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Abstract
Platform mounds and plazas have a 5000-year-long history in the eastern United States but are often viewed through the lens of late prehistoric and early historic understandings of mound use. This review approaches the history of these important landscape features via a forward-looking temporal framework that emphasizes the variability in their construction and use through time and across space. I suggest that by viewing platform mounds in their historical contexts, emphasizing the construction process over final form, and focusing on nonmound sites and off-mound areas such as plazas, we can build a less biased and more complex understanding of early Native American monumentality.
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Introduction
Mound building has a long history in the eastern United States, beginning in the Archaic period (c. 8000–1000 BC) and elaborated during Woodland (c. 1000 BC–AD 1000) and Mississippian (c. AD 1000–1500) times. Flat-topped earthen mounds, or platform mounds, are often thought to have developed rather late in this sequence. While many of these mounds were foundations for structures, I define platform broadly to include any flat-topped structure on which activities likely took place. Because of their ubiquity at Mississippian sites, platform mounds have been consistently tied to hierarchical social organization and agricultural lifeways, leading them to be seen as diagnostic of those traits. However, platform mounds have been constructed by societies with a wide range of sociopolitical and economic
systems, and their functions and meanings are undoubtedly more variable than often assumed.

I highlight two particular issues that plague interpretations of pre-Mississippian platform mounds. The first involves the backward-looking approach taken by archaeologists interested in discovering the origins of particular cultural practices. For platform mounds, this has led to the overreliance on Mississippian and early historic understandings of platform mound function and use. The second issue involves the mound-centrism present in most interpretations of monumental landscapes. While mounds are often the most conspicuous site features, studies that focus primarily on their construction and use unfairly bias our interpretations of the range of activities that took place at a given location. Plazas—bounded, open spaces large enough to hold public gatherings—are likely to have been the venue for a large percentage of the social activities that took place at mound sites. As such, they should be as important in developing understandings about what happened at these sites and the traits of the cultures that used and inhabited them. While generally not discussed as an exclusively late prehistoric development, plazas are still too often discussed in the context of Mississippian mound-and-plaza centers, making their interpretation also subject to mound-centrism and archaeologists’ backward-looking gaze. By exhaustively reviewing pre-Mississippian mounds and nonmound and premound examples of plazas, this review begins the process of correcting these persistent biases and painting a more varied and accurate picture of this important set of prehistoric practices.

Monumentality and Mound Building in the Southeast

Monuments can serve any number of purposes. Some commemorate the past while others honor some aspect of the present; they mark certain places as special and communicate messages to their viewers (Scarre 2011, p. 9). Traditional definitions of “monument” emphasize a number of features: they are built to endure, their scale and elaboration exceed the requirements of utilitarian function, and their construction necessitates some organization of labor and resources beyond the household (e.g., Abrams 1989; Bradley 1993, p. 5; DeMarrais et al. 1996, pp. 18–19; Trigger 1990, p. 119). These characteristics factor heavily in interpretations of societies associated with large-scale public architecture. For example, Trigger (1990) argued that because of their labor and surplus requirements, monumental constructions correlate with increasing stratification and differentiation within a society; they were built to unambiguously mark social and political relationships and to be part of conspicuous consumption. The broad acceptance of this pattern led to the longstanding and relatively pervasive assumption that the development of prehistoric monumentality was tied to the emergence of agriculture and the rise of hierarchical society (e.g., Feinman 1995; Haas and Creamer 2012; Peebles and Kus 1977; Yoffee 1993). More specifically, this historical positioning of monumentality led many to assume that such constructions were inherently incompatible with more egalitarian, hunter–gatherer societies (Randall 2015, pp. 48–49). This assumption was, in turn, bolstered by the lack of ethnographic case studies in which hunter–gatherers

Archaeologists have now moved away from relying so heavily on ethnographic analogies to understand hunter–gatherer groups, focusing instead on archaeological data. This shift allowed for the acknowledgment of greater diversity and a higher degree of complexity within past hunter–gatherer societies (Price and Brown 1985) and for the recognition that monument construction was a regular occurrence in some cases (Scarre 2011, p. 10). In the American Southeast, this shift occurred around 25 years ago with the widespread acceptance of Archaic period monuments (e.g., Russo 1994b; Saunders et al. 1994). Earlier recognitions of Archaic monumentality were denied popular acceptance due to prevailing cultural-historical and evolutionary paradigms in the field; early radiocarbon dates were written off as anomalous, and compelling evidence was not published for fear of backlash (see Russo 1994a). However, a solid corpus of archaeological data quickly accumulated, and the fact that some hunter–gatherer societies in the Southeast regularly built mounds eventually was accepted, a fact that now figures prominently in summaries of early New World monumentality (e.g., Burger and Rosenswig 2015).

In the years since this initial acceptance, focus has shifted to questioning the level of complexity (and in particular, sociopolitical organization) required to construct monuments. If hunter–gatherer societies could create monumental architecture, did that mean that the sociopolitical structure of those groups was more complex than previously assumed, or were our assumptions about what monumental architecture actually required not accurate? In the southeastern literature, this line of inquiry manifested as a debate between three primary points of view: (1) Some Archaic people clearly lived in more complex and hierarchical communities than we had imagined, (2) the emergence of mound building does not necessarily indicate significant sociopolitical change because monuments were built by relatively simple and egalitarian groups, and (3) the identified mounds did not really qualify as monuments in the true sense, thus no change in our understandings of Archaic sociality was needed (see Gibson and Carr 2004). Evaluating the level of complexity reached by Archaic societies required moving beyond the presence or absence of monumental constructions and taking into account other archaeologically accessible cultural traits, such as investment in plant domestication, craft specialization, trade, sedentism, site planning, and storage, as well as evidence for settlement hierarchy, differentiation in structural remains, competitive feasting, ritual elaboration, and grave goods (see Gibson and Carr 2004). The picture painted by these investigations is one of great variability, which should not be surprising given the geographic and temporal extent of Archaic cultures in the Southeast. In reflecting on this variability, Endonino (2010, p. 20) discusses how the motivations that hunter–gatherers in the southeastern United States had for constructing mounds likely varied as a result of local historical experience. This critical recognition of the importance of local context and historical precedent for understanding these monuments draws attention to a major issue in archaeological interpretation more broadly that has significantly affected the interpretation of early platform mounds (Kassabaum et al. 2011).

Bailey (2007, p. 203) discusses the particular challenges brought about by the palimpsestic nature of the archaeological record and outlines two common
approaches for dealing with them: archaeologists may attempt “to reconstitute the individual episodes of activity,” or they may “focus on the best preserved and most highly resolved exemplars.” Because ethnographic case studies offer the thick descriptions not commonly afforded by prehistoric archaeology, they have often provided the data for the second approach, thereby allowing ethnographies of contemporary hunter–gatherers to have detrimental effects on the early acceptance of Archaic monumentality. Although many questions remain, it has only been through the application of the first approach that real progress has been made in our understanding of these mound-building cultures. Platform mound studies in the United States have been particularly susceptible to this problematic tendency in archaeological thinking.

Platform Mound Studies

The Mississippian period is broadly characterized by the development of institutionalized status hierarchy (i.e., chiefdom-type social organization), corn agriculture, shell-tempered pottery, wall-trench structures, a widely shared religious system displayed through iconography, and platform mound-and-plaza centers (Anderson 2012, p. 78). Because the Woodland period immediately precedes the transition to Mississippian societies, it is often assumed to contain evidence of the incipient stages of these developments. In many cases, the search for Woodland precursors was successful. For example, we now know that corn was utilized in the eastern United States long before it became the staple crop of Mississippian society. However, research on this early use of corn has painted a picture quite different from our understanding of Mississippian corn agriculture; early corn was a minor, ceremonial cultigen and did not form a major part of the diet (Smith 1989, p. 1570).

Similarly, platform mounds were long thought to be a uniquely Mississippian phenomenon; in some cases, the unflinching acceptance of this assumption led to dramatic misinterpretations of early platform mound sites (e.g., Sears 1956, 1992). Evidence gradually mounted against this belief, and a number of reviews of Woodland platform mounds were published in the 1990s (e.g., Jefferies 1994; Knight 1990; Lindauer and Blitz 1997; Pluckhahn 1996). We now know that flat-topped mounds were common at Woodland (and present on Archaic) sites. Even in the wake of dramatic increases in archaeological understandings of pre-agricultural, nonchiefdom complexity in general and pre-Mississippian platform construction specifically, long-held beliefs about status and hierarchy have nevertheless continued to hold sway over discussions of platform mound ceremonialism. In essence, while it became acceptable that relatively egalitarian, nonagricultural populations constructed monumental architecture in the form of conical mounds, platform mounds were another story.

Despite the fact that the earliest iterations of a practice do not always match later iterations, our assumptions about pre-Mississippian platform mounds have relied heavily on the understandings of well-excavated Mississippian centers and ethnohistoric accounts of mound use at the point of European contact (Kassabaum et al. 2011). For these reasons, it is often assumed that the shift from conical to platform
mounds reflects parallel social, political, and economic shifts (i.e., from a more egalitarian to a more hierarchical social order, and from hunting and gathering to agriculture), even when sites lack other characteristics associated with institutionalized hierarchy, such as burial practices indicating differences in status (Kassabaum 2011). Although the use of ethnohistoric and archaeological data from descendant groups sidesteps the most damning issues with using ethnographic analogies from unrelated, present-day groups, it still has had a strong homogenizing and distorting influence on our understanding of pre-Mississippian platform mound ceremonialism.

Because platform mound architecture varies widely across time and space, the motives and meanings behind these structures likely were similarly varied. The function and meaning of monuments is not explicit in their final form; rather, a certain degree of knowledge about the social context in which they were constructed is necessary for their interpretation (Endonino 2010, p. 32). Thus, to whatever degree possible, it is important to understand early platform-mound-building cultures in and of themselves without relying heavily on references to later societies.

Largely though not entirely due to our desire to utilize the “most highly resolved exemplars” (Bailey 2007, p. 203), archaeologists tend to employ a backward-looking approach to the past. This is clearly evidenced by our obsession with identifying the origins of various cultural practices. Of course, prehistoric people had no way of knowing to what they were headed, while they certainly had deep knowledge of the past. Any progress on developing a more emic perspective on the construction and use of platform mounds will require the examination of patterns via a forward-looking temporal framework. In this review, I begin with the earliest known examples of platform mounds and work forward to the more recent past, attempting to disregard assumptions that originated from later periods about what sites might represent. This process undoubtedly increases knowledge of pre-Mississippian platforms; it also has the potential to broaden our thinking about the more commonly discussed sites of the Mississippi period.

The Role of Plazas

In addition to the distorting effects of time perspectivism (Bailey 2007) as described above, a second issue—that of mound-centrism—also plagues archaeological interpretations of platform mound sites. For too long, archaeological work at mound centers has been overly focused on the mounds themselves. Especially in late prehistory, platform mounds commonly occur as part of mound-and-plaza centers, but the tendency to privilege earthworks over off-mound spaces has led to a mound-centric view that emphasizes a limited range of activities assumed to have taken place on mound summits (Barrier and Kassabaum 2018).

Plazas are as ubiquitous in the archaeological record as monuments and are regularly identified at short-term occupations, villages, and major cities; they are associated with the entire range of cultural expressions from egalitarian hunter-gatherers to highly hierarchical states. The privileging of architecture over open spaces limits archaeological interpretation of the cultural dynamics in these societies. Research from around the globe has demonstrated that the careful study of plazas can provide
useful insights into the lives of the people who built and used them (e.g., Low 2000; Moore 1996; Nair 2015, pp. 65–87; Tsukamoto and Inomata 2014). That said, there is great variation in the size and form of plazas, their locations and relationships to other constructed landscape features, and their cultural contexts. Undoubtedly, these variables affected what activities took place in the plaza, who participated in them, and how they were perceived by others. Understanding this complexity requires focused studies that trace histories of plaza construction and use.

In recent decades, Mississippian scholars have turned their attention to the plazas associated with platform mounds (Alt et al. 2010; Boudreaux 2013; Cobb and Butler 2017; Dalan 1997; Davis et al. 2015; Holley et al. 1993; Lewis et al. 1998; Nelson 2014; Rogers et al. 1982). Though not as common, scholars of earlier periods also have undertaken focused discussions of plazas (Barrier and Kassabaum 2018; Kidder 2004; Pluckhahn 2010; Sassaman and Heckenberger 2004). However, synthetic reviews of plazas in eastern North America are lacking, most likely due to under-identification, the lack of discussion of plazas in the primary literature, and the variable vocabulary used to describe them. Although not as encyclopedic as the discussion of pre-Mississippian platform mounds, I also survey the evidence for the construction and use of pre-Mississippian plazas and build a basic outline from which we may start working toward a more complete review.

