered is also intriguing:

There are multiple indications that the assemblage probably includes points that date from the Late Archaic ... any one of these points by itself might not be adequate evidence to suggest the presence of a Late Archaic component. The three points taken together, however, do suggest that the possibility of an earlier component must at least be considered (Bakken 2013).

Alone, the evidence is insufficient to make any arguments about the date of the Mound 12 burial feature. Yet, combined with the lack of ceramics, it does offer a compelling case to evaluate the possible early date of Mound 12 in comparison with other regional mound information.

Another typical Hopewell characteristic of the Mound 12 burials is the use of intensely black loam with burials. Unusually black soils originating from mucky wetlands are commonly found in Hopewell grave pits in the Upper Mississippi River Basin and appear to be related to a world renewal ceremony (Hall 1997: 18). Many North American origin stories tell of the world beginning as an unbroken expanse of water with no land for creatures. In these stories an “earth diver” must swim down to the depths of the primordial sea, retrieve a handful of mud, and then swim back to the surface. The journey can take considerable time and requires a heroic effort, but with the handful of mud, brought up by the brave creature, often a muskrat, the earth is born (Westerman and White 2012: 17). In the Dakota version of the myth the mud is placed on the back of a turtle, other origin stories tell of dutiful creatures placing the mud on a barren rock pile (Westerman and White 2012: 17, Hall 1997: 22). Ceremonies of earth renewal recorded in American Indian traditions often use cut sod to symbolize the initial land, and it is possible that the water-formed soils found in mounds played a similar role in burial ceremonies (Hall 1997: 18-23, Mather 2006:15). The stone cairn in the center of mounds at this site could be linked to similar cosmological beliefs representing a barren earth or even turtle’s back that must be covered with earth.

Whatever the meaning of the soils, they were definitely placed in mounds with deliberation and intent. Besides the use of the black loam, other colored soils were purposefully used to create features within Mound 12. East of the stone chambers, Lewis recorded a “ridge of fine, yellow, sandy clay” 2 feet wide, 7 feet long and a foot high with the form of a double-bladed paddle (1896a: 318). This feature, and a cairn of boulders on top of the limestone slabs, were covered with a 2½ feet thick mixture of sand, clay and loam. The next three feet were built from black loam and the mound was topped with three feet of a highly colored sandy clay (Lewis 1896a: 318). With the bones surrounded by wetland soils and covered by an artificial hill that simulates the geological and cosmological levels of mother earth, the burial mound is much more ideologically significant than an artful pile of dirt.
Although Mound 12 provides the singular example of a well-developed Hopewell burial pattern in Minnesota, Mound 3 contained the burial of a small child with a red clay funerary mask covering its skull—another classic Hopewell burial artifact (Lewis 1896a, Johnson 1957). The pattern of interment, however, was completely different with three clusters of crania and a cremation in the mound fill and human remains next to two boulders near the base, suggesting that the mound was constructed in at least two phases. Similar to Mound 12, this mound had stratified levels of soils and the inclusion of “many mussel shells” shows a symbolic connection to the depths of a watery place.

Other mounds at 2IRA10 do not have distinctively Hopewellian features, but the descriptions of the burials from the antiquarian documentation provide compelling details of a variety of burial styles at Indian Mounds Park over centuries.

Mound 8, nestled between mounds Mound 7 and Mound 9, was the only elliptical mound recorded at Indian Mounds Park and included copper and shell ornaments (Lewis 1896b). Kelley and Hill’s small excavation trench revealed a layer of red clay 6 inches above fragmentary human remains associated with a ceramic pipe and “shell or bone bead” bracelet and closer to the mound center, they uncovered a submound fire feature. Mound fill contained ceramic fragments and chips of limestone (Kelley and Hill 1866).

The most dramatic recovery from this mound was made not by archaeologists but by a landscaping crew in 1895 under orders of the Park Department to level the mound “in order that a better view of the river might be had from the street” (Lewis 1896b: 209). On the southern, river bluff side of the 4-foot-tall mound, four complete skeletons were uncovered reclining on top of one another, “not entirely separated by earth” (ibid). Two feet from these primary burials the crew found a 7 by 2 inch crescent-shaped hammered copper ornament, another similar friable copper item 4.5 by 2 inches in size, and a “earthen pipe composed of broken stone and clay, together with a number of mussel shells and some small pieces of pottery” (ibid). This mound is unusual for the complete skeletons and for preserving copper ornaments and ceramics.

Mound 7, originally 12 feet in height, appears to have been built in two stages. At a depth of 7 feet, a bone awl was recovered. “From this point, and extending downwards, was a round stake of about three inches in diameter, a little over two feet in length, and somewhat sharpened at the lower end, but so much decayed that it fell to pieces on being removed” (Lewis 1896a: 315). This stake sounds as if it could have been a central pole on a low mound that was covered over in a second building phase. Poles figured frequently in mourning rituals of North American Indians as recorded in the ethnographic literature (Hall 1997:38) and are shown in many drawings of Dakota burial areas often topped with a red flag. At the mound base, boulders covered a log tomb with a secondary burial/cremation on a clay hearth, which was itself built over a stratum containing human teeth and shell-tempered ceramics (Lewis 1896a: 315).

An unusual stone feature was recorded by Lewis in Mound 13, which had a cairn of six boulders over a cranium, a secondary burial 1 foot above the original ground surface, and a submound pit with two facing primary burials. No artifacts were recorded for this mound (Lewis 1986a: 316).

Mound 5 preserved two primary burials near ground level with complete skeletal remains except for the lack of their crania, which could have eroded out of the mound but could also evidence an expedient burial after violent deaths (De Montreville 1867).

