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Simon Stoddart
A tribute in honour of Giovanni Lilliu (1914–2012)

Anna Depalmas

Remembering Giovanni Lilliu may seem an easy task. One might think that it is only necessary to list his rich scientific bibliography and to describe his great work over the course of nearly a century, as a university professor and archaeologist. However, a simple listing of his achievements would not transmit the true importance of his work. He not only illuminated the prehistoric archaeology of Sardinia, but also used it to establish the idea of a Sardinian epic which he connected to the modern world.

Prehistory was the choice of his field of study – rather than the predominant exaltation of the Roman era and classicism of the time –, and this had its origins in his study under Ugo Rellini at Rome. He graduated in 1938 and worked as Rellini’s assistant until 1942, when he returned to Sardinia to take up the position of Professor of Historical Archaeology and Geography at the University of Cagliari. From 1942 to 1958, he taught various subjects – Paleoethnology, Geography and the History of Religion - and in the latter year became a Full Professor and was appointed to the Chair of Sardinian Antiquity at the University of Cagliari. From 1944 to 1955 he also worked for the Superintendency of Sardinian Antiquity.

He held many posts in his long academic career. He was for a long time, and on various occasions, dean of the Faculty of Letters, Director of the Institute of Archaeology and Arts, Director of the School of Specialization in Sardinian Studies and Editor of the Journal carrying the same name (Studi Sardi), and, in 1990, he was elected a fellow of the Academy of Lincei of Rome. In his later years, he remained a very active Professor Emeritus at Cagliari University.

In 1936, while he was still a student, he published his first work on Su Nuraxi di Barumini. This was his birthplace, and throughout his life he maintained a close and almost embodied connection with the village. This also led him to carry out his most important archaeological work in the landscape of his birth. Indeed, between 1951 and 1956, he worked on excavating an artificial hill there, which was found to cover the nuragic complex of Su Nuraxi di Barumini. This was the first excavation conducted in Sardinia using a stratigraphic methodology to establish a time-line for the nuragic period, and it became a benchmark for later investigations and chronological research. His work at Barumini formed the basis for a series of fundamental papers on Sardinian proto-history, from *I nuraghi. Torri preistoriche di Sardegna* (The Nuraghi, prehistoric towers of Sardinia) in 1962 to *Civiltà nuragica* (Nuragic civilization) in 1982.

He was the first to study many of the themes that he investigated in depth during his long scientific career and many of these were only studied for the first time in the first half of the twentieth century. The chronology of proto-Sardinian civilization was one key field that he developed, modified and changed in the course of his long academic career. At the same time, Lilliu published a brief essay in which he attempted to identify certain constant factors in the history of Sardinian art, and this was developed in the catalogue for the exhibition of Sardinian bronzes in Venice in 1949. Following the theories of Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli on how to classify the art of the ancient world, Lilliu assessed the coexistence of the ‘anti-naturalistic’ art of the barbarian world and the ‘naturalistic’ art of the classical world within which he inserted Sardinia as a ‘land of pure expression’, and defined as anti-classical and barbaric. This line of thought became the nucleus of a theme which he studied from various angles and which helped him to define key concepts in his field of study.

At the beginning of the 1960s, he published his wide-ranging synthesis of Sardinia, *La civiltà dei Sardi dal Neolitico all’età dei nuraghi* (1963) (Sardinian Civilization from the Neolithic period to the nuragic
era). This work was later reprinted, expanded and revised in various editions until 1988. Apart from incorporating the results of later research, the later editions also allowed him to reassess some of his earlier observations with a critical eye, which was always one of his great strengths as a researcher and academic. The book proposed that a single unifying thread ran through Sardinian prehistory from the Neolithic period, even starting in the Palaeolithic period, until the Phoenician conquest. It established elements of the historiography of the island using data obtained from his work as an archaeologist. Many of the principal Sardinian monuments were described in an elegant style which alternated with detailed, creative and lyrical descriptions. The book was aimed at not only archaeologists and students, but also at a wider public, and indeed the book was dedicated to ‘the shepherds of Barbagia’. Generations of archaeologists have studied the manual and found themselves cited in later editions, in agreement with Lilliu’s global historiographical approach which aimed to unite past archaeological research with his experience of teaching Sardinian Antiquity in a university context. This book also gave birth to a national and popular history of prehistoric Sardinia, and expanded the work of archaeologists and their research from being only something studied in university lecture rooms and solely of interest to academics to its status as part of the common heritage of all Sardinians.