The Long History of Platform Mound Construction

Three decades ago, Southeastern archaeologists focused their attention on demonstrating that platform mounds were not a uniquely Mississippian phenomenon. The number of known Archaic and Woodland platform mounds has since grown dramatically, and we now recognize that they were built by temporally and geographically diverse pre-Mississippian cultures. In response to this increase in data, Pluckhahn (1996, p. 207) has called for “more focused studies of the similarities and differences among [pre-Mississippian platforms].” In the 1990s, a number of reviews undertook, to some degree, the called-for examinations (e.g., Jefferies 1994; Knight 1990; Lindauer and Blitz 1997; Pluckhahn 1996). These reviews led to a variety of conclusions about the construction and use of primarily, Middle Woodland platform mounds and tended not to discuss earlier Archaic or later Woodland examples in as much detail. Regardless, one particularly important point emerged from these reviews—that while there is variability in the design attributes and signs of use associated with Woodland platforms, there are identifiable shifts in the construction histories displayed by early versus late mounds. For example, most reviews suggested that summit structures, especially residences, were common on late platforms while irregular scatters of post molds, large standing posts, middens, and burned surfaces characterize early platforms.

However, early platform mounds are more common and more diverse than previously recognized, especially if we view the process of building them as more important than the final product. Because flat-topped stages are common in mounds that are later capped with a rounded fill episode, excavation of these structures allows us to trace an even longer history of platform mound use characterized by continuous
as well as nonlinear shifts in mound function. Here I use time and space to organize the evidence for early platform mounds and to provide general background on the groups who constructed them. In doing so, I show that previous literature exaggerates the consistency, ubiquity, and scale of the shifts that are thought to have occurred at the transition from Woodland to Mississippian times. I provide evidence that the shifts described in previous reviews are not unidirectional and do not take place concurrently. Rather, there are many examples where the types of activities that regularly took place on Woodland period platform mounds (e.g., feasting and setting posts) persisted into Mississippian times and equally many where characteristically late uses of platform mounds (e.g., foundations for structures) have longer histories than are often acknowledged.

Archaic Period Platform Mounds

Though not often acknowledged, both Middle and Late Archaic flat-topped mounds are now well documented (Fig. 1). The best understood examples are at the Late Archaic Poverty Point site in Louisiana, though earlier Archaic platforms have been documented elsewhere in the Lower Mississippi Valley and in the St. Johns River Valley in Florida. The relative dearth of known Archaic platform mounds is undoubtedly exacerbated by our general lack of knowledge about mound construction during this period. Middle Archaic mound building became well accepted only around 25 years ago (Russo 1994a, b; Saunders et al. 1994), and many unexcavated and undated sites still exist. As more research is focused on this period, it is likely the corpus of identified Archaic platforms will grow substantially.

Lower Mississippi Valley

Due to the strong influence of Poverty Point culture (c. 2000–600 BC) on our understanding of the history of mound construction in the eastern United States, I begin with a review of the roles that platforms played at the type-site. Poverty Point was a location for seasonal aggregation, trade, and craft production for mobile fisher–hunter–gatherer populations. At the end of the Archaic, the site consisted of six elliptical ridges, two possible bird effigies, two conical mounds, and one flat-topped mound (Fig. 2). At least four of these mounds were, at one time, flat-topped and likely served a variety of functions (e.g., Kidder et al. 2009; Ortmann 2007). Unpublished research also has documented Poverty Point-era platform mounds at Jaketown (Kidder et al. n.d.) (Table 1).

Mound building began at Poverty Point with the construction of Mound B. Though it appears conical in final form, Mound B’s initial stages covered a prepared surface with platforms used for food preparation. A final construction episode added a conical cap, and activity in the area ceased (Ford and Webb 1956, pp. 33–46; Kidder et al. 2009; Ortmann 2007, pp. 63–79). In a north–south line with Mound B is Mound E, a flat-topped mound with a similar construction sequence, but it lacks the conical cap (see Fig. 1d). With Lower Jackson, a Middle Archaic mound 2 mi south,
these mounds formed a central axis, indicating Late Archaic people’s desire to tie their constructed landscape to the architecture of the past. Mound A also would eventually be built along this axis (Kidder et al. 2009, p. 128).

After Mound B was capped, the site was reorganized around the construction of the ridges to create a central plaza in which Mound C was built. Excavations in Mound C revealed a low platform consisting of midden deposits, horizontal caps, and differentially colored and textured floors on which a variety of activities took place. The mound was then partially covered by a material-rich cap around the time of Mound A’s construction (see Fig. 1c). Mound C’s function remains elusive, but nonlocal materials and short-term activities suggest ritual use (Kidder et al. 2009, pp. 110–112; Ortmann 2007, pp. 148–181).

While often discussed as an effigy, Mound A was built as a massive conical mound onto which a large platform was added (see Fig. 1b). Recent geoarchaeological analyses revealed that Late Archaic people built this mound in less than two months, requiring huge labor forces (Kidder et al. 2009; Ortmann 2007, pp. 190–250). No features have been identified on the platform, leaving its function unknown. That said, as one of the largest earthen constructions in North America,
**Fig. 2** Poverty Point site layout and platform mounds (adapted from Gibson 2001, figs 5.2 and 5.3). (a) Schematic of the Late Archaic Poverty Point site. (b) Schematic of Mound A showing a large platform attached to the initial conical mound. (c) Schematic of Mound C showing a platform partially covered with a conical cap. (d) Schematic of Mound E showing the remaining platform at the site

**Table 1** Archaic platform mounds in the Lower Mississippi Valley. Question marks indicate pieces of information that are uncertain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th># ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Point</td>
<td>16WC5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B and C</td>
<td>1600–1400 BC series of low, rectangular platforms with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Point</td>
<td>16WC5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1600–1400 BC (?) series of low rectangular platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Point</td>
<td>16WC5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1400 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaketown</td>
<td>22HU505</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A and X</td>
<td>1300–780 BC (?) rectangular platform (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Sano</td>
<td>16EBR17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5500–4000 BC rectangular platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby</td>
<td>16SH21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3200–3050 BC low, rounded platform with conical cap (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenchman’s Bend</td>
<td>16OU259</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3400–2700 BC series of low, round (?) platforms with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgepeth</td>
<td>12LI17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3100–2700 BC low, round (?) platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson Brake</td>
<td>16OU175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3500–2700 BC large conical with low side platforms with caps (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it is unfortunate that it has not figured more prominently in discussions of early platform mounds.

While Mound A’s size and form are extraordinary, the other mounds at Poverty Point were not unique for the Archaic period. Rather, the construction of platforms as the first stage of mounds later covered with conical caps has a deep history in the Middle Archaic period (c. 6000–2000 BC) at sites such as Monte Santo (Kuttruff 1997), Hornsby (Gibson and Shenkel 1988, pp. 9–10), Frenchman’s Bend, Hedgepeth, and perhaps Watson Brake (Saunders 2012, pp. 37–41) (see Table 1). At least one of these platforms supported mortuary facilities (Kuttruff 1997), while others show evidence of structures and nonmortuary activities on their summits (Gibson and Shenkel 1988, pp. 9–10; Saunders 2012, pp. 37–41).

Regardless of their function, these very early mounds were built by localized fisher–hunter–gatherers who did not engage in trade like the inhabitants of later Poverty Point. Middle Archaic society was egalitarian with some groups constructing mounds and others not, suggesting that the practice was undertaken by autonomous communities rather than coordinated, intergroup efforts as seen at Poverty Point. Moreover, many Middle Archaic mound sites show evidence of intensive Early Archaic occupation, indicating significant place-based continuity among these groups, with little change in subsistence or other daily activities associated with the onset of monument construction (Saunders 2010, 2012). This persistence of place is further demonstrated by 200-year hiatuses in mound construction at Watson Brake, suggesting the mounds themselves, not specific people, drew populations back (Saunders et al. 2005b; see also Thompson 2010).

Further excavation at these and other Archaic sites in the Lower Mississippi Valley will likely reveal additional Archaic platforms and provide more detail on their diverse functions. Based on the combined evidence from Poverty Point and Middle Archaic examples, platform mounds were an important form of monumentality for Archaic people. Their sequentially occupied summits served as foundations for structures and provided platforms for activities ranging from burial and processing of the dead, to food preparation and consumption, to short-term ritual events. Clearly, the idea of using constructed platforms to physically, and perhaps psychologically, elevate certain activities was present in mound-building practice from its inception.

St. Johns River Valley

Archaic platform mounds also are found at a series of Mount Taylor period (c. 5400–2600 BC) shell mounds in the St. Johns River Valley of Florida (see Fig. 1, Table 2). Harris Creek was a small mortuary platform that was gradually expanded through time (Aten 1999). In spite of limited excavations, the Mount Taylor mounds at North Hontoon Island and Hontoon Dead Creek also appear to fit this description (Randall and Sassaman 2005), as well as perhaps Live Oak (Sassaman 2003), Orange (Aten 1999, p. 176), and others that also have not been sufficiently excavated (Randall and Sassaman 2005). Slightly later, Thornhill Lake contains two sand burial mounds built in the shape of truncated cones (Endonino 2010).
Though excavation at these sites is minimal, it appears that the constructions began as flat-topped mounds associated with mortuary activities. Generally, there is evidence of significant premound activity, followed by the construction of a low platform upon which layers of shell midden, clean shell, sand, and other sediments were placed, creating additional flat summits. These summits show evidence of various activities in the form of midden deposits, burning episodes, additional burials, postholes, hearths, and other features. In addition to their mortuary functions, these early platforms provided locations for specialized (but not domestic) food production and consumption. Capping episodes were eventually undertaken to create conical final forms, but this generally occurred later by cultures reusing the mounds (Aten 1999; Kidder and Sassaman 2009, p. 674; Randall and Sassaman 2005; Randall 2015). Patterns of site use and mound construction before, during, and after Mount Taylor times thus suggest that people were again concerned with tying their earthworks to the past cultural landscape and that the construction of mortuary monuments was not something wholly new but rather “a transformation [of] preexisting practice” (Endonino 2010, p. 21).

It is important to note that most shell mounds in this region have been severely damaged by shell mining (Randall 2015, p. 5). Early investigations (e.g., Wyman 1875) noted preceramic components in many now-destroyed, St. Johns-area mounds. In addition, most Mount Taylor components that survived are buried under later deposits, allowing early monumentality to remain unnoticed (Randall and Sassaman 2005, pp. 18–20). As in the Lower Mississippi Valley, there are many un- and under-excavated sites with undated components. Considering that well over half of the Mount Taylor-age mounds tested in modern times contain hints of initial flat-topped stages, it seems likely that internal platforms will be discovered in many more with further investigation.

### Summary

In their discussion of Archaic monumentality, Kidder and Sassaman (2009, p. 675) state that “mound building as a monumental practice is a substantial change from practices of earlier times. Mounds are not only an indication of the capacity to move dirt or to mobilize labor but they are also a social and conceptual statement by the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harris Creek</td>
<td>8VO24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4100–3400 BC</td>
<td>series of low, round (?) platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hontoon Dead Creek</td>
<td>8VO214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5400–4350 BC</td>
<td>series of low, round platforms (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hontoon Island North</td>
<td>8VO202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3700–2600 BC</td>
<td>series of low, round platforms (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td>8VO41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5400–4350 BC</td>
<td>series of low, round platforms (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>8OR1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5400–2600 BC</td>
<td>series of low, round platforms (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornhill Lake</td>
<td>8VO58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3600–2500 BC</td>
<td>round platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornhill Lake</td>
<td>8VO59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3600–2500 BC</td>
<td>round platform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
builders that they are capable of recreating the landscape to suit their needs and to fulfill their vision of how the physical and symbolic world should be constructed.” From its inception, the practice of mound construction in the Southeast included platforms as important components of symbolic landscapes. Stratigraphic data from the excavated examples show cyclical patterns of mound construction and use that suggest both continuity and change in the construction and summit activities that occurred during the Archaic period. It is likely that these data will grow substantially as more Archaic mounds are identified and excavated, and with it we will gain a better understanding of the function and meaning of these structures to their builders.

**Woodland Period Platform Mounds**

Woodland platform mounds are now commonly recognized in the southeastern archaeological literature, though uncertainties about their functions and how they relate to later Mississippian platforms remain. Here I include data from infrequently discussed and recently published sites that may help clarify these questions. I review examples of Woodland platform mounds from across the eastern United States, employing regional divisions to simplify the discussion of the similarities and differences between sites (Fig. 3). I define these regions based on the accepted geographic ranges of archaeological cultures as they are discussed in the literature. For each region, I include a complete listing of known Woodland platform mounds and look in depth at examples of well-understood sites. In doing so, I situate Woodland platform mounds in their broader landscape, drawing attention to their relationships with other site features and natural topography.

**Midwest**

The Early Woodland mound-building culture in the Midwest is known as Adena (c. 600 BC–AD 100). Adena people were hunter–gatherers who supplemented with small-scale horticulture. They built large, conical burial mounds, some of which may have started as platforms (Hays 2001). Adena is followed by Hopewell (c. 100 BC–AD 400), a culture known for its expansive trade network that connected Middle Woodland groups throughout the eastern United States. The classic expression of Hopewell was centered in southern Ohio and is characterized by a horticultural subsistence system, elaborate geometric earthworks, and conical burial mounds containing distinctive grave goods (Lepper 2014). Though less frequently discussed, platform mounds also are part of the monumental architecture at Hopewell sites in Ohio and beyond (see Fig. 3, Table 3).