Mound 4 was a low mound and “mound approach” or attached oval mound, both with secondary burials at or below ground surface associated with mussel shells. Other mounds with the same burial pattern include Mound 1,
Mound 6 had two secondary burials just below ground surface with a projectile point, a lithic tool and mussel shells. Other mounds with the pattern of secondary burials near the ground surface, lithics and mussel shells include Mounds 10, 14, 15 (which had “over 100 clamshells” in the mound fill), Mound 16, and Mound 17 (Lewis 1896a).

Some of these mounds also had segregated rock or soil features: the submound pit in Mound 15, associated with a Middle Woodland stemmed style lithic point, was topped with “fine clean river sand.” Mound 16 had a heap of “nineteen round water-worn stones about the size of walnuts” on the western side of the secondary burials, while “opposite to them was about one bushel of river gravel” (Lewis 1896a: 318). The mussel shells, river sand, gravel and “water-worn” stones all reference a connection to water.

The nine mounds (Mounds 1, 4, 6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17) which shared the characteristics of secondary submound burials with mussel shells alone, or in association with lithics, tend to be the smaller, peripheral mounds and appear to reflect a local well-developed burial practice. The larger central mounds are much more diverse in character, both from each other and from the site as a whole.

Locally unique ceremonies of burial and mound construction likely provided a means for Woodland peoples to participate in group rituals that transformed the meaning of human death into rebirth, world renewal, and spirit release (Mather 2011, Hall 1997). Individual features created a record of these rituals through time and reflect the ways that death was understood and managed within larger cosmologies. Further comparison to other sites and ethnographic information has potential to deepen our understanding of ideologies especially in the contexts of using fire in cremation and burial rituals, use of distinct soils and stone materials as symbolic structures within mounds, the preparation of bodies prior to interment, creation of wood and log internal structures in association with the burials, and use of the mounds and internal features as ceremonial structures.

Indian Mounds Park is near a traditional cultural hub of the Dakota, the Bdote: the place of creation where the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers flow together (Westerman and White 2012: 19-20). A constellation of sacred and long-established sites once clustered around this center with Mni Sni (Coldwater Spring), Oheyawahi (Pilot Knob) near the core with Taku Wakan Tipi (Carver’s Cave) and Indian Mounds Park towards the edge. The prominence of the Indian Mounds Park earthworks could be related to their location at a regional cultural core where bands came together each year to visit and restore their relations through ceremonies including burial of bundled bones. Perhaps the uniqueness of the larger burials in St. Paul was the result of events that brought together several groups from a larger region to forge alliances through the observation of rituals that were not peculiar to the immediate locale—a regional rather than provincial gathering. Rather than representing just a village, the site could have been important to a larger group of allies who joined together hundreds strong and worked to raise the massive structures.

Certainly the size of some of the mounds and the indication that some of the colored clay soils were brought from offsite suggests that a larger than usual group of participants were organized for their construction. Ethnographic accounts from the early historic period do describe larger gatherings of related tribes that reinforced the shared identity of dispersed groups in periodic Feasts of the Dead. Unlike more personal rituals that honored individuals, these larger feasts in the Great Lakes Region took place at the time of reburial of groups of people and brought together allied tribes to reestablish connections between groups (Hall 197:38, Birmingham and Eisenberg 2000: 77-78). As described below, this vicinity was an important gathering place for a confederation of historic Dakota, a tradition that appears to have also been at work in prehistory. Thus, the evidence suggests that this site was nucleus for both large and small scale mourning rituals that had both personal and intergroup meaning over
Early Historic Dakota and Indian Mounds Park

The first written descriptions of the Dayton’s Bluff vicinity provide tantalizing, if vague, references to burial practices in the area. None of the descriptions directly describe the earthworks at Indian Mounds Park; instead, it is general geographic relation to the “Upper Group” of mounds at 21RA5, Carver’s Cave and Kaposia that is described (Woolworth 1981: 19-27). The earliest references come from the accounts of Captain Carver’s journey up the Mississippi River in 1766-1767. After describing the Wakon-teebe Cave or Dwelling of the Great Spirit Carver noted:

At a little distance from this dreary cavern is the burying-place of several bands of the Naudowessie Indians: though these people have no fixed residence, living in tents, and abiding but a few months on one spot, yet they always bring the bones of their dead to this place; which they take the opportunity of doing when the chiefs meet to hold their councils, and to settle all public affairs for the ensuing summer (Carver 1799: 60).

When we arrived at the Great Cave, and the Indians had deposited the remains of their deceased friends in the burial-place that stands adjacent to it, they held their great council, into which I was admitted (Carver 1799:80)

These passages clearly place the burial ground next to the cave named after Carver and was, in 1766, most likely at the “Upper Group” of mounds at Dayton’s Bluff (21RA5), which is directly above the cave. Carver was invited to other mourning rituals that he describes in some detail:

If they happen to be at a great distance from the place of interment appropriated to their tribe, and the person dies during the winter season, they wrap the body in skins, and lay it on a high stage built for this purpose, or on the branches of a large tree, till the spring arrives. They then, after the manner described in my Journal, carry it, together with all those belonging to the same nation, to the general burial-place, where it is interred with some other ceremonies that I could not discover (Carver 1799:375-376).

Though Carver participated in other events, he was not welcomed to the burial:

When the Naudowessies brought their dead for interment to the great cave, I attempted to get an insight into the remaining burial rites; but whether it was on account of the stench which arose from so many bodies, the weather being then hot, or whether they chose to keep this part of their customs secret from me, I could not discover; I found, however, that they considered my curiosity as ill-timed, and therefore I withdrew (Carver 1799:376).