This social dimension, this impact, can be clearly seen from Giovanni Lilliu’s popularity, which came from having shone a light on the national history of Sardinia and giving life to a Sardinian historiographical tradition, i.e. one with a strong sense of identity. His fame led to him being consulted, even in the later years of his life, on current events in Sardinia not necessarily related to culture or archaeology and being seen as a kind of prophet or even as the ‘father of his country’. One of the many lessons that he taught us, and in which he himself was an expert, was the importance of intellectuals being able to discuss, communicate and talk about complex historical themes in a way which was both comprehensible and of interest to laymen.

He showed a total but clear love for his land by taking on civic responsibilities, which he fulfilled in a way which was never dull but rather vigilant and acute, despite his soft tone. As a cultured man, he worked for the Regional Council of Sardinia, drafting the Special Statute of Autonomy. He was also involved in politics, first as a member of the Christian Democrats and later as a supporter of initiatives which promoted the independence of Sardinia and of progressive positions which were close to the Centre-Left. In practice, he was active in actions which were designed to give greater value to Sardinian identity and culture.

The ideological basis for these activities were elaborated by Giovanni Lilliu at the start of his intellectual life, and were made completely clear in the 1970s when he developed the concept of ‘constant Sardinian resistance’. At the beginning of the first prehistoric phase, the Sardinians were characterized by their resistance to foreign invaders and any attempts at acculturation. This characteristic did not disappear in ancient times, but has been a constant theme of Sardinian history and ethnicity, and is still present today. In this sense, Sardinian culture is not a fossil, but rather displays an extraordinary historical continuity with the past. This is an analysis which never became an idealization of aspects of Sardinian society and behaviour, but rather provided a clear and realistic picture through also identifying its negative aspects and its limitations. Nuragic civilization in particular became a symbol of a polycentric society, always in conflict with itself, the land and foreign invaders.

However, it is certainly limiting to supply a rigid definition of what Lilliu meant by nuragic civilization, given that he saw it as a dialectical relationship between its various dimensions, and worked on a reconstruction of it that was complex and multifaceted. He proposed an interpretation of nuragic civilization that saw it not as local but Mediterranean. In this, he was greatly influenced by his direct experience of excavations in the village of Ses Paisses in Majorca, where he found ethnic roots which were common to all the large islands of the West Mediterranean, the Balearics and Corsica, although there were also differences connected to the independent developments drawing on their insularity.

The fact that he found writing easy as can be seen from his some 330 publications. The last of these was in 2010, and was a detailed description of the excavation of the Giant’s Tomb of Bidistili in Fonni. It is worth saying that many of the present arguments about certain elements and problems of prehistoric and proto-historic Sardinia were originally raised by him.

I would like to end this brief and partial memorial to Giovanni Lilliu by mentioning his work as a university professor of prehistoric and proto-historic Sardinia (and not only those subjects – with great versatility he also taught Geography and Christian archaeology). What I will personally remember is his little figure in jacket and pullover (he seldom, if ever, wore a tie), typewritten sheets in hand, and always punctual. He never postponed a lesson and was never
absent. As an examiner he was always courteous and understanding. But you had to be very well prepared for his exams. The end of the course every year was the moment that we all waited for. Then there were the one or two day excursions that he led us on to various parts of Sardinia. We students would present our explanations of the monuments and he would listen with great attention as if it were his first visit, and then sometimes add some of his own memories, making it ever more clear how he was the creator of our view of prehistoric Sardinia.

He really was the memory of Sardinian history.
Tributes to Dr David Trump, FSA, UOM (1931–2016),
and Dr Euan MacKie, FSA (1936–2020)

Caroline Malone & Simon Stoddart

David Trump was best known for his important work on the islands of Malta (Malone 2020), but his contribution to the prehistory of Sardinia is also worthy of record in the context of this volume.

David Hilary Trump took his first class BA in Arch and Anth at Pembroke College, Cambridge in 1955, and was a scholar of both the British School at Jerusalem, where he dug with Kathleen Kenyon, and the British School at Rome, where he excavated the key site of La Starza.