The Hopewell earthwork at Marietta features platform mounds prominently in its layout, which also includes three enclosures, a walled road, and a conical burial mound with a ditch and embankment (Pickard 1996; Squier and Davis 1848, pp. 73–77). Testing in one platform revealed complex stratigraphy and abundant features. A prepared premound surface was covered with differentially colored
Fig. 3 Locations of Woodland period platform mounds in the Eastern United States. Because platform mound sites dating to the Coles Creek period in the Lower Mississippi Valley are so numerous, their individual locations are not listed, though the general Coles Creek culture area is outline by a dashed line.
Table 3  Woodland platform mounds in the Midwest. Question marks indicate pieces of information that are uncertain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marietta</td>
<td>33WN13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Capitolium, Quadranaou, and 2 unnamed</td>
<td>AD 100–300</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platforms inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>33LI10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>unnamed, within Octagon</td>
<td>AD 100–500</td>
<td>rectangular platforms inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>33LI10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 100–500</td>
<td>rectangular platform on lower terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Banks</td>
<td>33RO9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>800 BC–AD 500 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginther</td>
<td>33RO21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>800 BC–AD 500 (?)</td>
<td>round platform associated with enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>12PO2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 and 9</td>
<td>AD 100–500</td>
<td>rectangular platforms associated with enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
<td>15GP8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>800 BC–AD 1 (?)</td>
<td>rounded, ramped platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camargo</td>
<td>33HA166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>200 BC–AD 500</td>
<td>round platform surmounted by a conical mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Den</td>
<td>33PI5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>200 BC–AD 500</td>
<td>round (?) platform surmounted by a conical mound inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; O</td>
<td>15JO9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>800 BC–AD 1 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seip</td>
<td>33RO40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 400</td>
<td>series of rectangular platforms with conical cap inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>33FR4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 400 (?)</td>
<td>round (?) platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickison</td>
<td>11P5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>477 and 478</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 400 (?)</td>
<td>round platforms with conical caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>11WH3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 400 (?)</td>
<td>round platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sediments in complex patterns, and the excavation of one buried summit revealed postholes that had been pulled and refilled with brightly colored sediments before the next stage of mound construction (Pickard 1996).

Platform mounds also are reported at other Hopewell sites with geometric enclosures, including Newark, Cedar Banks, and Ginther (Squier and Davis 1848, pp. 52–54, 67–72) in Ohio, and Mann (Ruby 1997) in Indiana. At these sites, the placement of the platforms within the broader earthwork complex suggests they were integral to the design of the site and were not added later (Prufer 1964; Ruby 1997, p. 406). Although only some have been excavated, those that have resemble Marietta in the presence of complex prepared floors, large posts, and other unusual features (Ruby 1997; Shetrone 1926). At Mann, midden deposits and differentiated activity areas on the summits suggest that mound-top activities focused on food sharing and ceremonies surrounding symbolically valuable goods and raw materials (Ruby 1997).

Although undated, the platform mound in the enclosure at Cedar Banks may represent a precursor to Hopewellian platforms given the characteristically Adena site layout (Prufer 1964, p. 51). Regardless, an Early Woodland platform has been identified at Biggs (Applegate 2008, p. 525; Squier and Davis 1848, pp. 77–82), and the Adena origin of platform mounds is supported by their presence underlying conical mounds at Camargo (Squier and Davis 1848, p. 93) and Snake Den (Fischer 1974, p. 78), and as an early stage of one of the C & O mounds (Webb et al. 1942, pp. 315–317). This latter construction practice continued at Middle Woodland sites in Ohio—e.g., Seip (Shetrone and Greenman 1931, pp. 480–490) and Wright (Shetrone 1924, p. 346)—and in Illinois—e.g., Dickison (Walker 1952, pp. 16–18) and Wilson (Neumann and Fowler 1952, p. 188).

Though I do not include these sites, the Illinois Hopewell mortuary program consists of crypts placed in or under low, platform-like, ramp-and-tomb structures that served as stages for ceremonial activities (Fig. 4) (Charles et al. 2004;
King et al. 2017). That said, Reed (1969, pp. 38–39) clearly outlines how this early form of mound construction could seamlessly transform into the platform mounds prevalent in later periods. He suggests a shift toward increased sedentism would make covering ritual and/or mundane refuse less necessary, thereby demonstrating how applying a forward-looking temporal framework to archaeological data can shift interpretations.

Appalachian Summit

The Connestee phase (c. AD 200–800) in the Appalachian Summit is defined by ceremonialism surrounding the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. It is characterized by continued reliance on wild foods, semipermanent base camps in river valleys, and a shift toward the construction of platform mounds at important sites (Wright 2014b, pp. 28–56; see Fig. 3, Table 4). The recognition of these early mounds as substructural platforms implies that the defining characteristics of South Appalachian Mississippian culture did not enter the region as a developed set from elsewhere, but that platform mounds saw an in situ development in the region (Peterson 1975). Importantly, while this development coincides with people settling down in larger, more formalized communities, there is little to no evidence of ranked, hierarchical society (Wright 2014b, pp. 50–51).

Garden Creek, consisting of four mounds, two ditch enclosures, a plaza, and two village areas, has been the focus of recent research (Wright 2014a, b). The single platform mound contains two Middle Woodland episodes and a later Mississippian cap. Construction began with yellow clay placed atop a ritually dismantled special-purpose structure. Another structure and large standing posts were placed on the first summit and continuously maintained for multiple generations. At the end of its use life, this structure was burned before the second fill episode. Additional standing posts, post molds, refuse pits, and hearths were identified on this level (Wright 2014a). The area immediately surrounding the mounds was used for feasting and craft production focused on Hopewell Interaction Sphere items. The areas farther afield hosted temporary but more typically domestic events associated with mound-top activities, but there was no evidence for permanent settlement (Wright 2014b). Investigation of nearby Biltmore revealed another Connestee Phase platform mound site with a similar location, layout, and pattern of use (Kimball et al. 2010).

Table 4  Woodland platform mounds in the Appalachian Summit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th># ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden Creek</td>
<td>31HW2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 200–400   rectangular platform associated with enclosures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biltmore</td>
<td>31BN174</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 400–600   rectangular platform inside ditch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Midsouth

In the Midsouth, the Middle Woodland period is identified by the presence of Miller tradition (c. 100 BC–AD 600) ceramics and/or Copena tradition (c. AD 100–500) mortuary ceremonialism. Settlement patterns include nonmound villages, mound sites with villages, ceremonial mound sites, and burial sites with conical mounds. Early platform mounds in the region (see Fig. 3, Table 5) have low artifact and feature densities suggesting they were nonresidential and were occupied only on ceremonial occasions (Andras 2004; Kwas and Mainfort 1986, p. 38; Mainfort 2013). Like elsewhere, Woodland period burials occurred on platforms later covered with conical caps—e.g., Pharr (Bohannon 1972; Walling et al. 1991), Brogan (Baca and Peacock 1996, pp. 15–16), McRae (Blitz 1986), and Bynum (Cotter and Corbett 1951, pp. 6, 11; Walling et al. 1991) (see Table 5).

Table 5 Woodland platform mounds in the Midsouth. Question marks indicate pieces of information that are uncertain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinson</td>
<td>40MD1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 (Saul’s)</td>
<td>AD 1–300</td>
<td>large rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinson</td>
<td>40MD1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AD 128–421</td>
<td>irregular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinson</td>
<td>40MD1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 350 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinson</td>
<td>40MD1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 and 28</td>
<td>AD 1–300</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinson</td>
<td>40MD1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (Ozier)</td>
<td>AD 128–383</td>
<td>ramped, rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>40MD3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 and 5</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 1</td>
<td>rectangular platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forkland</td>
<td>1GR15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 200</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingomar</td>
<td>22UN500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ca. AD 210</td>
<td>ramped, rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate Springs</td>
<td>22CA502</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 70–780</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped (?) platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma</td>
<td>22CS501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AD 540–1020</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma</td>
<td>22CS501</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2–4</td>
<td>AD 540–1020 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma</td>
<td>22CS501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>AD 540–1020 (?)</td>
<td>round platform (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanih Waiya</td>
<td>22W1500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 0–300 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walling</td>
<td>1MA50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 100–350</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>1LU10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 100–500</td>
<td>rectangular platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>40HR29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>ca. AD 400</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>ILA111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 10–250</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharr</td>
<td>22PS500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A, B, D, and E</td>
<td>AD 50–150</td>
<td>round platforms with conical caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brogan</td>
<td>22CL501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 300 (?)</td>
<td>round platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRae</td>
<td>22CK533</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 1–300</td>
<td>round platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bynum</td>
<td>22CS501</td>
<td>2 (?)</td>
<td>A and E (?)</td>
<td>200 BC–AD 1</td>
<td>round (?) platform(s) with conical cap(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two early platform mound sites, Pinson and Johnston, indicate an area of distinct importance along the Forked Deer River. Both sites include small, low-density habitation areas suggesting they were not occupied year-round. Based on the presence of nonlocal materials and ritual paraphernalia, the sites likely served as ceremonial centers for people in nearby settlements. Abundant burial mounds demonstrate that mortuary ritual was an important part of this ceremonialism (Kwas and Mainfort 1986; Mainfort 2013, pp. 14–14, 96–141).

Pinson, the better understood of these sites, consists of an embankment and at least 13 mounds, six of which are flat-topped (Mainfort 2013). Mound 9, a tall, rectangular platform near the site’s center, was built in stages, aligned with the cardinal directions, and shows no evidence of a structure on its unusually small summit (Mainfort 1988). Mound 10, a teardrop-shaped platform, began with the replacement of the submound topsoil and proceeded in stages (Mainfort 2013, pp. 151–153). The ramped Mound 29 was built in stages and is surrounded by a circular embankment reminiscent of classic Hopewell sites (Mainfort 2013, pp. 179–181). Mounds 15 and 28 were built as single events (Mainfort 1988).

Another group of four mounds sits to the west of this primary complex and would potentially have been viewed as a separate site prehistorically (Mainfort 2013, p. 7). Mound 5 with its prominent ramp dominates this area and aligns with the cardinal directions as well as, potentially, the solstice. Like Mound 10, the premound surface was prepared by removing and replacing the subsoil and then the mound was constructed in stages. Excavation of the uppermost summits showed that they were not single floors but rather each represented a series of events that involved removing and reveneering the surface with yellow, upland sand and gray, lowland clay. No summit structures were identified, but two hearths, a low clay platform, and scattered nonlocal goods suggest ritual use (Mainfort 2013, pp. 85–96).

Other Miller tradition platform mound sites include Forkland (Shogren 1989, pp. 1–9), Ingomar (Andras 2004; Rafferty 1990), Slate Springs (Baca 2015), and likely Thelma (Johnson and Atkinson 1985; Rafferty 2015) and Nanih Waiya (Carleton 1999). Although most of these sites have not been well studied, excavations at Ingomar have demonstrated distinct similarities between the vacant, multimound complex and the Forked Deer sites discussed above, including ramped platform mounds that were built in stages, cardinally oriented, and capped with multicolored clay.

Evidence for Middle Woodland platform mound construction in the Tennessee River Valley has been found at Walling (Knight 1990), Florence (Boudreaux and Johnson 2000), Savannah (Welch 1998), and Oakville (Rael 2014). These sites belong to the Copena tradition, named for the characteristic copper and galena objects found with burials (Walthall 1980, pp. 116–117). The best understood example is Walling, a single platform adjacent to an oval-shaped midden surrounding a plaza and associated with two Copena burial mounds (Knight 1990, pp. 1–18). Built over a premound midden, excavation of the earliest floors revealed a random assortment of post molds, large standing posts, and small pits while the latest floor showed a clear structural pattern (Knight 1990, pp. 31–51). Food remains and ceramics from the premound and mound-related deposits lack characteristics of
domestic consumption and suggest the site served as a location for ceremonial feasting (Knight 1990, pp. 115–164, 2001).

Coastal Plain

The Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plains are home to a sequence of archaeological cultures that provide extensive evidence for Woodland platform mound construction, including sites dating to Late, Middle, and potentially late Early Woodland times (see Fig. 3, Table 6). Although there is a great deal of variation, Woodland sites on the Coastal Plain are generally characterized by a series of overlapping ceramic complexes known as Deptford, (c. 800 BC–AD 700), Cartersville (c. 100 BC–AD 500), Santa Rosa–Swift Creek (c. AD 50–800), and Weeden Island (c. AD 200–1000) (see Stephenson et al. 2002). When combined with the evidence for Archaic period monumentality in the St. Johns River Valley, the Coastal Plain was clearly a hotbed of early monumental architecture and, more specifically, an important center for early platform mound ceremonialism. Here I further subdivide these Woodland period platform mound sites into four geographic areas: northern and eastern Georgia, southern Alabama and the southern Chattahoochee Valley, northern Florida, and central Florida. The overall impression of these sites is of great complexity and great variability in both the construction and use of platform mounds.