Thus, it has always remained a matter of some conjecture how the “burial place” next to Carver’s Cave was used in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, and whether mound building was still being practiced there. Later early 19th century descriptions by Schoolcraft and Major Long repeat the association between Kaposia, Carver’s Cave, and the burying ground with its scaffolds, poles and graves—although none explicitly mention mounds (Woolworth 1981: 19-27). At the very least, there is a clear association between the burial mound sites at Indian Mounds Park and the “burial-place” of the Historic Dakota suggesting that they were aware of the centuries-long use of the scared site were continuing burial traditions there (Westerman and White 2012: 127).

Mound Builders Mythology and Antiquarian Archaeology in North America

When European Americans began settling the “wilderness” they had taken from Native Americans, they found a human-altered landscape marked by dramatic artificial earthworks like those at Indian Mounds Park. From Virginia to North Dakota, settlers witnessed groups of mounds, linear embankments, enclosures, animal effigies,
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and even pyramids all constructed from earth. The most spectacular examples were found in the Ohio River Valley, but earthworks also lined the terraces along much of Mississippi River Valley into its very source. Partially in a desire to create a story of a civilized antiquity for the raw new settlements, and partly in a need to disassociate the impressive earthworks with the lazy “savages” that they found so troublesome to displace from valuable farmland, the myth of an extinct Mound Building race became part of the belief system of most 19th century European Americans (Silverberg 1968).

There was ample evidence that the predecessors of the American Indians were associated with the mounds. Travelers such as Catlin and Carver and missionaries including Pond had documented native Minnesotans using or building mounds (Gibbon and Anfinson n.d., Pond 1986). Yet rational debunkers were spurned and the myth of a superior “Lost Race,” based in Middle America, capable of building monuments, and related to Old World ancestors remained deeply entrenched in the collective vision of the past. As early as 1803, the debate became polarized between those who felt that evidence supported their observation that mounds were built by ancestors of the Indians and those who posited that the earthworks were “too elaborate an engineering feat for savage Indians” (Silverberg 1968: 44-48).

In popular culture, the myth of the Mound Builder was disseminated through sensational accounts that gave evidence of wars between giants of the superior lost race and the lost savage tribes of Israel or battles between wandering Welsh giants and violent red men. The better educated found the proof of the distinct, superior race in the newly invented fields of physical anthropology and phrenology as unveiled in the 1839 book *Crania Americana* by Samuel Morten. This tome classified the skulls, and thus minds, of Mound Builders with those of semi-civilized Toltecs. The Indians, on the other hand, were proven to have “Barbarous” or even “savage” skulls that correlated to their aversion to civilization and were easily distinguishable from those of the white man or Toltecs (Silverberg 1968:108).

It was inconceivable to European Americans that Native Americans that “lived by the chase” had the technological ability and social organization to coordinate the construction of mounds. As well as ignoring the evidence that native groups depended upon social organization to survive by hunting and gathering, whites ignored the fact that many native women managed extensive gardens. Instead, the observed lack of men practicing agriculture, “that first, difficult and indispensable preliminary step, before any advance can be made toward civilization” was used as proof that no large, sedentary population, or any kind of social organization could have ever existed in Native American culture (Silverberg 1968:131). And as Native Americans were not observed making the kinds of ceramics and lithics plundered from mounds, it was surmised that they could not have made them in the past.

The Mound Builders debate was fierce and spurred antiquarian investigations of mounds as well as the founding of learned societies devoted to archaeology and related “sciences.” Eventually the newly established Smithsonian Institution was asked to help settle the issue and published the definitive study on the subject, *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley*, by Squier and Davis (1847; Winchell 1911). This landmark study was the first to systematically record American earthworks and its publication was funded by the Smithsonian provide a scientific perspective to the Mound Builder debate (Birmingham and Silverberg 2000: 18-19). The authors concluded that American earthworks were built by a common “family of men, moving in the same general direction, acting under common impulses, and influenced by similar causes” (Squier and Davis 1847: 301). Their observations pointed “to a connection more or less intimate between the race of the mounds and the semi-civilized nations which formerly had their seats among the sierras of Mexico, upon the plains of Central America and Peru” (ibid). Further research, they felt would address the “equally interesting questions connected with the extinct race, whose name is lost to tradition itself, and whose very existence is left to the sole and silent attestation of the rude but imposing monuments which throng the valleys of the West” (Squier and Davis 1847: 306).
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While Squier and Davis were awed by the magnitude of the large-scale earthworks they felt that the excavation of burial “mounds and their contents, as disclosed by the mattock and the spade, serve to reflect light more particularly upon their customs... Within these mounds we must look for the only authentic remains of their builders” (1847: 139). Thus they called for more digging by a new class of self-made archaeologists to address the problem of the Mound Builders in all corners of their former dominion.

The first person to follow the call for more data in Minnesota was missionary, educator, and historian Edward Duffield Neill in 1856. Neill chose to dig in what is now known as Mound 9 in Indian Mounds Park and published the sum of his field results two years later in a footnote to his 1858 History of Minnesota:

On the bluff above [Carver’s Cave] are numerous mounds. Under the supervision of the writer, one eighteen feet high and two hundred and sixty feet in circumference at the base, was opened to the depth of three or four feet. Fragments of skull, which crumbled on exposure, and perfect shells of human teeth, the interior entirely decayed, were found (Neill 1859: 208).

Even by nineteenth century antiquarian standards, the fact that the haphazard digging was abandoned within “three or four feet” and the results reported, barely elevated this into an “excavation.” Neill’s contemporaries, dryly noted years eight years later that this “hasty excavation” of a “trench so made was never filled up” (Kelley and Hill 1866). Yet this “first” is significant because Neill’s connection to antiquarian inquiry provides context to understand the cultural setting within which the origins of archaeology in Minnesota can be understood. Neill was no outlier. His success as a clergyman, educator, historian, and secretary to President Lincoln indicate that his worldview was well aligned with the people of the times and his influence in the development of educational and intellectual institutions in Minnesota was significant (Kilde 2010).