After Malta, Trump held the post of Staff Tutor in Archaeology at the University’s Board of Extra-Mural Studies until retirement in 1997, when he was succeeded by Caroline Malone. He not only contributed to the teaching of Mediterranean Prehistory in the Department of Archaeology, but also had a large following in the wider, continuing education community, engaging mature students in all aspects of Archaeology in the region and beyond. It was during this period that he made a major contribution to the archaeology of Sardinia, uncovering once again unsuspected phases of prehistory at Grotta Filiestru (Trump 1983) and completing the survey of Bonu Ighinu. At Grotta Filiestru, he characteristically invested all the resources he could muster into constructing an effective chronology (Switsur & Trump 1983) and some of the first faunal studies undertaken in Sardinia (Levine 1983). This work was, in its way, as equally pioneering as his work on the island of Malta. The Grotta Filiestru produced a new scientifically dated sequence of Sardinian prehistory, identifying the fifth-millennium BC Filiestru Neolithic phase for the first time. In earlier fieldwork he also excavated the cave site of Sa ‘uca de su Tintirrìolu (Loria & Trump 1978). His work around Bonu Ighinu (Trump 1990) is, however, closest to the theme of this volume since, in typical energetic style, Trump also provided one of the earliest studies of a nuragic landscape, once again demonstrating a pioneering role, now followed by many others.
Euan MacKie was a central figure in the study of brochs, as is shown by the very high level of citation in this volume (Mackie 1965 ... 2008). In several ways the contribution of David Trump and Euan MacKie run in parallel, one journeying south, the other journeying north also from Cambridge beginnings, both Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries of London, engaged in seminal fieldwork, on a shoe string generally with volunteers, providing the first chronological foundations for monuments in the landscape and addressing synthesis of the results. Both were pioneers of their generation who retained their own intellectual independence in museums (both) and in continuing education (Trump), rather than a department of archaeology or a heritage organization.

MacKie graduated in Archaeology and Anthropology from St. John’s Cambridge in 1959 and took his PhD from the University of Glasgow in 1973, becoming, after a brief period at the British Museum, Keeper and Deputy Director (1986) of the University Hunterian Museum. As a graduate he took part in an expedition to British Honduras, directing the excavation of the Maya site of Xunantunich, leading to an interest in Mesoamerican archaeology throughout his life.

His excavation of brochs such as Dun Mor Vaul on Tiree, published in 1975, Dun Ardtreck on Skye published in 2000 and Leckie in Stirlingshire published in 2008, were fundamental in uncovering the sequence, material culture and chronology of these monuments. He gathered information for his important three-volume compendium on brochs from his own excavations and the investigations of others, undertaking research well into retirement (1998), publishing the final volume in 2007. These volumes are landmarks of data on the subject, a resource which provides a platform for all broch studies. His achievements were also celebrated in his Festschrift, In the Shadow of the Brochs (2002), showing the respect shown to him by younger generations.

He ventured far and wide in his more interpretative work. Some of his interpretations of broch builders and their monuments are no longer widely held and the chronologies are currently being reconsidered, but his stimulating approach to ideas endures. He was passionate about many other subjects including his seminal work in prehistoric metrology and archaeoastronomy. The volume Science and Society in Prehistoric Britain (1977) was a central work for Glyn Daniel’s teaching in Cambridge, and he made the valid point that the sophistication of prehistory is not to be underestimated. His interest in ethnography, no doubt drawing on his Arch and Anth undergraduate career at Cambridge, gave him a great respect for other ways of thinking and for the architectural and political achievements of prehistoric Britain, most notably for the builders of the brochs themselves in the Iron Age.
Chapter 5

Memories, monumentality and materiality in Iron Age Scotland

Louisa Campbell

The construction and application of explicit theoretical models has transformed archaeological approaches to the study of material culture (Miller 2005) and landscapes over the past two decades (Gosden & Head 1993). Demonstrably appropriate ethnographic analogies (Binford 1983; Lane 2008) have rendered modern Westernized perceptions as inadequate for providing insights into ‘social landscapes’ as active embodied entities (Fowler 2008) which are understood, engaged with, lived in (Thomas 2008) and experienced through culturally embedded social practices (Bourdieu 1977). Phenomenological approaches encourage active engagement with landscapes as a sensuous and somatic experience (Brück 2005) within the social dimension rather than an extra-somatic study of disconnected, de-territorialized spaces that can be adequately captured through computer models or photographic imagery (Tilley 2008; Barrett & Ko 2008).