In northern and eastern Georgia, Woodland platform mounds are present at minimally eight sites, including one large, multimound center that shows direct connection to Hopewellian communities farther north and west. The Leake complex consisted of one rectangular and one circular platform mound, a conical mound, ditch enclosure, cave, hilltop stone enclosure, stone-covered tomb, and residential areas. Midden deposits, structures, and features at the site suggest both domestic and ceremonial activities occurred there from late Early through Middle Woodland times (Keith 2010).

The Leake assemblage is dominated by local ceramics but also contains nonlocal items that suggest connections to communities throughout the Southeast and Midwest; a direct connection between Leake and Mann (see above) is indicated through stylistic and petrographic analysis of stamped pottery (Keith 2010, pp. 312–315; Stoltman 2015, pp. 117–127). Leake likely served as a place of residence as well as a stop for Middle Woodland traders. As a gateway community, the site would have been a center of interaction that drew together large groups for feasting, mound building, and other ceremonies, as well as manufacture and trade of Hopewell goods (Keith 2010; Stoltman 2015). Though exact dates on the platform mounds are not known, mound building began at Leake in the first century BC and increased during the Middle Woodland. Excavation on the summit of Mound A revealed abundant post molds with potential structural alignments and pit features associated with large standing posts (Keith 2010, pp. 457–460).

Farther east, the platform mound at Fortson also contains early Swift Creek pottery but has no evidence of a structure on its summit and minimal off-mound habitation (Elliott and Kowalewski 1989; Williams 1992). Dating slightly later, Cold Springs (Fish and Jefferies 1986; Jefferies 1994, pp. 76–82), Swift Creek
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leake</td>
<td>9BR2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 180–544</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leake</td>
<td>9BR2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AD 600–800 (?)</td>
<td>round platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortson</td>
<td>9WS2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 100–400 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular (?) platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Springs</td>
<td>9GE10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 290–445</td>
<td>round platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Springs</td>
<td>9GE10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>AD 290–445 (?)</td>
<td>round platform with conical cap (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift Creek</td>
<td>9BI3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 500–750</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anneewakee Creek</td>
<td>9DO2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 600–800</td>
<td>round (?) platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milamo</td>
<td>9WL1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 500–750 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>9GN6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>AD 600–750 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerour</td>
<td>9FO16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 700–1000</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>9CY1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 1–300</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>1BR15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>300 BC–AD 1 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durant Bend</td>
<td>1DS1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>300 BC–AD 800 (?)</td>
<td>irregular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolomoki</td>
<td>9ER1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 70–650</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolomoki</td>
<td>9ER1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>AD 550–650</td>
<td>irregular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolomoki</td>
<td>9ER1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>AD 450–650</td>
<td>round and rectangular platforms with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolomoki</td>
<td>9ER1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F and H</td>
<td>AD 650–750</td>
<td>round platforms with conical caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>1CV32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 0–600 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuorquodale</td>
<td>1CK500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 1–500</td>
<td>round platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letchworth</td>
<td>8JE337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>AD 200–900</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddells Mill Pond</td>
<td>8JA65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 200–500</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block–Sterns</td>
<td>8LE148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>200 BC–AD 1</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yent</td>
<td>8FR5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 150–650</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>8WA4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 300–900</td>
<td>circular platform (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aucilla River</td>
<td>STA1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 400–750</td>
<td>circular platform (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>8FR14, 16, and 21</td>
<td>4+ (?)</td>
<td>A, C. Singer, Cemetery</td>
<td>AD 200–700</td>
<td>circular platform (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Island</td>
<td>9PU20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>AD 100–750 (?)</td>
<td>circular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeithen</td>
<td>8CO17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A and B</td>
<td>AD 350–475</td>
<td>rectangular platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeithen</td>
<td>8CO17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AD 350–475</td>
<td>circular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Patch</td>
<td>8DI4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>AD 320–500</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore Homes</td>
<td>8PI41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 890–1220 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Island</td>
<td>8CI41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 800–1050</td>
<td>rectangular, stepped, ramped platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Island</td>
<td>8CI40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>AD 800–1050</td>
<td>rectangular, stepped platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Island</td>
<td>8CI36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AD 800–1050 (?)</td>
<td>Rectangular, stepped platform (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal River</td>
<td>8CI1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>800–420 BC</td>
<td>sloping platform (?) surmounted by a conical mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal River</td>
<td>8CI1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>800 BC–AD 120</td>
<td>triangular, ramped platform (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal River</td>
<td>8CI1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 750 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular (?) platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal River</td>
<td>8CI1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>AD 200–550</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped (?) platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal River</td>
<td>8CI1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>AD 200–550</td>
<td>narrow, ramped platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal River</td>
<td>8CI1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 400–700</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Jefferies 1994, pp. 71–73; Kelly and Smith 1975), Anneewakee Creek (Dickens 1975, pp. 36–38; Wauchope 1966, pp. 404–406), Milamo (Kelly and Smith 1975, pp. 202–210; Snow et al. 1979), and Evelyn (Ashley et al. 2007; Kelly and Smith 1975, pp. 242–244) all contain Middle Woodland platform mounds. Evidence for significant off-mound habitation at these sites is variable, but summit excavations consistently revealed both small, possibly structural posts and large standing posts. Nearby, but during the Late Woodland period, the summit of the large platform mound at Summerour held a temple or public structure with identifiable entrances, central posts, benches, and fire pits (Pluckhahn 1996).

Southern Alabama and the southern Chattahoochee Valley are home to another cluster of Woodland platform mounds centered on the well-excavated sites of Mandeville and Kolomoki, both of which were home to large resident populations. Mandeville was occupied during late Early and early Middle Woodland times and consists of one platform and one conical burial mound with an intensive and permanent village area in between (Kellar et al. 1962a, b). Extensive excavation in the platform revealed no definitive structures on the sequential summits, though circular structures, pits, and massive standing posts were present under the mound. The mound’s construction sequence was unusual, starting with several small, sand and clay platforms that were eventually connected into a single summit that was then extended laterally but not vertically. Throughout the mound’s history, only one half of the summit was utilized, while the other was kept clean (Kellar et al. 1962a). Although these unusual patterns of construction and use are not present at nearby Shorter (Kurjack 1975, pp. 87–109) and Durant Bend (Nance 1976), these single mound sites add support to the possibility of late Early Woodland platform mound construction in the region. Although they have not been well explored, we know the mounds were built using special sediments differentiated by color and texture; an unbroken sequence of mound construction through the entire Woodland period at Durant Bend suggests long-term continuity in site use.

Kolomoki was founded in the Middle Woodland and constitutes a major, multimound center with a long history of investigation (e.g., Pluckhahn 2003; Sears 1956). Nearby, Mitchell may be an additional Middle Woodland platform mound in this cluster, but the site has not been well investigated (Earnest 2004). Kolomoki consists of a low, earthen embankment and at least eight mounds, five of which are or were at one time platforms. The off-mound deposits at Kolomoki consist of 12 activity areas that define an inner and outer plaza.

The site developed over four phases, beginning as a vacant mound center that gradually grew into a small, permanent settlement. Construction on Mound A, a large platform mound with a tiered summit, likely began during this time (Pluckhahn et al. 2018). In the following phase, a formal arrangement of mounds and a U-shaped village developed, followed by an embankment and a number of burial mounds, including the early stages of Mound D, an architecturally complex conical structure with an early, tiered platform stage (Pluckhahn 2003, pp. 56–64). Concurrent with the completion of Mounds A and D, this highly organized site plan morphed into a hypertrophic yet discontinuous village (Pluckhahn et al. 2018). As construction diminished, two additional mounds were built, including a platform of unclear shape riddled with the remains of many superimposed large posts. This
mound may have hosted large feasts or other communal activities during this period of decline (Pluckhahn 2003, pp. 58–59).

Occupation during the final phase was even less structured, but two mounds were added before the site’s abandonment. Mounds F and H began as small platforms for structures and/or mortuary activities, which were later covered with conical caps (Pluckhahn 2003, pp. 67–68). Along with the examples from Kolomoki and one from Cold Springs (Fish and Jefferies 1986), the McQuorquodale mound indicates that the practice of constructing platforms as the first stage in burial mounds was present in the Gulf Coastal Plain (Wimberly and Tourtelot 1941).

Just south of this cluster, Letchworth, Waddells Mill Pond, and Block-Sterns in the Florida Panhandle support the case for high variability in the construction and use of Woodland platform mounds on the Coastal Plain. Letchworth consists of around 20 burial mounds surrounding a plaza and a large platform mound with a complicated construction history involving significant color symbolism. Domestic debris is scarce, suggesting either short occupation or habitation only by a small group of caretakers who occasionally hosted integrative events in the plaza (Bigman and Seinfeld 2017; Seinfeld and Bigman 2013; Tesar et al. 2003). Block-Sterns, a permanent village with four mounds, includes a very early Middle Woodland platform with post molds, scattered debris, and fragments of human bone on its stacked summits (Jones et al. 1998). The single platform mound at Waddells Mill Pond was built on a prepared surface within an earlier village, and each summit showed evidence of structures and hearths (Tesar and Jones 2009). Though not well understood, at least five other sites in northern Florida may contain Woodland platform mounds: Yent, Hall, Aucilla River, and Pierce along the Gulf Coast (Moore 1902, pp. 217–229; 265–274, 282–304; 325–329; White 2014; Willey 1949, pp. 271–272, 278–282, 290–292, 301–302) and Murphy Island on the Atlantic Coast (Moore 1895, p. 15).

McKeithen—the best-understood platform mound site in northern Florida—provides significant data on the importance of platforms in Woodland mortuary ceremonialism. The site includes three platform mounds that surround a central plaza and are connected by a low embankment and midden ridge built up through the persistent use of the site as a village during the Late Woodland. The three mounds were functionally distinct: Mound A’s summit was partitioned by a screen behind which mortuary and potentially feasting activities took place (Knight 2001; Milanich et al. 1984, pp. 94–105); Mound B supported a structure controlled by a ritual specialist who was eventually interred inside it (Milanich et al. 1984, pp. 105–112); and Mound C held a charnel house used to store human remains for processing (Milanich et al. 1984, pp. 112–117). As the importance of the site faded, activities on all platforms ended abruptly, the summit structures were burned, and the mounds were capped, but the midden areas continued to be occupied (Milanich et al. 1984, p. 91).

Farther south, Garden Patch, Bayshore Homes, Roberts Island, and Crystal River provide strong evidence for both the complexity and variability of Woodland platforms on the Coastal Plain. The site layout of Garden Patch, including its ramped platform mound, was developed during the Middle Woodland (Wallis and McFadden 2016; Wallis et al. 2015), while Bayshore Homes (Austin and Mitchem 2014; Austin et al. 2008) and the Roberts Island complex include very Late Woodland
platform mounds. Roberts Island in particular evidences an extremely high level of architectural complexity, with three stepped platforms made of shell, a plaza, and an extensive midden deposits (Pluckhahn et al. 2016).

The nearby center of Crystal River consists of a plaza, a curvilinear shell feature, three stone monuments, between four and six platform mounds, and one burial mound complex (Pluckhahn et al. 2010; Thompson and Pluckhahn 2010). The earliest construction at the site occurred during the Early Woodland when a mortuary complex including conical mounds, a large, slightly sloping platform, and a roughly triangular platform was built (Pluckhahn et al. 2010, pp. 173–174). Two nonmortuary platforms were built somewhat later, followed by a large, unusually narrow platform mound with a prominent ramp. This mound was built quickly using zones of boulders and shell alternating with sand, with each layer extending the height but not the footprint of the mound (Pluckhahn et al. 2010, pp. 170, 177). The residents then began artificially expanding the terrace on which the site was built, topping this expansion with a large, ramped platform by alternating between rapid mound construction and slow deposition through activities such as feasting (Norman 2014, p. 66).

The nearly 50 Woodland platform mounds on the Coastal Plain show a huge degree of variability. Some served as vacant ceremonial or mortuary centers while others had long-term or short-term residential populations; some were built quickly while others were constructed continuously throughout the entirety of the Woodland period. The summits of some show evidence for permanent structures (of domestic, mortuary, and ceremonial function), others indicate standing posts, and still others appear to have been kept clean. Combined, they do not paint a consistent picture of platform mound construction and use and instead suggest a variable practice that drew on earlier patterns of site use, while fundamentally transforming the landscape of the Coastal Plain.