After graduating from Andover Theological Seminary, Neill arrived in St. Paul in 1849 under the sponsorship of the American Home Missionary Society. This group had already sent the Pond brothers to evangelize the Dakota but Neill showed no interest in leaving educated American society to follow their path. Within months of arriving in the territory he helped establish the public schools by crafting a mission statement that articulated the necessity of moral and religious training in the “education for eternity” (Kilde 2010: 19-20). The next month, he became a founding member of the Minnesota Historical Society (Kilde 2010:21), perhaps partly to document the local Dakota prior to what was expected to be their inevitable extinction.

When Neill made his investigation of Mound 9 in 1856, direct descendants of the people who had built or at least used the earthworks at Indian Mounds Park were still resident in the area. One of the nearby locations of the Dakota village Kaposia, known to Neill, had only been vacated for three years (Anderson 1997:204). Neill had collected Dakota history, and in his book Dahkota Land and Dahkota Life, he recorded their burial practices (Neill 1859). Though mounds were likely not being constructed near St. Paul in the late 1840s, later in the book he made a direct correlation between historic Dakota mourning rituals and the “upper group” of burials at Mounds Park:

The corpse is not buried, but placed in a box upon a scaffold some eight or ten feet from the ground. Hung around the scaffold are such things as would please the spirit if it was still in the flesh — such as the scalp of an enemy or pots of food. After the corpse has been exposed for some months, and the bones only remain, they are buried in a heap, and protected from the wolves by stakes. On the bluff, above the dilapidated cave which forms the eastern limit of Saint Paul, there is an ancient burial place. Here the Dahkotahs formerly brought their dead, and performed solemn services (Neill 1859: 88-89).

Yet, it is not clear that Neill made any connection between the fragments of skull and teeth he removed from the
massive burial mound at Indian Mounds Park, the “ancient burial place” at the nearby site, and the living Dakota. His excavation established a new interest in the bones and the burials of a known people, turning them into objects of inquiry. By turning the burial place of a living people into an arena for academic analysis, it facilitated the dehumanization of their culture and may have even lessened sympathy for their dire situation.

In 1850s Minnesota, the white preoccupation with the Dakota revolved around the best way to civilize them so that they could survive on increasingly smaller reservations—and the idea of civilization was directly associated with conversion to Christianity (Anderson 1997). Preservation of native cultural traditions was thought to only hasten the eventual extinction of the savage culture that stood in the way of the so-called superior culture (Berry 1960). Although somewhat accurate in detail, Neill’s descriptions of Dakota culture show that he understood the world of the non-Christian “heathen” as little more than a collection of inferior superstitions. Neill believed that Christian revelation undergirded all knowledge, thus it must have been difficult for him to understand how a culture that rejected the Christian God could have achieved the ability to construct such massive religious monuments.

Neill’s excavation may not have answered any questions regarding the Mound Building culture that supposedly created the tumuli at Dayton’s Bluff, but it did set a precedent for antiquarian investigations at the site. Alfred J. Hill an English-born engineer, surveyor and draftsman who moved to Red Wing in 1854 and became a draftsman in the state land office was the next man to supervise archaeological investigations (Dobbs 1996). Hill had moved to a particularly rich area of earthwork construction soon after it was officially vacated by the Dakota, and his position exposed him to all aspects of the state’s geography, including “aboriginal mounds.” Hill also collected historical maps and information regarding Dakota and Anishinabe place names, and corresponded with the naturalist and frontier historian Elliott Coues about these interests (Alfred J. Hill papers: 1850-1892). Most of the letters in the Hill files were written to him, thus it is difficult to determine what Hill’s own beliefs were regarding the builders of mounds, but the worldview of an engineer may have been less biased than that of a missionary.

As well as having inside information on earthworks from other surveyors, Hill was in the ideal professional position to invest in real estate in St. Paul while land was inexpensive, and by such speculation amassed the personal wealth to pursue his antiquarian interests (Finney 2001: 13). On May 7, 1862, Alfred Hill surveyed the Dayton’s Bluff mounds, which were only blocks from his house, with fellow mound enthusiast William Wallace, noting the mound “defaced by a superficial excavation in 1856” (Hill field notes from1862 in Lewis notebook 1). Hill mentioned that Carver’s Cave was below the “Upper” mound group. Yet his comment, “whether [Carver] meant these mounds by certain expressions of his or not, is an unsettled question” suggests that he may not have accepted the direct association of the mounds to the Dakota “burying place” mentioned by the explorer (Hill 1894: 314).

Although Hill and Wallace planned to return to take elevations, they were soon called to serve in the army for the Civil War. In a surprising turn of events, two days after their provisional organization at Fort Snelling on August 16, 1862, the Minnesota 6th Regiment heard the “news of the outbreak of the Sioux Indians in the western part of the state” and the regiment “was put on war footing” (Hill 1899:11). Hill served as a private in the 1862 Indian Campaign serving to liberate the American troops at Birch Coulee and at the Battle of Wood Lake, where he “would have preferred a little less chivalry and a few more dead Indians” before being transferred to Washington where his mapping and topographical skills were put to use (Hill 1899: 13,16).

Upon his return to Minnesota, Hill became the secretary of the Archaeology Committee of the Minnesota Historical Society, prepared a questionnaire asking for information regarding earthworks and antiquities throughout the state, and visited and surveyed some with “more or less accuracy, as circumstances permitted” (Hill 1894). Ironically, the Dakota, who could have provided the most accurate information about the use, and
perhaps construction, of mounds had been recently forced into exile, far outside of the homeland once marked by the sacred earthworks. Perhaps inspired by *Crania Americana*, Hill was also a charter member of the Phrenology Society in Minnesota and collected Indian skulls (Hill papers, Box shipping receipt: 1883).