A long-term holistic approach to the study of active embodied Iron Age landscapes, settlements and associated material culture in northern Britain is proposed here as an effective model for identifying patterns of continuity and change, taking account of similarities and differences on a macro and micro scale at the inter and intra site level. These interconnected strands are integral components in the construction of identities and the formation of new hybrid identities within Iron Age communities engaged in variable degrees of contact with Roman incomers (Alcock 1979; Haselgrove & Moore 2007; Hunter 2007). These continually reinforced and renegotiated connections between people, places and time (Ingold 1993) are here proposed as central to understanding social landscapes and people’s engagement with social memories as a collective concept in interpreting the past (Halbwachs 1992; Hutton 1993) through selectively remembering and forgetting (van Dyke & Alcock 2003a). Such concepts inform the interpretive foundation for research (Campbell 2011) that reassessed Roman material culture crossing social and imperial boundaries (McCarthy 2008) into Iron Age contexts in northern Britain.

Social landscapes and memories

Ethnographic analogies provide valuable interpretive insights into the concept of ‘social landscapes’. For example, Aboriginal ideological belief systems, laws and patterns of life are informed and defined by The Dreamtime. These are complex oral traditions passed through successive generations to explain the creation of sacred places, animals, people and customs (Isaacs 1980). Such belief systems confirm that through placemaking people actively construct place (Rubertone 2008, 13) in an embodied landscape imbued with cultural and ancestral significance marked by monumentality (Bradley 1998a), materiality (Miller 2005), objectification (Tilley 2006), memories (van Dyke 2008) and enchainment practices (Chapman 2008; Campbell 2016). The concept of enchainment links people to inalienable objects and imposes culturally specific restrictions on their use, reuse (Campbell 2012a) and/or discardment (Strathern 1988). Enchainment is inextricably linked to objectification, identity or multiple identities and individualism where links are formed and forged between people through the medium of material culture (Tilley 2006). Shared identities are therefore forged and reinforced through shared embedded objects and places as a means of negotiating the social interface (Alcock 2002; Myers 1988, 54) and constructing social memories.

Ingold (1993) uses ‘taskscapes’ to discuss landscape as technology, while McAnany and Hodder (2009, 10) explore the concept of structured deposition (Hill 1995). They offer ‘social stratigraphy’ as an interpretive framework for the identification of deliberate construction, closure and reconstruction of
buildings over previous structures as a means of creating, maintaining and reinforcing connections with the past, forming layers of meanings for social practices which intentionally relate to earlier deposits and the continual reuse of space. The reuse of significant places in the landscape (Barrett et al. 1991; Garcia Sanjuan et al. 2007) and incorporation of traditional and newly acquired foreign objects (e.g. Eckardt & Williams 2003) into structures may constitute a means by which people manipulated the past to make sense of the present by establishing connections between the ancestors, social memories and changing identities (Hingley 1992, 29).

While people can ‘give away’ rights to certain places in the landscape, that does not necessitate the severance of their own connections to and identities within that landscape. As Myers (1988, 53) makes clear in his study of Pintupi Aborigines, land can be shared, but it can never really be lost. Therefore, northern societies may have tolerated an incoming Roman military force ‘borrowing’ land rights, but they are unlikely to have abjured their own ancestral, contemporary or future rights to and deep-rooted connections with the land. While Keppie (1989, 6) suggests that the Roman presence is likely to have been largely welcomed in northern Britain, the placement of military installations directly overlying existing settlements, such as the camps constructed on top of settlements at Car- ronbridge and Dun in Montrose or the Antonine Wall cutting through the hillfort at Castelhill, must surely have caused a certain amount of resentment and disruption to the existing occupants of this landscape. Indeed, the imposition of the Empire’s most northern frontier in the form of a massive mural barrier, in itself an example of Roman monumentality, cutting a swathe through the Scottish Lowlands is likely to have consumed some culturally important places and caused a level of social and ideological upheaval. Many of these spaces will have been re-aggregated into local traditions on the Roman withdrawal from the region.