**Southern Florida**

South of Deptford, Cartersville, Santa Rosa-Swift Creek, and Weeden Island, there is evidence of Woodland mound building associated with the Glades tradition (c. 500 BC–AD 1000) (see Fig. 3, Table 7). These sites represent a distinctive coastal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Center</td>
<td>8GL13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ID A</td>
<td>AD 200–500 irregular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Center</td>
<td>8GL13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ID B</td>
<td>AD 200–500 round platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Marco</td>
<td>9CR48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ID A and B</td>
<td>AD 500–900 rectangular platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Island</td>
<td>9CR55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>AD 500–1000 rectangular (?) platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Key</td>
<td>8CR17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>AD 700–950 rectangular, ramped platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Glade</td>
<td>8PB41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>AD 700–1050 round platform (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Glade</td>
<td>8PB41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>AD 200–600 round platform (?) with conical cap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tradition of platform mound ceremonialism through their consistent use of shell
and distinctive structural remains, with the largest sites closely tied to mortuary
ceremonialism.

The largest Fort Center consists of mounds, embankments, middens, circular
ditches, plazas or courtyards, and a manmade pond. The pond, along with two flanking
platform mounds and encircling embankment, forms a Middle Woodland mortuary complex. A raised wooden platform over the pond was elaborately decorated
with wooden statues and supported a large number of human burials. One of the
flanking platforms shows an elaborate construction process and contains evidence
for the preparation of human remains. Across the pond, rich midden atop a large,
irregular platform suggests a habitation area for people responsible for processing
the dead. Given the large number of interments at Fort Center and the minimal evi-
dence for occupation, it is likely that the site served as a ceremonial center for a dis-
persed regional population (Sears 1982; Thompson and Pluckhahn 2012).

Additional sites in southern Florida, including Key Marco (Widmer 1996; cf.
Key (Schwadron 2010), and possibly Belle Glade (Purdy 1991, pp. 66–81; Wid-
mer 2002, pp. 383–384), provide further support for Woodland platforms within the
Glades tradition. Key Marco, famous for Cushing’s (1896) excavation of the “Court
of the Pile Dwellers,” is often assumed to be Mississippian; however, the objects
recovered from the pond are strikingly similar to those from Fort Center. Recent
excavations revealed a Woodland flat-topped, shell mound built in stages, each of
which supported a structure before being veneered with specially procured clam
shells. The final structure appears to have been raised above the mound’s summit on
pilings, as were the superimposed structures on the mound at Shell Island. A sec-
ond platform at Key Marco also was indicated in these excavations but not further
explored (Widmer 1996, 2002).

Lower Mississippi Valley

The building of platform mounds in the Lower Mississippi Valley began during the
Archaic. It is generally thought that platform mounds then disappeared as a form of
public architecture until the Middle Woodland, when they rose in popularity with
Marksville culture (c. 100 BC–AD 400), a trend that continued through the early
Late Woodland Baytown (c. AD 300–700) and Troyville (c. AD 400–700) cultures
and blossomed in the terminal Late Woodland Plum Bayou (c. AD 600–1050) and
Coles Creek (c. AD 700–1200) cultures. This amounts to a huge corpus of evidence
for Woodland platform mound construction in the region (see Fig. 3, Table 8).
Although there is a great deal of variability, there also was relatively gradual and
continuous change in platform mound ceremonialism through time.

Mounds attributed to Plum Bayou and Coles Creek populations are often elimi-
nated from reviews of Woodland platform mounds under the premise that they are “emergent Mississippian” rather than truly Woodland in nature. In describing
the limits of his review, Knight (1990, p. 168) states, “deliberately weeded out are
the Early and Late Coles Creek mound sites, for which growing evidence reveals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batesville</td>
<td>22PA500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A and B</td>
<td>200 BC</td>
<td>oval then rectangular platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>16SM17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600 BC–AD 200 (?)</td>
<td>round platform (?) with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Louis</td>
<td>16CT24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>larger</td>
<td>800 BC–AD 100 (?)</td>
<td>round platform (?) with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crooks</td>
<td>16LA3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 400 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Gulf</td>
<td>22CB522</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>800 BC–AD 100 (?)</td>
<td>round (?) platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womack</td>
<td>22YA500</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 200–700</td>
<td>round (?) platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marksville</td>
<td>16AV1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AD 1–300</td>
<td>rectangular platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marksville</td>
<td>16AV1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>AD 1–450 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marksville</td>
<td>16AV1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>AD 1–450 (?)</td>
<td>circular platform surmounted by conical mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marksville</td>
<td>16AV1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AD 1–450 (?)</td>
<td>irregular platform surmounted by conical mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leist</td>
<td>22SH520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AD 1–400</td>
<td>platform surmounted by conical mound with associated embankment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Fort</td>
<td>22SH500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 200–400 (?)</td>
<td>round platform (?) with associated embankment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Spanish Fort</td>
<td>22SH522</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100 BC–AD 200 (?)</td>
<td>round platform (?) inside embankment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuffee</td>
<td>16CT17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 300–700 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform surmounted by conical mound inside embankment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsden</td>
<td>16R13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 500–600 (?)</td>
<td>round (?) platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsden</td>
<td>16R13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AD 500–600 (?)</td>
<td>round platform surmounted by a conical mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptiste</td>
<td>16AV25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 500–1000 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform surmounted by a conical mound (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>22IS507</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 200–400 (?)</td>
<td>irregular (?) platform surmounted by conical mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>22CO503</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 300–700 (?)</td>
<td>round then rectangular platform with internal conical mounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manny</td>
<td>22IS506</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A and D</td>
<td>AD 200–900 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>16CT16/217</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C and D</td>
<td>AD 200–600 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Grove Landing</td>
<td>16CA2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 200–400 (?)</td>
<td>circular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericks</td>
<td>16NA2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AD 400–650</td>
<td>rectangular platform (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Site #</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baytown</td>
<td>3MO1</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AD 300–700 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Mine</td>
<td>16RI13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 775–875</td>
<td>round platform with conical cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troyville</td>
<td>16CT7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>AD 600–700</td>
<td>terraced, rectangular platform surmounted by a steep conical mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troyville</td>
<td>16CT7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, 6 and 7</td>
<td>AD 400–700 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troyville</td>
<td>16CT7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AD 100–650 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graveline</td>
<td>22JA503</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 550–800</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Camp</td>
<td>16ST6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 350–500 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Landing</td>
<td>22HA515</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ca. AD 655</td>
<td>rectangular, ramped platform associated with enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toltec</td>
<td>3LN42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>AD 700–1025</td>
<td>rectangular platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toltec</td>
<td>3LN42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>AD 750–800</td>
<td>rectangular platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toltec</td>
<td>3LN42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>AD 850–1000</td>
<td>round platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toltec</td>
<td>3LN42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>AD 800–900</td>
<td>rectangular platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toltec</td>
<td>3LN42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D and E</td>
<td>AD 900–1050</td>
<td>rectangular platform inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toltec</td>
<td>3LN42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H and J (?)</td>
<td>AD 700–1055 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular platform (?) inside enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coy</td>
<td>3LN20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 600–1000</td>
<td>rectangular (?) platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coy</td>
<td>3LN20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 600–1000</td>
<td>round platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>3AR37</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD 600–1050 (?)</td>
<td>rectangular (?) platform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distinctly proto-Mississippian form and function … that is so far much less clear, if not entirely missing, from the generally earlier and more easterly remainder” (emphasis original). To the contrary, I contend that these sites clearly represent a culmination of long traditions of mound building and use that began much earlier, and thus serve as a fitting end point for such a review (for an early recognition of this, see Belmont 1967, pp. 31–32).

Based on studies of Early Woodland mound building in the Lower Mississippi Valley, dispersed conical burial mounds took the place of large mound centers, the long-distance trade that characterized the terminal Archaic ceased, and the first intensive use of ceramic technology began. Early Woodland people fished, hunted, and gathered wild resources from relatively permanent villages grouped around burial sites that sometimes contained mounds (Hays and Weinstein 2010). Recent work at Batesville has provided evidence against a strict Early Woodland (800 BC–AD 1) hiatus in platform mound construction. Batesville consists of six mounds, including at least two platforms, and associated midden deposits. The mounds were initially assumed to be Middle Woodland (Ford 1996); however, an unusual assemblage in the first two stages of Mound B and off-mound areas suggested an Early Woodland date. The summit that divides the stages containing Early Woodland material from those potentially built later was left open for some time and marks a shift in mound shape from ovate to rectangular. Features and collections from the site suggest short-term, nondomestic use, perhaps focused on food preparation for communal feasts associated with mortuary ritual (Johnson et al. 2002).

Like elsewhere, both Early—e.g., Lafayette (Heller et al. 2013, pp. 280–323) and Lake Louis (Kidder 2002)—and Middle Woodland—e.g., Mound 4 at Marksville (Fowke 1928), Mound A at Crooks (Ford and Willey 1940), Grand Gulf (Brookes 1976), and Womack (Ford 1980; Koehler 1966)—burial mounds began as platforms for ceremonies related to mortuary activities. The association of at least two of these sites with Early Woodland ceramics further suggests that platform mound construction did not cease entirely, but rather that the scarcity of evidence may be due to a paucity of excavated mound sites and a lack of recognition that conical mounds may have begun as platforms.

In addition to containing these multistage burial mounds, Marksville sites also incorporated earthen embankments like those at Middle Woodland sites in other regions, participated to a small degree in the Hopewell Interaction Sphere, and contained increasing numbers of platform mounds through time (McGimsey et al. 2005, p. 85). Marksville communities were largely egalitarian hunter–gatherers, although it has been argued that incipient social differentiation was present at some sites (McGimsey 2010). The most complex and best-investigated Middle Woodland site in the Lower Mississippi Valley, the Marksville type-site, includes a C-shaped ditch and embankment, six mounds, and an open plaza. Outside this main area but clearly associated with the site are two additional mounds, four embankments, and up to 70 unique ring-shaped earthworks of enigmatic function (McGimsey 2003; McGimsey et al. 2005).

Mound 4, mentioned above, is a burial mound in the primary complex that began as a platform that supported a structure and was left open for some time before being capped (Fowke 1928; Gibson and Shenkel 1988, p. 15). Mound 7, a platform north
of the main site area, resembles the first stage of Mound 4 and may represent an unfinished conical burial mound (Fowke 1928; Mainfort 2013, p. 204). These initial flat-topped stages likely served as important components of the ritual landscape during their time as platforms.

Two additional mounds in the main Marksville complex were platforms upon which small conical mounds may have been constructed (Toth 1974, pp. 28–31; Vescelius 1957). This pattern of mound construction, while present in other regions (Fischer 1974, p. 78; Pluckhahn and Thompson 2009, p. 17), seems to have been especially popular in the region. Farther north, Leist shows considerable similarity, including a large platform mound surmounted by a conical mound, associated embankments, and additional mounds (Jackson 1998; Phillips 1970, pp. 367–373). Marksville platform mounds with associated embankments also may exist at nearby Spanish Fort and Little Spanish Fort (Jackson 1998; Mainfort 2013, p. 209).

The early part of the Late Woodland period in the Lower Mississippi Valley contains two distinct cultures—Baytown to the north and Troyville to the south. Although platform mounds became more common during this period, they share a great deal with their predecessors in terms of construction and use. “Mound building during the Baytown period was likely characterized by some form of ideological influence and ritual engagement of local societies and the surrounding population, rather than economic control” (Lee 2010, p. 138). Some individuals may have achieved higher status, but this power was impermanent and not inherited, ascribed, or made visible in the mortuary program and was less marked than in both the preceding Middle Woodland and succeeding Mississippi periods. Baytown people lived in small, dispersed hamlets and, like earlier groups, subsisted on wild resources (Lee 2010). Many Baytown mound sites have sizable premound components and likely were important symbolic locations before mounds were constructed. Both premound and mound deposits are often associated with evidence of large-scale food consumption, likely representing intercommunity events (Belmont 1982, p. 88).

The multimound sites of McGuffee (Saunders et al. 2005a; Shuman et al. 1999), Marsden (Bitgood 1989, pp. 48–75), and possibly Baptiste (Whitmer 1987; Phillips 1970, p. 897; cf. McGimsey and Cossey 2000), and the single mound site of Thornton (Phillips 1970, pp. 371, 581–587) include large platforms surmounted by conical mounds and are thus reminiscent of earlier, Marksville sites. Oliver also may have had a conical mound that surmounted a platform at one time, though it was eventually subsumed in a later mound stage (Belmont 1961, pp. 31–50). In addition to these examples, Manny (Greengo 1964; Phillips 1970, pp. 616–697), King (Gibson 1983, pp. 210–218), Poplar Grove Landing (Gibson 1983, pp. 188–190), Fredericks (Girard 2000), Baytown (Rolingson 1998, pp. 115–116; Phillips 1970, pp. 903–904), and Gold Mine (Belmont 1982; McGimsey 2004) each likely include at least one early Late Woodland platform mound.