Nationally, the mound builder debate raged on through the late 1860s, the period during which the MNHS archaeology committee was most active, and the “Suburban Hills” mounds remained the focus of their excavations. Besides Hill, the committee during these years included Robert O. Sweeny (druggist and illustrator of Dakota life scenes), Col. D. A. Robertson, William H. Kelley (brother of Grange founder Oliver Kelley), and doctors Charles Mayo and Dr. C. De Montreville. The archaeological methods were simple by modern standards. Excavations were typically trenches quickly dug in a day. Plan drawings were rarely made, soil was not screened, and artifacts were not systematically collected or catalogued.

Yet, the investigators did write letter reports on their findings, map in their excavation areas and provide scale drawings of the excavation areas and some profiles. Hill later noted that Neill’s excavation left Mound 9, “somewhat mutilated by a hasty excavation” indicating that the Archaeology Committee also had standards including backfilling and site restoration. The narratives of the letter reports they made to the Committee convey meaningful information regarding the internal configurations and stratigraphy of the mounds. Here, for example, is a description of the lower excavation levels of Mound 6 at “Suburban Hills”:

Near the southwestern corner at a depth of four and two tenths (4.2) feet fragments of charcoal began to appear, and also, at a depth of four and six tenths (4.6) feet, ashes became abundant-amongst the ashes were ten single pieces of bone, not charred, one being a portion of a joint socket. When cleared out, the pit or fire place was found to be about one and a half feet in diameter; the bottom being five and eight tenths (5.8) feet below the surface of the centre (Hill and Kelly 1866).

Antiquarians retained some human remains that were in good condition. For example, a femur was appended to the report of the opening of Mound 3 (De Montreville 1867). In other cases reburial was immediate and “of the bones exhumed a great majority were returned to the interior of the mound” (De Montreville 1867). Osteological analysis was sometimes provided. For example, a jaw was determined to be that of a roughly eight-year-old based on tooth eruptions (Kelley and Hill 1866) and height and sex of complete skeletons were assessed without exaggeration (De Montreville 1867). Materials such as galena and red ochre we were submitted for analysis to experts (Hill 1866), the effects of rodent burrows to deposits were noted and soil samples were saved, “in order to throw light upon [mound] formation—whether natural or artificial” (Kelley and Hill 1866). Using the observational and drafting skills of surveyors, engineers, doctors and illustrators, the descriptions and drawings made by the teams are especially informative and remain useful into the present. In contrast, Minnesota, newspapers of the time frequently published notices of excavations of mound excavations that were little more than weekend entertainment with a shovel (St. Paul Daily Globe, March 23, 1878:3, St. Cloud Journal November 7, 1867:1).

The Archaeological Committee mentions artifacts in the reports, but no catalogues are provided, nor do any of their “relics” remain within archaeological collections. Some mentions are made of ceramic temper, but descriptions are otherwise vague. Because the excavators were concerned with more spectacular finds exhibiting obvious stylistic attributes such as those illustrated in antiquarian tomes, the collection and treatment of artifacts is the weakest aspect of the antiquarian record (e.g. Squier and Davis: 1847: 188). Nor are human remains beyond the femur attached to De Montreville’s 1866 report documented from the MNHS excavations. The Park Department was rumored to have had bones from Mound 8, now lost (Nelson 2008:5). The lack of recorded human remains raises another possibility, that one motive of some antiquarians, particularly the doctors, was to collect skeletal materials for medical study. Charles Mayo, one of the committee members, had been given anatomy lessons using an exhumed cadaver of one of the 38 Dakota hanged at Mankato in the mass execution
following the U.S.-Dakota War (Clapetsattle 1969:77). Because there was no means of legally acquiring bodies for dissection and medical research, pilfering American Indian burials may have been an incentive for doctors to participate in mound excavation.

In 1873, the overtly racist book Prehistoric Races of the United States of America by J.W. Foster, the president of the Chicago Academy of Sciences, presented skull measurements, interpreted through anti-Indian sentiment to argue that the degraded, brutal, lazy, and immoral American Indian could not have created linear embankments or symmetrical mounds (Silverberg 1968: 157-160). As the political problems of Western Indian Wars were a heated topic covered in the daily papers, the Mound Builder debate, “cloaked in scientific trappings, the sentiments of a nation then engaged in genocide” (Silverberg 1968: 159). This same year, the archaeological committee was discontinued (Finney 2001:14), perhaps discouraged by the lack of concrete evidence regarding the builders of the mounds, and perhaps torn apart by the debate.

Because the Archaeological Committee did not attempt to interpret the results of their investigations, it is impossible to know the intellectual context of their investigations (e.g. Hill 1894: 311-319). Whatever their beliefs, the records of the Archaeological Committee’s excavations at the future Indian Mounds Park do demonstrate their ability to make scientific observations without forcing the results into explanatory framework, and marks the movement toward a natural history approach to archaeology in Minnesota. At the same time, the sterile descriptions of findings and lack of a cultural context for interpretation divorced archaeological inquiry from even the most basic ethnographic information provided by the earliest travelers to the area. The forced ignorance of any connection between the site and the native culture also prevented any meaningful understanding of the place, its connection to the larger setting, and the significance of the excavated burials—even as it could have contributed the Mound Builders debate.