Changes to the social landscape may have altered the expectations, interpretations and perceptions of local populations (Lucas 2001, 55) whose oral traditions over time could transform culturally significant places to embody cultural tradition, identity or power (Garcia Sanjuan et al. 2007, 1). Bradley (1990; 1998a, 66) has demonstrated that ancestral rituals permeated Neolithic society and Garcia Sanjuan et al.’s (2007, 1) case studies of prehistoric Spanish funerary sites propose this legacy of cultural belief systems and practices, coupled with a system of significant places and landscapes, resonated throughout the Bronze and Iron Ages of European societies. Oral tradition imbibes certain places with social significance and their physical properties, including monumentality, location, visibility, material and symbolic associations, to enable archaeological interpretation. Cultural associations would have altered over time and successive generations may have transformed these sites to embody changing social conditions. People engage with social memories as a shared concept in interpreting the past (Hutton 1993) through selectively remembering and forgetting (van Dyke & Alcock 2003b) different versions of that past to negotiate their needs and validate their actions in the present.

Religion and ideology are likely to have been intricately entwined within the Iron Age societies conquered by Rome and a cultural response to the political and economic dominance of the Empire may have been to invoke cultural memory to stimulate ideological and symbolic resistance (Garcia Sanjuan et al. 2007, 2). In this way, reuse of traditional sites could enable provincial peoples to legitimize the present by manipulating the past in the same way that a resurgence of votive deposition during the Roman Iron Age in northern Britain may signify communities who felt under threat from a foreign culture and a requirement to reinforce their cultural identities (Harding 2004, 81). The expression of identities can intensify within groups who are experiencing increased competition for resources or other social tensions (Hodder 1979) and material culture can be utilized to reinforce group identities as a form of cultural resistance (Herring 2007, 23). Deliberate and selective adoption of foreign material could have facilitated the transformation of traditional cultural concepts through the acquisition, reformulation, creative interpretation, adaptation and appropriation of Roman material and ideas into existing social strategies (Miller 1987; Roymans 1996, 99; Campbell 2012a), including deposition into places inscribed with ritual significance.

Changing perceptions, interpretations and use of cultural landscapes before, during and after Roman occupation of territories (Petts 1998, 91), as well as the placement and treatment of material culture associated with ritual practices can also aid our understanding of spatial, symbolic, temporal and ritual issues (Weekes 2001, 75) as well as the choices of the participants. Such rituals often follow distinctive phases in the form of preliminal, liminal and postliminal stages of rites of passage (van Gennep 1960 [1909]) and changes in context can indicate cultural change, perhaps through imperialism or appropriation. However, these must always be considered within the context of the specific societies and agents under study, taking account of intentionality (Barrett 1994; Gardner 2004; Robb 2010) whilst ensuring that we do not unconsciously impose motivations, structures and language stemming from colonial impositions of the nineteenth century (Dietler 2005,
Northern landscapes in the Roman Iron Age

Northern Britain was well known to the Romans. Ptolemy’s *Geographia* provides the first definition of tribal boundaries from around the mid-second century AD. However, his reliance upon predominantly first century sources and incorrect 90 degree bending of Scotland has caused considerable problems in correlating his locations with modern geography (Strange 1997). For example, uncertainty surrounds whether his assigned place-names refer to Roman or indigenous places (Mann & Breeze 1988; Barrow 1989; Breeze 2002).

Northern studies have historically benefited from a strong tradition of gathering data on Roman material culture recovered from Iron Age contexts (e.g. Curle, J. 1913; 1932; Robertson 1970; Hunter 2001). Much of this research, however, amounts to little more than a cataloguing exercise and lacks any commitment to comprehend the deeper social meanings behind locals appropriating Roman material culture. It is also, perhaps, surprising to note the absence of any comprehensive landscape study of Roman period sites in Scotland as a means of understanding the impact a large invading army might have had upon the existing population. These embodied landscapes would most likely have been imbued with oral histories and experienced through a wide range of traditional and situationally relevant practices as critical components of strategies for the negotiation of identities, particularly the Roman and provincial interface in regions historically considered as marginal.

A detailed assessment of depositional practices set within the framework of biographical approaches (e.g. Kopytoff 1986; Comaroff 1996; Gilchrist 2004; Meskell 1999; Hoskins 2006; Stahl 2010; Campbell 2012a, 2016) are proposed here as critical to any attempt to interpret social practices, relations (Stahl 2008) and memories (Joyce 2008; Pollard 2008, 58–9) as they inform symbolism (Hodder 1982b) as well as mundane and profane practices (Brück 1999). The Scottish evidence confirms, in many cases, that Roman objects have been deposited in contexts which appear to have ritual significance and several of these sites experienced lengthy human occupation spanning the Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age periods. An analysis of depositional trends appears to have confirmed inter-generational connections between life cycles of landscapes, structures and people (Campbell 2011).