The Troyville site provides a unique example of Woodland platform mound construction. Troyville consists of an elaborate, 25-m-tall earthen mound, at least nine additional mounds, and an earthen embankment. The Great Mound at Troyville included two terraced, rectangular platforms built over a prepared surface surmounted by an exceptionally steep, truncated conical mound. The initial platform was constructed of differentially colored sediments as well as cane matting, palm
fronds, wooden planks, and large posts (Walker 1936). The four additional platform mounds were functionally variable; one (the earliest) had a mortuary function, two had domestic refuse on their summits, and another showed evidence for communal feasting (something further supported by Belmont’s [1982] investigations at Gold Mine) (Saunders and Jones 2003; Saunders et al. 2006). Additional refuse was associated with the embankment and off-mound areas, implying a residential population at the site (Cusick et al. 1995; Lee et al. 2010).

Also in the early Late Woodland but farther south, Graveline (Blitz and Downs 2015), Jackson Landing (Boudreaux 2015; Williams 1987), and Indian Camp (Webb 1982) served as major coastal mound centers. The first stage of the platform mounds at Graveline and Jackson Landing appear less like platforms and more like enclosures around a ritual space where feasting and other activities took place. It is possible that such structures also served as berms to help control the construction process. Mound summit excavations indicate nondomestic group activities, potentially including ceremonial feasting; little to no material was found in the off-mound areas.

The latter portion of the Late Woodland in the Lower Mississippi Valley is characterized by Plum Bayou culture to the north and Coles Creek culture to the south. These cultures have often been viewed as regional variants of emergent Mississippian; however, they also show a great deal of continuity with their Woodland predecessors (Kassabaum 2014, pp. 12–13; Rolingson and Kelly 2012, pp. 102). The Plum Bayou region is dominated by the site of Toltec with approximately 18 mounds (including at least seven low platforms, a large platform, and two large conicals) carefully arranged around two plazas within a ditched embankment. While little is known about the big mound, the low platforms were utilized successively and consistently built over earlier middens. Evidence for structures on their summits is equivocal, though flank midden deposits indicate feasting and other ceremonial activities. While trash deposits occur at various locations around Toltec, there is not enough material to suggest a large, permanent occupation (Rolingson 1998; Rolingson and Kelly 2012).

In adjacent drainages, Coy (Nassaney 1996, pp. 29–31) and Hayes represent additional Plum Bayou mound centers that likely served as central gathering places for a dispersed population (Rolingson 1998, pp. 102–104). People continued consuming wild foods but relied heavily on cultivated and domesticated native plants, including small quantities of maize. The small number of multimound centers and abundant hamlets in the region have been interpreted as a settlement hierarchy that along with the presence of small amounts of nonlocal items and local prestige goods initially implied some degree of status differentiation. However, this has not been supported by data from burials and structural remains. Nassaney (1996, see also Rolingson and Kelly 2012, pp. 149–150) has convincingly argued that while Plum Bayou groups may show slight increases in status differentiation over the predecessors, they were still living in communally oriented societies with minimal competition (Rolingson 1998, pp. 105–110).

Coles Creek sites farther to the south paint a similar picture. Mound centers are characterized by consistent site layouts of two or more flat-topped mounds arranged around open, curated plazas (Fig. 5). Hundreds of Coles Creek mound centers have been reported (Steponaitis 1986, p. 385). I reviewed basic data from over 40 sites for
this article, but due to the exceptional number of identified platforms, I do not list them individually here and have not included them in Fig. 3 or Table 8. I highlight the most extensively excavated and best-understood sites as examples of identified patterns.

Coles Creek mound centers were largely vacant and served as central gathering places for dispersed populations (Barrier and Kassabaum 2018; Kassabaum 2014; Roe and Schilling 2010). People subsisted on wild resources and eventually adopted a number of indigenous, domesticated seeds crops, though corn did not become a major cultigen until the very end of Coles Creek (Fritz and Kidder 1993). The mortuary program and lack of identified status symbols implies a relatively egalitarian social structure (Kassabaum 2011; cf. Barker 1999). That said, a great deal of change occurred during Coles Creek, with early site layouts, artifact assemblages, settlement patterns, and presumed lifeways closely resembling their Troyville and Baytown predecessors, and terminal Coles Creek culture beginning to show characteristics more like the later, Mississippian Plaquemine culture (Harmon and Rose 1989; Kassabaum 2014, pp. 177–181, 212; Roe 2010, p. 164; Roe and Schilling 2010; Wells 1997).

Early excavations at large and complex sites like Lake George, with 25–30 mounds surrounding two well-developed plazas (Williams and Brain 1983), and Greenhouse, with seven mounds around a plaza (Ford 1951), led to interpretations of
Coles Creek as “Mississippian–lite” (e.g., Barker 1999; Steponaitis 1986). This conclusion was supported by the presence of well-defined structures on platform mound summits, a trait thought to be diagnostic of hierarchical Mississippian social organization. More recently, many excavations have taken place with the goal of exploring the transition from Woodland to Mississippian traditions in the Lower Mississippi Valley, and this picture has been complicated. This research has focused on Coles Creek sites in the Natchez Bluffs, i.e., Feltus (Kassabaum 2014; Steponaitis et al. 2015, Smith Creek (Kassabaum et al. 2017), and Mazique (LaDu 2016); the Tensas Basin, i.e., Raffman (Roe 2010) and Mott (Schilling 2006); and the Gulf Coast, i.e., Bayou Grande Cheniere (Schilling 2004). Additional important work has been undertaken through contract and public archaeology projects in both Mississippi and Louisiana (e.g., Kassabaum et al. 2014b; Kowalski and Jackson 2015; Weinstein 2005; Ryan 2004).

Evidence concerning mound function and summit use varies: some have evidence of formal buildings, e.g., Mound C at Osceola (Kidder 1990) and Mound 1 at Morgan (Fuller and Fuller 1987); others imply periodic use of temporary structures, e.g., Mound B at Raffman (Roe 2010); and still others show no evidence of buildings at all, e.g., Mound A at Feltus (Kassabaum 2014; Steponaitis et al. 2015) and Mound A at Raffman (Roe 2010). In addition, some platforms continued to function as burial locations, e.g., Mound C at Lake George (Williams and Brain 1983) and Mount Nebo (Giardino 1977). Moreover, some mound complexes developed rapidly, e.g., Lake Providence (Weinstein 2005), while others were built gradually throughout the Coles Creek period, e.g., Bayou Grande Cheniere (Schilling 2004). Plazas were present at many sites from their inception (Belmont 1967; Kassabaum 2014), with the process of mound construction causing them to become more circumscribed through time (Kidder 1998, 2004; Roe 2010; Schilling 2004).

The overall picture painted by this review of platform mound construction in the Lower Mississippi Valley is one of great continuity. While platform mound sites certainly increased in frequency and complexity through time, many more early platforms were present than often acknowledged. Evidence for changes in the structural, social, economic, and political characteristics of these societies likewise demonstrates gradual change. Terminal Woodland mounds in the region share some formal and functional characteristics with Mississippian platforms and others with earlier Woodland platforms, precisely as one might expect from a practice being undertaken at a temporal frontier. As such, Plum Bayou and Coles Creek mounds provide an important connection between this review and understandings of later mounds.

Summary

Prior to understanding the deep history of mound construction in the eastern United States, archaeologists had become “complacent about the trajectory of social evolution” (Saunders 2010, p. 76), assuming that mound construction, and particularly the construction of flat-topped platform mounds, required stratified, agricultural polities epitomized by Mississippian chiefdoms. We now know that platform mounds have
persisted as a form of public architecture for more than 5000 years, and that up until very recently, their builders sustained themselves by fishing, hunting, and gathering.

This long review of pre-Mississippian platform mound ceremonialism paints a picture of gradual though inconsistent change. “Mound building is an iterative mechanism of social integration adopted and abandoned by societies of varying complexity, economy, and antiquity” (Saunders 2012, p. 47). Rather than consistently building toward highly complex Mississippian society, the levels of complexity demonstrated by early mound-building groups are highly variable depending on which societal traits are examined. This complexity waxed, waned, and morphed, with potential peaks associated with wide interaction spheres during Late Archaic, Middle Woodland, and Mississippian times. While the intervening Middle Archaic, Early Woodland, and Late Woodland groups participated in more localized and inward-facing traditions, platform mound ceremonialism still played an important role.

The scarcity of identified Early Woodland and Archaic platform mounds may be due in part to a paucity of well-excavated mound sites from those times and a lack of recognition that some conical mounds began as platforms. Moreover, the same bias that has sometimes caused Middle and Late Woodland mounds to be assigned to the Mississippi period on the basis of form may still be at work in these earlier cases. That said, climatic shifts also could explain the Early Woodland lull (Kidder 2010). In either case, it is important to recognize that a lack of platform mound construction does not indicate a lack of platform mounds. Mound sites would have remained as persistently important places on the landscape (Thompson 2010), a fact clearly demonstrated by later reoccupation and mound construction at early sites (e.g., Mound D at Poverty Point [Ortmann 2007, pp. 275–276]).

During Middle Woodland times, the number of identified platform mounds increased dramatically, along with other forms of landscape modification such as earthen embankments, ditches, and constructed plazas. Site layouts and mound use during this period were highly variable, with both hypertrophic (e.g., Kolomoki [Pluckhahn 2003] and Marksville [McGimsey et al. 2005]) and simple examples present in most regions. During the Late Woodland, particularly in the Lower Mississippi Valley, the traditional mound-and-plaza arrangements that have long dominated archaeological discourse about platform mounds developed organically out of these earlier prototypes. While highly organized and elaborate site layouts increased through time, platform mounds have consistently formed only a small part of complex constructed landscapes that also included conical mounds, embankments, ditches, palisades, borrow pits, water features, zones of occupation, and, of course, plazas.

The Long History of Plaza Construction

Like platform mounds, plazas are hallmark features of Mississippian centers; and recent literature has drawn attention to the importance of plaza-focused studies for understanding site construction histories and site function. However, detailed studies of plazas have generally been limited to situations in which they form part of
a traditional mound-and-plaza arrangement (i.e., an open space symmetrically surrounded by flat-topped, earthen constructions) (Alt et al. 2010; Boudreaux 2013; Cobb and Butler 2017; Dalan 1997; Davis et al. 2015; Holley et al. 1993; Kidder 2004; Lewis et al. 1998; Nelson 2014; Rogers et al. 1982; cf. Barrier and Kassabaum 2018; Pluckhahn 2010; Sassaman and Heckenberger 2004). If the concept of the plaza is decoupled from the Mississippian ideal, then it becomes clear that plazas also have a long history in the eastern United States, that this history is not always tied to mounds, as plazas predate them at some sites and exist entirely independently of them at others, and that because they vary in form, function, and defining characteristics, their study is necessary for understanding the cultures that created them.

This review is limited by a number of factors. Plazas are chronically underdiscussed at mound sites and often go unidentified at nonmound sites, leading to fewer descriptions in the primary literature. Moreover, the variable vocabulary used to describe empty spaces makes a comprehensive literature review difficult. While less encyclopedic than my discussion of pre-Mississippian platform mounds, I survey the evidence for construction and use of pre-Mississippian plazas and build an outline from which we may work toward a more complete review.

I view plazas as bounded, open spaces large enough to hold public gatherings. This differs slightly from definitions that emphasize the role of permanent architecture in bounding plaza spaces. Plazas are not dependent on the presence of mounds (Kidder 2004, p. 516), let alone platform mounds; rather, ring middens and other sites with distinctly circular plans are found throughout the Southeast, spanning many time periods and geographic areas. As with platform mounds, these sites vary dramatically in form and function from permanently occupied villages to vacant centers used sporadically for special occasions.

Despite the commonality of this layout, it has been differentially studied. In the coastal regions of the Southeast where shell rings are easily identifiable, the study of circular settlements is well developed, whereas similar studies in more inland regions are lacking. Here I focus on three distinct classes of circular sites: coastal shell rings, ring middens on the Coastal Plain, and ring middens in the Lower Mississippi Valley.

Coastal Shell Rings

Perhaps due to interest in hunter–gatherer complexity, there has been a recent proliferation of work on coastal shell rings. Shell rings consist of circular, U-shaped, or C-shaped arrangements of shell-bearing sediments surrounding areas of little to no shell often referred to as plazas (Marquardt 2010, p. 563). They were built along the coasts of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi primarily during the Late Archaic and Early Woodland periods, though perhaps continuing into the later Woodland in some areas (Schwadron 2010). Over 50 Late Archaic and Early Woodland rings have been identified, and there is distinct spatial variation in their layouts, with large U-shaped and curvilinear shellworks in southern Florida, circular and horseshoe shapes in northeastern Florida, and smaller circles or C-shaped arrangements in coastal Georgia and South Carolina (Russo 2006) (Fig. 6). Ongoing work...
continues to add to this count, especially because many sites have been submerged under rising seas and/or buried under later shellworks (Schwadron 2010).