Sometime around 1878, a self-made archaeologist named Theodore H. Lewis arrived in Minnesota, perhaps intrigued by the promise of exploring undocumented archaeological territory (Finney 2005a). Lewis had lived in the Chillicothe region of Ohio, known for its monumental earthworks. He was intellectually influenced both by the archaeology of that region and the great success of the first publication of the Smithsonian Institution, Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley, produced by local residents Squier and Davis (1847, Winchell 1911:x). At that time, no qualifications were required to become an archaeologist, but Lewis was experienced and widely read, and embodied all the complications of being a self-employed archaeologist in the 19th century. He kept notebooks of clippings regarding all aspects of archaeology from Cuzco, Peru to Fergus Falls, Minnesota, and subscribed to the theory that apparent similarities of mounds evidenced a Mound Builder race “distinct from that of the modern Indian” (Lewis scrapbooks n.d, Winchell 1911: vii, x). He was a ruthless excavator of sacred earthworks, yet sometimes managed to carefully record the character of the mounds he excavated. And though frustrated by the lack of valuable relics, he still recognized and collected mundane lithic artifacts and recorded their provenience.

In 1879, Lewis excavated Mound 7 at the “Suburban Hills” group with William Gross, independently of any archaeological organization (1896a). The fact that an artifact mining rush had broken out when eastern collectors began to pay high prices for ceramic vessels from mounds cannot be ruled out as an incentive for his excavation (Silverberg 1968: 161). Whatever his motivation, Lewis soon became acquainted with Alfred J. Hill. Even after the dissolution of the MNHS Archaeology Committee, Hill had remained committed to the study of mounds throughout the state and continued to collect information regarding their location and construction. When he met Lewis, Hill found an ideal collaborator for his dream of surveying the rapidly disappearing mounds of the Old Northwest region and together they founded the Northwest Archaeological Survey (NAS) (Dobbs 1996, Lewis 1898). Hill had funds, leads, and connections while Lewis was an astute and discriminating observer of archaeological phenomena, a capable and systematic surveyor, and held a boundless interest in earthworks.
The Northwest Archaeological Survey was funded solely by Hill’s personal wealth and performed solely by Lewis’s tireless fieldwork (Lewis 1898). Hill was a retiring person and did not have ambitions to enter the archaeological debate regarding mound builders (Winchell 1911, Lewis 1898). In contrast, Lewis had “always had hopes that something would turn up by the time the work is completed to have the whole embodied in a good standard work” (Lewis to Hill December 12, 1882 in Hill papers n.d.). As part of the survey, Lewis communicated to Hill that he hoped to excavate “some of the larger mounds, for they are more liable to contain relics than the smaller ones. And to make a complete book with illustrations of the relics found in the state should accompany it as these relics proves conclusively that the mound builders of other states were of the same class and people as those in Minn.” (Lewis to Hill December 12, 1882 in Hill papers).

Lewis believed (correctly) that the mounds at 21RA10 were the largest in the state, and this appears to have motivated him to excavate them in search of relics (1891:2). In August of 1882 and June of 1883, Lewis returned to the “Suburban Hills Group” often “opening” up to four mounds a day and completing the field work of excavating 11 mounds in a total of six days: August 12, 13, 16, 17 and 18, 1882; and June 12, 1883 (Lewis 1896a). Lewis did not appear to find the artifacts from these and other Minnesota mounds very compelling or collectable, but he did recognize the importance of accurately recording their provenience. As he wrote in the article “Ancient Mounds of Minnesota”:

Human bones, fragments of rude pottery, mussel shells, bits of charcoal, sometimes a flint arrowhead or two, and very rarely indeed, a copper implement — never all these things in the same mound—are the poor relics rewarding hours of manual labor and unremitting watchfulness. The task of thoroughly examining artificial earthworks by excavation is so onerous, and the prospect of finding anything of material value to pay for it so slight, there being scarcely anything but the knowledge acquired to compensate the labor, that few persons care to undertake such work for so poor a return. As a fact, the excavation of a mound by inexperienced individuals is a positive disadvantage to the cause of science, for it gives only a partial and incomplete knowledge of the character, structure and contents of the work explored (1891a: 8).

It should be noted that in the absence of any other funding, archaeology did depend upon the sale of artifacts to recoup costs and archaeological publications included want ad sections, so Lewis’s mercenary attitude was not unusual (American Archaeologist 1898). As Lewis finished the fifteenth year of survey for the NAS, 1895, Hill suddenly died. The Northwest Archaeological Survey came to an abrupt end, and the mound survey information collected by Lewis became entangled in an estate dispute (Finney 2000). Lewis’s antiquarian investigations at 21RA10 must not have been funded by the NAS, for he retained the rights to publish the results as well as ownership of all the artifacts he collected at Indian Mounds Park. Lewis later sold his large collection to Mitchell, but most of the artifacts have been lost except for 10 lithics that are still in the MNHS collections.

In 1896, two articles were published containing the bulk of the excavation information (Lewis 1896a, 1896b). Although Lewis’s original notes from his excavations at Indian Mounds Park do not survive, the five pages of reporting in an American Antiquarian article communicate a remarkable amount of information regarding mound excavation in a concise text, and have informed interpretations of the site ever since (Lewis 1896a: 314-318).