There is a marked preference for Roman ceramics on sites where craft-working activities were being undertaken. Such sites have traditionally been considered as the domain of elites; however, this present research cannot corroborate that assumption on the basis that such activities could equally have been ascribed ideological significance (Hingley 1997). Leadership does not necessarily require hierarchical social structures, but rather it can be context specific and a temporally imposed construct based upon the performance of certain rituals at particular times by selected individuals perceived as situationally appropriate (Bern 1979). Therefore, it is possible that metal-workers and potters could have been revered as holders of magical and ideological powers for their capacity to transform the properties of raw materials into entirely new physical objects.

It could be further argued that the continued imposition of modern Westernized models for social structures onto Iron Age societies based largely upon the presence or absence of Roman objects is unhelpful at best and heavily biased at worst. Rather, the presence of metalworking evidence on sites with higher numbers of Roman sherds, particularly reused Samian, might equally be interpreted as rituality ascribed to metalworking or potting crafts, to which we might add glassmaking. That such evidence predominates on sites with lengthy occupational sequences might further corroborate the proposal that certain activities were being performed in ‘special places’ within a landscape perceived as culturally and symbolically significant (Halbwachs 1992; Hingley 1996; Garcia Sanjuan et al. 2007).

The lowland brochs serve as a useful case study to explore these concepts further by assessing the material expression of social and ancestral memories (Alcock 2002) through monumentality in the context of the communities in northern Britain affected by Rome’s expansionist policies.

The lowland brochs

Aside from Traprain Law and Edinburgh Castle, larger Roman ceramic assemblages come exclusively from the southern brochs. These enigmatic circular drystone solid-based towers are situated on prominent and strategically important positions in the landscape, commanding extensive views over their surrounding terrain. Animal bones from Teroy, Dumfries and Galloway (Curle 1912) as well as Fairy Knowe, Buchlyvie (Main 1998) and Leckie in Stirlingshire (MacKie 1979; 1982; 2004) confirm livestock kept or consumed at these
sites, whilst palaeobotanical evidence confirms cereal production and processing at the latter two, suggesting a mixed farming economy.

Contestation surrounds the appearance of brochs in southern Scotland. For instance, MacKie (1982) has argued that these alien architectural forms, normally prevalent in the Atlantic north and dating to the first millennium bc, are the result of dominant southerners migrating northward. However, there is now general agreement that the southern examples were built in the first to second centuries ad, probably for the display of wealth in architectural form, where elites of hierarchical societies controlled the redistribution of prestige Roman goods in the region beyond Hadrian’s Wall (Macinnes 1984). However, they may equally embody widespread cultural and political contacts across Scotland (Hingley 1992, 28). This current research proposes that brochs also fall into the category of monumentality during the Iron Age as a means of memorializing and commemorating special places as well as reinforcing and publicly displaying social memories and ancestral connections between the land on which they are constructed and their associated communities.

The diverse range of artefacts recovered from Fairy Knowe, Leckie, Torwoodlee and Hurly Hawkine confirms that the occupants of these brochs, in common with several Iron Age hillforts, may have been engaged in craft-working activities and they may also have served as central storage places for communal agricultural surplus (Hingley 1992, 29). The presence of 125 amphora sherds at Fairy Knowe (Main 1998) might imply Roman influence on the storage of food; however, they originate from a single vessel and cannot, therefore, be taken as evidence of changes in traditional storage practices. Internal dividers follow the tradition of timber roundhouse predecessors (Piggott 1951; MacKie 1979, 1982; Main 1998), although brochs contain an added vertical dimension which may have reinforced hierarchical social divisions (Foster 1989). The format of internal spaces could equally have depended upon a range of factors including areas associated with sleeping, working, age, gender (Harding 2004, 291) or public and private space.