Shell rings were used year-round as either permanent settlements or ceremonial centers (Russo 2006, pp. E45–E46). Many sites consist of single rings, while more elaborate examples include interconnected rings, e.g., Fig Island 1 (Saunders and Russo 2002) and Rollins (Saunders 2004); numerous rings in close proximity, e.g., Fig Island (Saunders and Russo 2002) and Sapelo (Thompson 2006); or rings in association with other monumental architecture (Russo 2006, pp. E27–E29; Schwadron 2010). The symmetry implicit in circular shellworks has been interpreted as evidence of communal, egalitarian social organization (Trinkley 1985). Yet C- and U-shaped shellworks often have higher shell volumes at the closed end, e.g.,

Fig. 6 Archaic and Woodland shell ring footprints from Florida, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi (adapted from Russo 2006, fig. 1; Saunders 2017, fig. 2; Schwadron 2010, fig. 6.6)
Sewee (Russo and Heide 2003), Rollins (Saunders 2004), Fig Island 1 (Saunders and Russo 2002), and Horr’s Island (Russo 1991), suggesting differential importance of the occupants or activities in those areas (Russo 2004).

Shell rings and their plazas have variously been interpreted as related to feasting behavior (Saunders 2004; Russo 2004), purposeful monumentality (Sassaman 2004; Sassaman and Heckenberger 2004), burial ceremonialism (Elliott and Sassaman 1995, p. 146; cf. Russo 2006, pp. E46–E51), trade (Russo 2004), water management (Marquardt 2010; Middaugh 2009), and domestic habitation (Thompson 2006; Trinkley 1985). The key issue in this debate often becomes whether shell rings were formed gradually through midden accumulation or deliberately constructed as monuments. Evidence supporting both interpretations has been recovered; for example, Sapelo 3 (Thompson 2006) and Lighthouse Point (Trinkley 1985) had houses atop their rings, while the steepness of the rings at Horr’s Island and Fig Island would preclude summit buildings (Russo 2006, p. E17). The use of shells mined from other middens as construction fill further supports their monumental nature, e.g., Fig Island 1 (Saunders and Russo 2002). The conflicting evidence in this discussion has led some scholars to conclude that shell rings likely served variable functions through time (e.g., Russo 2004; Russo and Heide 2003; Thompson 2007).

Despite debates about the functions of coastal shell rings and the fact that central open spaces are essential to their definition, relatively few shell ring plazas have been explicitly investigated (Russo 2006, pp. E49–E50). Thompson (2007, p. 91) notes that no matter the assumed function of the ring, the plaza is always viewed as communal and kept clean. Russo (2010, p. 163) suggests that plazas were places of ceremony, oratory, and display (but does not explain why). On the other hand, features, midden, and artifact scatters found inside the rings at Chester Field (Flannery 1943), Horr’s Island (Russo 1991), and Cedarland (Sassaman and Ledbetter 1996, p. 80) led their excavators to believe the interiors of the rings were occupied.

Recently, a small number of studies have directly tackled the question of what happens in the plazas of shell rings through both excavation and geophysical exploration. Sanger and Thomas (2010) excavated in the plazas of St. Catherine’s and McQueen’s shell rings and uncovered large, circular, empty pits, which they suggest may be mast processing pits or large postholes. Marquardt (2010) suggests they may have been dug as wells during particularly dry spells. Thompson’s (2007) work at Sapelo Island III revealed evidence for intensive occupation of the central plaza in the form of ceramic and lithic debris and pit features. While these studies have provided some data from which to begin thinking about the activities that took place in the centers of shell rings, the plazas at the vast majority of sites remain untested. Future investigations of these spaces will be necessary to further our understanding of the functions of shell ring sites.

While the creation of shell rings slowed significantly around the transition from Late Archaic to Early Woodland (Russo 2006, p. E27), it did not cease entirely. Schwadron (2010, p. 137) argues for a degree of continuity with later Woodland period groups in the Glades region and emphasizes “the persistence of memory tied to the landscape.” Sassaman and colleagues (2014, pp. 152–154) likewise identify many U-shaped shell ridges constructed circa AD 1–400 and build a similar argument for the persistent use of certain locations. Regardless of the degree to which
shell rings continued as a form of architecture in the Woodland period, coastal cultures of that time certainly continued to organize their settlements in circles; those sites are the focus of the next section.

**Coastal Plain Ring Middens**

In addition to abundant research on shell rings in the coastal Southeast, attention has been focused on curvilinear (and occasionally rectangular) arrangements of dark, organically stained soils intermixed with cultural material surrounding central open areas. Although they overlap in distribution, these sites are distinct from Late Archaic shell rings due to a general lack of shell and minimal topographic relief (Russo et al. 2014, p. 127). Even though these characteristics have made them more difficult to identify from the surface, over 35 Woodland period circular and semicircular middens have been found in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama (see summaries in Pluckhahn 2010; Russo et al. 2014; Stephenson et al. 2002). Additionally, recent work at Silver Glen Springs has suggested that this pattern may extend back into the terminal Archaic (Randall et al. 2014). Ring midden sites have been identified based on distributions of ceramic material and midden soils using systematic shovel test and auguring surveys and density maps (e.g., Bense 1998, pp. 267–268; Pluckhahn 2003, pp. 91–125; Randall et al. 2014, fig. 1.4; Russo et al. 2014, figs. 6.2–6.4; Seinfeld and Bigman 2013, p. 17). Most ring middens are not consistent closed rings but are better described as irregular semicircles or discontinuous rings made up of distinct midden patches (Russo et al. 2014, p. 127).

Ring middens on the Coastal Plain were recognized as a common site type fairly early when Willey (1949, p. 403) interpreted them as evidence of either ancient fortifications or the remains of ceremonial activities. However, they did not become a focus of intensive study until the mid-1970s when a number conference papers asserted that ring middens were the remains of villages associated with burial mounds (Russo et al. 2014, p. 124). The presence of post molds in middens such as Horseshoe Bayou (Bense 1998, p. 258–259) and Old Homestead (Thomas et al. 1996) and the discontinuous nature of many rings have led to their interpretation as the remains of domestic dumps associated with particular houses (though structural patterns have not been discernable) (Stephenson et al. 2002, pp. 345–346). It is now assumed that most large villages during the Woodland period on the Coastal Plain took this form (Pluckhahn 2010, p. 105).

This domestic interpretation has persisted with little attempt to critically examine how detailed artifact analyses could augment understandings of midden function. Unless exotic materials were recovered, artifact assemblages, especially those containing food remains, were generally interpreted as straightforward evidence of domestic activity (Russo et al. 2014, p. 125). When analyses were completed on artifactual collections, they focused on determining whether ring middens represented permanent or seasonal encampments. Evidence for this was divided, with some sites showing faunal diversity that suggests permanent settlement, e.g., Bird Hammock (Byrd 1994; Nanfro 2004) and Old Homestead (Thomas et al. 1996), and others showing a more limited suite of faunal resources indicative of seasonal occupation,
e.g., Third Gulf Breeze (Byrd 1994) and those on Tyndall Air Force Base (Russo et al. 2014).

Studies of ring middens have generally not focused on what was happening in the plazas (Russo et al. 2014, p. 127), yet the contents of plazas at Woodland ring middens have figured more significantly in site interpretations than at Archaic shell rings. The authors of these studies have generally argued for more ceremonial site interpretations. For example, faunal and ceramic collections from plaza pits at Bird Hammock (Nanfro 2004) and Old Homestead (Thomas et al. 1996) were interpreted as the remains of short-term ritual activities that may have included feasting. Likewise, excavations at ring middens on Tyndall Air Force Base led to the development of a model in which communal feasting in plazas allowed for reciprocal food sharing during seasonal fluctuations in resource availability (Russo et al. 2011). At Bernath, burials and exceptionally large pits were interpreted as evidence of elite occupation and/or punctuated ceremonial use (Bense 1998).

Russo and colleagues (2014, pp. 129–136) present additional evidence for these more ceremonial interpretations, suggesting that exotic pottery, nonlocal materials, and other burial objects were brought to nearby mound sites via ceremonies held at ring middens. While the middens themselves were very likely locations of habitation, the plazas would have served as public arenas for the manipulation of both everyday and exotic materials during ritual events. “The open space of ring plazas facilitated verbal and visual communication and allowed for the manufacture, display, presentation, and symbolic negotiation of sacred objects destined for the mound” (Russo et al. 2014, p. 134). The close material and spatial relationships between domestic and ceremonial activity at these ring middens implies that the two domains were unlikely to be viewed as separate by the people involved. Rather, ring middens and their plazas were locations where the sacred and secular merged.

Pluckhahn (2010, p. 102) presents a conflicting interpretation in his discussion of the midden rings and plazas at large Middle Woodland villages associated with mounds in the same region. Taking Kolomoki as his prime example, he interprets mound-and-plaza complexes as “corporately organized ritual spaces that served to reduce tensions in growing communities” while also noting that the ritual activities that took place would have provided opportunities for personal aggrandizement and status seeking. He concludes that “this contradiction was mitigated through the segregation of ceremonial and domestic activities” into spaces partitioned through dichotomies in both the built environment and material culture.

The plaza at Kolomoki is defined more by a concentric set of ring middens than by mounds (Fig. 7). This site layout would not have restricted access to the plaza in the way that the high mound densities and palisade walls at later, Mississippian sites would, thus providing support for the interpretation of Middle Woodland plazas as resolutely public spaces. This communal interpretation is further supported by the labor requirements for constructing and maintaining these plazas. Artifact densities suggest that time was taken to sweep the Kolomoki plaza clean after ceremonial activities took place there. In addition, the elimination and subsequent control of vegetation in plaza spaces in the subtropical climate of the Coastal Plain would have required huge labor investments (Pluckhahn 2010, pp. 106–107). Importantly, this discussion highlights the high level of community investment in plaza spaces.
rather than allowing them to be passively defined by what is not there (i.e., habitation debris).

While many ring-midden plazas would have served only the community living in the proximate village, Pluckhahn (2010, p. 107) argues that the largest of these ring middens may have integrated a regional community. Many of these sites had associated mounds, including some of the early platform mound sites discussed above—e.g., Kolomoki (Pluckhahn 2003), Letchworth (Seinfeld and Bigman 2013), McKeithen (Milanich et al. 1984, pp. 53–54), Garden Patch (Wallis and McFadden 2016), Walling (Knight 1990), and potentially Evelyn (Ashley et al. 2007). In some cases (e.g., Kolomoki), the midden appears to predate the majority of mound construction; in others, the midden and the mounds grew up more-or-less simultaneously (e.g., Garden Patch). Regardless, plazas would have been defining characteristics of these sites from the beginning, and the activities that took place within them must have been essential to the development of early villages and mound centers in the Coastal Plain.

Lower Mississippi Valley Ring Middens

There are significant similarities in the sites and the social processes at play at coastal and inland sites; there also is great variation in the way the sites are thought about and discussed. Despite the recognition that plazas are not just empty spaces but rather meaningful locations of activity (Kidder 2004), discussion of them at inland sites relies heavily on the presence of mounds. Of course, plazas figure
prominently in discussions of Mississippian site layouts; they also are discussed in
the literature on pre-Mississippian platforms reviewed above.

The practice of constructing mounds around open spaces was present from the
inception of monument construction in the inland Southeast, e.g., Frenchmen’s
Bend, Hedgepeth, Caney, and Watson Brake (Saunders 2012). However, research
at Middle Archaic sites has often been limited to coring and small test excavations
aimed at establishing the age and stratigraphy of mounds. While this leaves very
little known about activities that took place between and around them, the highly
planned nature of these empty spaces has been clearly demonstrated (Clark 2004;
Sassaman and Heckenberger 2004), thereby suggesting that the associated activities
were important and should be further investigated.

In the Late Archaic, Poverty Point provides an obvious example of monumental
constructions oriented around a central plaza (Clark 2004; Ortmann 2007). Other
Poverty Point culture sites also may have had mounds arranged around plazas (Sas-
saman and Heckenberger 2004); Cedarland and Claiborne represent contemporary
nonmound sites with central open areas (Bruseth 1991; Clark 2004). The plaza at
Poverty Point was a purposefully constructed space that likely required significant
labor investment (Ortmann 2003). While its functions are not well understood, a
highly complex ceremonial mound and a series of post circles that suggest ritual
activity were erected within it (Greenlee 2009; Ortmann 2007, pp. 148–181).

Sassaman and Heckenberger (2004) interpret Archaic sites with mounds and
plazas as indicating the hierarchical nature of their builders. They emphasize that
plazas separate people rather than draw them together by dividing insiders from out-
siders, nature from culture, and sacred from profane. However, this is a minority
point of view, as circular spaces have been regularly interpreted as a reflection of
unity and U- and C-shaped spaces as demonstrating structural opposition between
relatively equal halves. Regardless, Sassaman and Heckenberger (2004, p. 20) make
an important point that plazas’ “significance lies not so much in the labor needed to
erect them as in the ideas needed to conceive of them.” This is undoubtedly true for
the large number of mound-and-plaza layouts identified throughout the Woodland
period as well. The inclusion of sites that do not contain platform mounds would
increase the number of Woodland mound-and-plaza centers significantly.