During the years of the NAS survey, the imaginary Mound Builders received a huge boost in notoriety from another St. Paul resident, when a book by two-term U.S. congressman Ignatius Donnelly presented an elaborately argued proof in a bestselling book that American earthworks had been built by refugees from Atlantis (Silverberg 1968). “The Colonies of the Mississippi Valley” in the 1882 book Atlantis: the Antediluvian World provided the basis for this theory of cultural dissemination for a popular audience (Donnelly 1882: 370-386). While this book
The myth of the mound builders may have persisted in the popular imagination, but by the 1890s mound investigators were increasingly open to the connection between Native Americans and American earthworks. The evidence was little changed, but the transition to a more rigorously scientific perspective and the virtual elimination of American Indians as a threat to European American settlement allowed the connection to be more logically considered. In a paper delivered to the MNHS and reprinted in the St. Paul Daily Globe in 1893, another self-taught Minnesota-based archaeologist, Jacob V. Brower, wrote that the implements found in a mound in northern Minnesota suggested that the "ancient mound builder of the Rainy Lake region" was a "copper colored primitive man (the ancient ancestor of the modern Indian)" (St Paul Daily Globe December 18, 1893:16). This connection was weakened in an exclusive article published two years later titled "PREHISTORIC MOUND BUILDERS: Important Discoveries by Hon. J. V. Brower and Prof. T.H. Lewis about the Mississippi Headwaters: Gruesome Discoveries in Mounds: A Race of Men Who Occupied Part of Minnesota Hundreds of Years Before the Red Man Came: Bones of these Men are Dug Up" that described the findings from a trip made by Brower and Lewis to Itasca. The article's conclusion that the mound-building race formerly inhabiting the area was "a race of men superior to the Ojibway population now occupying the locality" may have been more aligned with what would sell newspapers and the viewpoint of Lewis than the beliefs of Brower (St Paul Daily Globe, August 4, 1895:13).

Although Lewis excavated at Indian Mounds Park between 1879 and 1883, he published the results at least a decade later. In his 1890s articles, there are timid hints that the evolution of anthropological thought may have had affected his interpretations—or perhaps his editors. In the early 1890s he derisively referred to "the assumption that the Indians built the mounds" as the "squaw theory" (Lewis 1891b: 3). But by 1896, after the description of the Indian Mounds Park excavations, he asks, "Does the theory advanced by Dr. Cyrus Thomas, that the stone graves were built by the Shawnee Indians and cognate tribes apply to these also?" (Lewis 1896a: 320). Yet, this language does not seem to be Lewis's own and could have been that of an editor.

While archaeologists pondered the meaning of mounds, they were rapidly being destroyed by agriculture, transportation projects, and urban expansion. Mounds within the floodplains were more vulnerable to plowing, but the setting of the Suburban Hills mounds put them in danger of being developed for the residential lots of those wealthy enough to afford a panoramic view. In 1872, the visionary landscape architect Horace W. Cleveland came to Minneapolis and St. Paul, and delivered a well-received speech to the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce urging the city fathers to begin buying the most wild and picturesque spots within the city—particularly those spots along the Mississippi River Bluffs. In his presentations, Cleveland identified the area that became Indian Mounds Park as one of the most important spaces to purchase prior to development (Tishler and Luckhardt 1985).

The process of acquiring land for the park was slow and did not begin until 1887 when a Board of Park Commissioners was created to arrange for the financing of parkland purchases (Tishler and Luckhardt 1985). In 1888, Alfred Hill mentioned that "these fine tumuli have a good chance of being preserved for the benefit of posterity, as it is proposed to lay out a public park on the bluff there, which will include most of the mounds, together with the adjacent hillside slopes" (Hill 1888: 313). The same year $20,000 in bonds were issued for purchase of parkland (St Paul Park Commissioners 1888:35). By the time the results of Lewis's excavations were published in the mid-1890s, decades of agitation and debate regarding the preservation of the overlook and
mounds at Indian Mounds Park by were finally having an effect. In 1890, the city began condemnation of the site—excepting the far western side, which contained Mounds 14, 15 and 16—but the panic of 1893 put the project to sleep for another four years when “surface improvements were completed” around the “the antique memorials of an Indian race which formerly held sway over the region” (St. Paul Daily Globe, March 15, 1890: 2, February 2, 1894: 4).

In 1900, Jacob Brower and David Bushnell published a convincing “historico-Archaeological deduction” connecting the builders of Minnesota mounds with the Historic Dakota, realigning subsequent mound investigations and intellectually beginning the extermination of the mound builder theory in Minnesota archaeology (Winchell 1911: x). In Mille Lac they wrote:

At or immediately adjoining every Sioux village site there is a mound group, and at one of them an enclosure. No evidence of any kind whatsoever, obtained at Mille Lac, surely indicates that any other ancient nation of men resided there. A series of mounds, and of village sites overspread with stone implements and pot shards, extends from Dayton’s Bluff to Rum River, and up that river to Mille Lac... and thence up the Mississippi to Itasca Lake, all of one identical character (Brower and Bushnell 1900:135).

The tide of educated opinion had probably already turned. Just three years later, not even park planners suggested that Indian Mounds Park had been the site where a mysterious “lost race” built tumuli before being evicted by inferior savages. In fact, the complete removal of the Dakota from Minnesota by this time evoked a sense of nostalgia in city dwellers. In a new twist to the tale, the archaeologists were recast as the invading vandals in the noble warrior’s domain.

The edge of the bluff, which takes in this wide sweep of prospect and makes it a portion of the park itself, is crowned with five (sic) superb cone-shaped Indian mounds, the tumular monuments, not of a vanished race, but of the chiefs and head men of the ancestors of the exiled Dakota nation, in which their remains were buried perhaps centuries ago, in the belief no doubt, that to lay them in such conspicuous sepulchers was the highest honor which could be paid them. As long ago as when Jonathan Carver visited this spot, then the seat of the annual councils of that ancient nation, these mounds were here. In the early days of St. Paul they were ransacked by antiquarian vandals and robbed of the Indian relics that were buried with the warrior dead (Board of Park Commissioners: 1903:22).

Pursuing a line of inquiry somewhere between vandalism and science, T.H. Lewis and the members of the Archaeological Committee did not employ sophisticated archaeological techniques or interpretive frameworks, but the documentation of their investigations at Indian Mounds Park have been a lasting source of archaeological information into the present. From their reporting, this site’s connection to the Hopewell Tradition was identified in the twentieth century by John Bennett (1934) and Elden Johnson (1957) and the site has been important for understanding the expression of the Havana-Related/Hopewell cultural context in Minnesota (Arzigian and Stevenson 2003, Arzigian 2012).