The lowland brochs are commonly multi-period sites that demonstrate complex and lengthy occupational sequences. For instance, Hurly Hawkine, Angus (Jervise 1868; Taylor 1982) and Torwoodlee in the Scottish Borders (Curle 1892; Piggott 1951) have been constructed on earlier Iron Age hillforts. These brochs, along with Edin’s Hall in the Scottish Borders (Dunwell 1999), were superseded by stone-built settlements (Cunliffe 1991, 115). Radiocarbon sampling suggests the Stirlingshire brochs which replaced earlier timber structures date to the first century ad. Meanwhile post-broch occupation is evident at some sites including Leckie and the construction of a souterrain at Hurly Hawkine.

The presence of human internments on several southern brochs after they have fallen out of use is deeply enigmatic. For instance, historical sources record a stone-lined human burial at Fairy Knowe (Main 1998, 295) and a cist was also unexpectedly recovered from the intersection of deliberately infilled broch and hillfort ditches at Torwoodlee (Piggott 1951, 105). A similar practice is evident further north with cist burials contained within post-broch settlements at Gurness, Orkney (Hedges 1987, 61) and Crosskirk, Caithness (Fairhurst 1984). Meanwhile disarticulated human remains were recovered from the wall filling at Hurly Hawkine (Jervise 1868, 212) as well as the interior of Dun Mor Vaul on Tiree (MacKie 1974), both of which are thought to postdate the brochs’ primary occupational phases. Such burial practices may confirm the cultural significance of these sites over extended timescales and the ideological connections continually reinforced by people with places ascribed with symbolic and ancestral meanings.

Roman objects have been recovered from several lowland brochs (Fig. 5.1), but only Fairy Knowe and Leckie contain anything approaching large Roman ceramic assemblages, both are almost exclusively dated to the first century. That such goods appear then to have become more widely available in the second century when the frontier moved north to the Antonine Wall, potentially allowing locals easier access to material and interaction with the Roman army (Erdrich et al. 2000; Harding 2004, 188), may strengthen Macinnes’ (1984) argument for elite restriction of exotica to the wider population. However, analysis of the artefacts from other southern brochs indicates that these dates may be too restrictive and Edin’s Hall, for instance, may have been constructed in the late pre-Roman Iron Age (Hunter 1999, 342).

The absence of Roman artefacts at Edin’s Hall (Dunwell 1999) may suggest that the occupants were either not motivated to interact with the Romans or did not have direct access to negotiatores to trade with them (Hingley 2004, 337). Alternatively, the absence of Roman material on many southern brochs may hint that some communities elected actively to resist, either overtly or covertly, close interaction with the Romans. Thus:

In such a fluid situation, each southern broch may have had a quite different history, reflecting the local experience of conflict and collaboration with the Roman world (Armit 2003b, 132).
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Court yard at Fairy Knowe (Main 1998), combined with heated glass and burned Samian, provide evidence of burning at the end of the broch’s life. Notably, the excavator makes no assumptions as to whether the internal fire was accidental or an act of deliberate arson. However, she does make the point that the dismantling of the inner wall, foundation course and northwest wall core was a deliberate act of destruction, although no assumptions are made as to why this was done or by whom (Main 1998). This is opposed to Leckie where the excavator considers the broch destruction to be the result of attack by hostile Roman forces because of the presence of a Roman crossbow bolt and two cracked granite boulders thought to have been used as missiles covered in burning oil and fired from Roman ballistas (MacKie 2016, 81). Although he recognizes dismantling of the structure was systematically undertaken after the fire caused little damage (MacKie 2016, 15), he credits Romans with the demolition to render the site indefensible (MacKie 2016, 81). No evidence was recovered to suggest reoccupation of Fairy Knowe after destruction, though occupation continued at Leckie in the form of a stone roundhouse then an ‘unfinished promontory fort’ and confirmed by radiocarbon dating evidence until the end of the second century AD (MacKie 2016, 58).