Importantly, plazas predate mounds at many sites in the Lower Mississippi Val-
ley and thus may have provided their defining organizational principles. At Watson
Brake, one of the few extensively excavated Middle Archaic sites, the site’s layout
initially developed as an oval-shaped premound midden to which the mounds were
later added (Saunders et al. 2005b). This pattern of initial midden deposition sur-
rounding an open space also has been identified at Late Archaic sites, including
Jaketown (Ford et al. 1955), Savory (Phillips 1970, pp. 338–339), and Teoc Creek
(Connaway et al. 1977).

Woodland midden rings defining the future layout of mound-and-plaza sites have
been broadly recognized. One of the earliest recognitions of this pattern comes from
Belmont’s (1967) work at Greenhouse, a prominent Coles Creek mound center
in Louisiana. The Baytown occupation of Greenhouse consisted of an oval plaza
flanked by crescent-shaped middens at each end, with smaller middens on the sides
and no signs of occupation either inside or outside the ring. The mounds were not
constructed atop this ring of midden until the succeeding Coles Creek period. Belmont (1967) notes that this site plan existed at earlier Middle Woodland sites as well and became common during late Baytown.

Phillips (1970, pp. 265–268, 270–272, 352–359, 373–376) recognizes a similar pattern of Baytown ring middens in the Lower Yazoo Valley, most of which never had mounds built atop them (Fig. 8). He documents at least seven instances of this pattern, most of which consist of circular arrangements of shell heaps interpreted as household middens surrounding a clean plaza. Though less common, he acknowledges that this same circular arrangement also has been found at sites that do not have shell. These ring middens are more difficult to identify from the surface, especially when not associated with later mounds, and they are thus likely to be underrepresented in Phillips’s sample.

The regular presence of ring middens without shell under later mound-and-plaza sites further supports this conclusion. At the early Coles Creek Feltus site, the mounds were built on an oval or parentheses-shaped midden similar to that at identified by Belmont (1967) at Greenhouse (Steponaitis et al. 2015). Density maps of artifact types collected from a grid of shovel tests showed the midden’s extent, or perhaps more accurately, the plaza’s extent. Geophysical surveys of off-mound areas and excavations into premound deposits further supported this pattern (Kassabaum 2014, pp. 28–30). This clearly indicates that the site was not occupied haphazardly before the construction of the mounds, but rather it was a planned use of space that already included the purposeful creation of a central plaza.

Distinct ring-shaped, premound middens also were present at other Coles Creek sites, e.g., at Mazique (LaDu 2016, pp. 361–380), and likely at Raffman (Roe 2010, p. 77), Morgan (Fuller and Fuller 1987, p. 9), and Lake Providence (Weinstein 2005, pp. 56–61, figs. 5–23). Moreover, investigations of many additional Coles Creek mounds (as well mounds from other periods) show evidence of major submound

![Fig. 8 Site plans of ring middens in the Lower Yazoo Basin. Dashed areas represent concentrations of midden (adapted from Phillips 1970, figs. 77, 80, 133, and 149)](image-url)
midden deposits, but the sites lack significant excavation in the areas between the mounds that might connect the dots between these deposits. Correcting the long-standing emphasis on understanding mound stratigraphy at the expense of off-mound investigations by focusing excavations in these gaps in the monumental landscape might demonstrate that plazas at many other sites were laid out before mounds were constructed.

In addition to Ortmann’s (2003) work in Poverty Point’s plaza, excavations at Coles Creek sites have demonstrated the degree to which plazas were actively constructed in the Lower Mississippi Valley. The plaza at Raffman was leveled by purposefully filling in low spots and then artificially extended during early Coles Creek (Kidder 2004). Additional mounds were later built atop this extension (Roe 2010, pp. 74–75). Large-scale plaza extensions also have been documented at Mazique (LaDu 2016, pp. 381–383). Not only does this demonstrate that a great deal of labor was directed toward plaza construction, but it also underscores the importance of viewing plazas as active spaces that change through time and thus require detailed archaeological attention (Kidder 2004).

Summary

Circular site layouts are common throughout the world. The fact that hunter-gatherer, horticultural, and agricultural societies have and continue to regularly organize both their villages and their monuments in circular patterns is well documented (e.g., Clay 1987; Fraser 1968; Heckenberger 2005; Levi-Strauss 1963; Means 2007). The plazas at these sites have served as locations for dances, burials, feasts, and other ceremonial activities, as well as mundane activities such as food and craft production and exchange.

This review supports the existence of similar practices throughout the prehistory of the eastern United States. Excavations at the Paleoindian site of Bull Brook in Massachusetts suggest that the domestic space that surrounded a plaza not associated with mounds was used for public activities (Robinson et al. 2009). This organizational principle continued throughout the Archaic and Woodland, during which time it was elaborated into the mound-and-plaza complexes so characteristic of late prehistory. While mound building slowed dramatically prior to European contact, the construction of plazas continued through the historic period and until today. A review of the literature on the stomp grounds and square grounds of contemporary Native groups reveals remarkable consistency with the stated functions of these spaces (i.e., constructing identity, building community, creating harmony, and settling disputes both within and between groups) (Hudson 1976; Jackson 2003; Witthoft 1949; see also Pluckhahn 2010, pp. 114–115). “Plazas, like other monuments, represent the social relations of the people who build, maintain, or simply appear in them. They are fixed, or marked, points that not only reflect social relations but also perpetuate or ‘sediment’ these relations in place” (Sassaman and Heckenberger 2004, p. 229).

In drawing attention to the importance of plazas in the Southeast, I am trying to correct the long-standing mound-centrism in current interpretations and suggest
a gap in our theoretical and methodological approaches to mound sites. Through targeted excavations of submound and between-mound contexts, it has become clear that the premound iterations of many mounded landscapes were not without structure but rather were focused around formal plazas from their inception. As such, the functions and meanings of mounded landscapes and their associated plazas developed from a long and widespread tradition of central open spaces and should be understood with respect to those earlier iterations as much as, if not more than, the mound centers that are so heavily studied from later time periods. Doing so will likely shift the emphasis of our discussions about the social interactions that took place at mound-and-plaza centers (or perhaps we should call them plaza-and-mound centers) from models of Mississippian sociopolitical hierarchy to more dynamic models that take into account the variety of integrative and competitive outcomes of communal social behavior.

**Conclusion and Future Directions**

Early platform mounds are more common than has been recognized in previous discussions. The picture painted in this review is one of remarkable time depth and remarkable diversity. A review of more than 100 pre-Mississippian platform mound sites allowed me to trace a longer history of platform mound use characterized by continuous and nonlinear shifts in mound function. Generally, numbers of platforms were low in the Archaic and Early Woodland (though this number is likely to increase with further excavation) and then exploded during the Middle Woodland. Further research and many more dates will be necessary to determine if the practice of constructing flat-topped mounds developed independently in each region or spread along with the goods and ideas that traveled through the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. Understanding Archaic and Early Woodland histories of platform mound construction in each region is an essential step to answering this question. The pace of platform mound construction increased even more during the Late Woodland, though it was more isolated to the Lower Mississippi Valley, where mound-and-plaza centers that resemble those constructed at later Mississippian sites became the norm.

When examined with a forward-looking temporal framework, it is very difficult to list a suite of characteristics that clearly differentiates pre-Mississippian platform mounds from those that came after (cf. Lindauer and Blitz 1997). In each period and region examined, mound summit use varied; some mounds served as burial locations, some as foundations for structures, and some as stages for communal, ritual, or elite activities. Through the Archaic and Woodland periods and across the eastern United States, some platforms were associated with large, permanent habitations, some were home to more limited or temporary occupations, and some were not inhabited at all, instead serving as vacant centers for a dispersed population. Platform mounds’ construction histories also vary wildly; some were built rapidly while others grew gradually through time. Still others began as platforms that were eventually covered with conical caps. Most have complex construction sequences that involve preparation of the premound surface and purposefully chosen sediments.
deposited in structured ways. Identifying patterns in practices of mound construction and use is thus difficult as the variability within any given period is as great as, if not greater than, the variability between periods. It is possible that geographic location accounts for more patterning in the data than does period of construction.

This suggests that our interpretations of platform mound sites of all periods ought to be formed on the basis of the evidence present at the particular site. While regional and temporal patterns certainly exist and can be useful in forming hypotheses, the multidirectional and asynchronous nature of the broader patterns means we must be cautious in relying too heavily on expectations. How, then, do we control the desire for “highly resolved exemplars” (Bailey 2007, p. 203) that has caused us to regularly take a problematic, backward-looking approach to interpreting early platform mound sites? I propose three distinct areas in which to focus. We must emphasize and investigate the process of constructing a mound as much as its post-construction use; we must take a less mound-centric approach to sites, focusing on off-mound and between-mound areas such as plazas; and we must increase our understanding of the full range of nonmound sites utilized by mound-building populations.

Studies of mounds in the eastern United States have historically focused on their post-construction use—more or less as burial locations or platforms for activities. In other words, most studies have focused on mounds as static symbols rather than mound building as a dynamic process. Calls to change this have been becoming progressively more common (e.g., Anderson 2012; Knight 1986; Sherwood and Kidder 2011) and have been focused on recognizing mound-building processes as highly sophisticated and likely highly meaningful for the participants. As a necessarily communal activity, better understandings of construction practices would undoubtedly reveal important information about social interaction and relations of power within mound-building communities. Knight (1986, pp. 678–679) uses linguistic and ethnohistoric evidence from contemporary Native groups to argue that the meaning of mounds was tied as much to their creation and maintenance as to the use of their final form. Joyce (2004) has put forward a similar point, adding that the permanence of monuments extends the possibilities for variable interactions indefinitely, leading to both intended and unintended consequences of monumentality.

Recent studies have revealed the complexity and variability involved in the mound construction process, as well as demonstrated techniques by which archaeologists can examine it more easily and in more detail (e.g., Bigman and Seinfeld 2017; Herrmann et al. 2014; Kassabaum et al. 2014a; Kidder 2011; Kidder et al. 2009; King et al. 2017; Sherwood 2006; Sherwood and Kidder 2011; Thompson and Pluckhahn 2010; Zimmer-Dauphinee 2017). More studies like these, making use of geoarchaeological and geophysical data followed by excavation, will be necessary to create a more complete account of the wide variety of materials and myriad construction techniques utilized by prehistoric mound builders.

However, monuments are a small part of the lived landscape at most sites. It is likely that only a tiny percentage of the activities at a given site would take place on the summit of a mound. Moreover, at some site, those activities may be highly limited in terms of attendance. Focusing on plazas and other “empty” places shifts the emphasis of discussions about social interactions taking place at mound-and-plaza
centers from the special activities that took place on mound summits to the more everyday activities that took place in off-mound areas. Plazas were meaningful spaces of interaction, and a great deal of labor was directed toward their construction at some sites (e.g., Anderson et al. 2012; Holley et al. 1993; Kidder 2004). In order to more effectively locate and research plazas and other important nonmounded spaces, we must document midden distributions in pre- and nonmound contexts. Systematic surface collection, coring, shovel testing, and geophysical survey has successfully mapped plazas at a number of sites (e.g., Bense 1998, pp. 267–268; Kassabaum 2014, fig. 2.6; LaDu 2016, figs. 8.3–8.10; Pluckhahn 2010, pp. 92–110; Pluckhahn et al. 2010; Russo et al. 2009, p. 76, 91, 2011, pp. 61, 97). Targeted excavation within these identified spaces is clearly the necessary next step.

Finally, in addition to off-mound locations, focused investigations of nonmound sites will be necessary to build a broader understanding of the social milieu in which mounds and plazas were constructed and used. Just as summit activities represent only a small fraction of activities that took place on mound sites, so do the activities on and near mounds represent only a small fraction of the overall social sphere in which people lived. Systematic survey and more intensive use of the data from contract archaeology are two effective ways to identify nonmound sites on which to focus investigations.

These three suggested ways forward combine to provide a method for constructing a “thick prehistory” (sensu Carr and Case 2008) of the lives of prehistoric mound builders in the eastern United States. As anthropologists, we should be interested in the mound builders and the mound users more so than the mounds. Carr and Case (2008, p. 3) state that “rapport with and understanding of another person comes in part from taking the time to experience life together with them, cultivating within oneself an awareness of their actions, responses, and sensitivities in varying contexts, and situating oneself, to the extent possible, in their social and personal worlds.” For archaeologists, this is challenging, and the difficulties we face in trying to people the past are often what cause us to fall back on the expectations and assumptions that we have developed by looking backward through time from better understood cases. It is only through studies that focus on investigating people, events, and actions in their local cultural, natural, and historical contexts that the dynamic processes of identity construction happening at the multitude of sites on which prehistoric people lived their lives may be accessed. “Immersing oneself in such details constrains the range of reconstructions that can logically be made, and gives at least the hope that the material voices of past people will speak louder than one’s own presuppositions, and will help to jar one into awareness of them” (Carr and Case 2008, p. 3). This review has revealed the remarkable diversity of pre-Mississippian platform mounds and plazas, drawn attention to some of the issues that have plagued prior interpretations of them, and suggested a few ways forward. Undoubtedly, the picture of Archaic and Woodland monumentality painted here is incomplete, but with any luck, it will look quite different in a matter of years.
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