Yet, for centuries prior to archaeological scrutiny, local peoples had known the significance of this place. From their nearby villages, or travelling up and down the river, the sacred paha of their ancestors were visible on the high bluff.
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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 #
   ___ recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey #

Primary location of additional data:
   x State Historic Preservation Office
   ___ Other State agency
   ___ Federal agency
   ___ Local government
   ___ University
   x Other: MN Office of the State Archaeologist

Name of repository:

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned):

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property  3.6

(Do not include previously listed resource acreage.)

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting (mE)</th>
<th>Northing (mN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>495547.40</td>
<td>4976928.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)
The eastern boundary is on the eastern side of the sidewalk from the parking lot to the southeastern overlook. The southern site boundary is the bluff edge south of the mounds beginning at the overlook on the eastern edge to the sidewalk that cuts northwest at the western side. On the western side the boundary falls east of the sidewalks that connect from the bluff to the sidewalk north of the mounds. On the north, the boundary falls inside (south) of the northern sidewalk for 370' and then angles southeast on the southern side of the pavilion. From the intersection of this diagonal sidewalk with the central sidewalk that runs straight south from the pavilion, the boundary trends due east to the northern point on the eastern boundary.

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)
Boundaries conform to the site as mapped by T.H. Lewis ca. 1880 and natural topographic boundaries, and exclude the non-contributing pavilion over the location of destroyed Mound 18.
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name/title  Sigrid Arnott, Geoff Jones, David Maki
organization Archaeo-Physics LLC
date 8/20/2013
street & number 4150 Dight Avenue, #110
telephone (612) 379-9464
state MN
zip code 55406
city or town Minneapolis
e-mail sigridarnott@gmail.com
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Maps (on continuation sheets):
Map 1: USGS Quad Map with Indian Mounds Park Mound Site Location, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Map 2: Sketch Map of Indian Mounds Park Mound site (21RA10) National Register Boundary overlaid on Winchell (1911) map of site with photo locations.

Map 3: Numbered Mounds and Geophysical Survey Areas shown on existing conditions LiDAR imagery.

Figures (on continuation sheets):
Figure 1: Geophysical results Eastern Grid with Mapped Mound Locations.

Figure 2: Geophysical results in Western Grid with Mapped Mound Locations.

Figure 3: Looking south to Indian Mounds Park, Mounds 2, 3, 7, and 9 in 1889 from left to right (St. Paul Park Department Collection).

Figure 4: Possible Location of Mound 6 in foreground of 1920-1930s postcard. Photo is facing northwest and Mound 9 is visible on far right.

Figure 5: Post card view of original park pavilion on Lot 30 near the northern side of Mound 15 in the early 20th century. Mound 9 is in the far right foreground, and Mounds 10, 12 and 13 are in front of the Pavilion.

Figure 6: Plan drawing of the Hill and Kelley excavation areas in the 1866 investigation of mounds numbered 8 and 9 by Lewis.

Photographs (prints and on CD):
Name of Property: Indian Mounds Park Mound Group (21RA10)

City or Vicinity: St. Paul
County: Ramsey  
State: Minnesota

Photographer: Sigrid Arnott

Date Photographed: May 4, 2013

Photo 1 of 7: Mounds 2 and 3, facing south from northern boundary

Photo 2 of 7: Mounds 12, 10, 9 and 7, from near right to far left, facing southeast

Photo 3 of 7: Mounds 10, 9 and 7, from near left to far right, facing east

Photo 4 of 7: Former location of Mound 16 (between walkway and tower base, left of park bench) and Mound 15 (behind shrubs at base of tower) facing east northeast from southwestern boundary. Note cutting in foreground and fill beneath Airmail beacon tower.

Photo 5 of 7: Likely remnant of Mound 6 bisected by overlook retaining wall on south side of Mound 10, facing west.

Photo 6 of 7: Two eras and levels of retaining walls on southern side of site support fill beneath circulation features. Oldest is lower level. Suspected remnant of Mound 6 is in background between the retaining wall and large tree on far left of photo. Facing west.

Photo 7 of 7: Mounds 7 and 9. Facing northwest.
Indian Mounds Park Mound Group                                        Ramsey, Minnesota
Name of Property                                                  County and State

Property Owner:
(Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

name  
street & number  

city or town  

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.
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Figure 1: Geophysical results Eastern Grid with Mapped Mound Locations
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Figure 2: Geophysical results in Western Grid with Mapped Mound Locations
Figure 3: Looking south to Indian Mounds Park, Mounds 2, 3, 7, and 9 in 1889 from left to right (St. Paul Park Department Collection)
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Figure 4: Possible Location of Mound 6 in foreground of 1920-1930s postcard. Photo is facing northwest and Mound 9 is visible on far right.

Figure 5: Post card view of original park pavilion on Lot 30 near the northern side of Mound 15 from early 20th century. Mound 9 is in the far right foreground, and Mounds 10,
12 and 13 are in front of the Pavilion.

Figure 6: Plan drawing of the Hill and Kelley excavation areas in the 1866 excavations of mounds numbered 8 and 9 by Lewis.
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Map 1: USGS Quad Map with Indian Mounds Park Mound Site Location, St. Paul, Minnesota
Map 2: Sketch Map of Indian Mounds Park Mound site (21RA10) National Register Boundary overlaid on Winchell (1911) map of site with photo locations
Map 3: Numbered Mounds and Geophysical Survey Areas shown on existing conditions LiDAR imagery