Of the contexts of deposition at Fairy Knowe, one Samian sherd has been recovered from a thin deposit of blackened soil on the entrance passageway floor, an adjoining sherd of which came from the broch interior (Main 1998, 303). The handle of a Roman blue-green glass bottle was recovered from the paving of an intramural chamber floor, whilst Samian and amphora sherds came from the chamber rubble; additional amphora sherds came from the rubble overlying extra-mural cobbling on the south of the building (Main 1998, 307). Several sherds were associated with an iron furnace and iron slag in the east of the broch exterior. The remaining Roman sherd s and glass fragments came from the burnt interior courtyard and could have fallen as upper floors collapsed during the fire or as a result of deliberate placement prior to the fire (Main 1998, 310) in the manner of other potentially placed objects within the broch (Main 1998, 304; 390). The intentional placement of material prior to firing of a structure can be challenging to identify (Cessford & Near 2006; Twiss et al. 2008), but a detailed contextual analysis, taking account of associated material and place of deposition, can clarify such practices (McAnany & Hodder 2009). Therefore, given that the excavator suggests the possibility, it is entirely possible that objects were intentionally placed at specific places within the broch prior to it being set alight at the end of its life.

Each site must therefore be considered on its own merit and complex and multifaceted processes of adaptive practices and negotiation are evident across the region and between sites. Attention should also be drawn to the potential for inadequate excavation of some sites. For instance, excavations by the local rambler’s club at Torwoodlee (Curle 1892) failed to reach the structure’s true occupational floor which lay some 6–9 inches deeper (Piggott 1951). Given that the same group excavated at Bow Castle (Curle 1892), it is tempting to speculate that this broch too holds more meaningful data yet to be revealed.

Lowland broch depositional trends

Perhaps because of the smaller internal dimensions, some southern brochs have benefited from relatively comprehensive excavation and provide welcome contextual data (Table 5.1). Reports from excavations at Leckie broch, Stirlingshire (MacKie 1979; 1982; 2016) contain limited information on contexts of deposition so more reliance is placed on the published accounts of other brochs for this survey. For instance, the charred and scattered condition of artefacts across the interior courtyard at Fairy Knowe (Main 1998), combined with heated glass and burned Samian, provide evidence of burning at the end of the broch’s life. Notably, the excavator makes no assumptions as to whether the internal fire was accidental or an act of deliberate arson. However, she does make the point that the dismantling of the inner wall, foundation course and northwest wall core was a deliberate act of destruction, although no assumptions are made as to why this was done or by whom (Main 1998). This is opposed to Leckie where the excavator considers the broch destruction to be the result of attack by hostile Roman forces because of the presence of a Roman crossbow bolt and two cracked granite boulders thought to have been used as missiles covered in burning oil and fired from Roman ballistas (MacKie 2016, 81). Although he recognizes dismantling of the structure was systematically undertaken after the fire caused little damage (MacKie 2016, 15), he credits Romans with the demolition to render the site indefensible (MacKie 2016, 81). No evidence was recovered to suggest reoccupation of Fairy Knowe after destruction, though occupation continued at Leckie in the form of a stone roundhouse then an ‘unfinished promontory fort’ and confirmed by radiocarbon dating evidence until the end of the second century AD (MacKie 2016, 58).

Of the contexts of deposition at Fairy Knowe, one Samian sherd has been recovered from a thin deposit of blackened soil on the entrance passageway floor, an adjoining sherd of which came from the broch interior (Main 1998, 303). The handle of a Roman blue-green glass bottle was recovered from the paving of an intramural chamber floor, whilst Samian and amphora sherds came from the chamber rubble; additional amphora sherds came from the rubble overlying extra-mural cobbling on the south of the building (Main 1998, 307). Several sherds were associated with an iron furnace and iron slag in the east of the broch exterior. The remaining Roman sherds and glass fragments came from the burnt interior courtyard and could have fallen as upper floors collapsed during the fire or as a result of deliberate placement prior to the fire (Main 1998, 310) in the manner of other potentially placed objects within the broch (Main 1998, 304; 390). The intentional placement of material prior to firing of a structure can be challenging to identify (Cessford & Near 2006; Twiss et al. 2008), but a detailed contextual analysis, taking account of associated material and place of deposition, can clarify such practices (McAnany & Hodder 2009). Therefore, given that the excavator suggests the possibility, it is entirely possible that objects were intentionally placed at specific places within the broch prior to it being set alight at the end of its life.

Figure 5.1. Lowland brochs with Roman material culture, including a newly discovered broch at Castle Craig, Perth & Kinross. 1) Fairy Knowe; 2) Leckie; 3) Teroy; 4) Torwoodlee; 5) Bow Castle; 6) Hurly Hawk.
Table 5.1. Southern brochs and souterrains – depositional contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brochs</th>
<th>Souterrains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairy Knowe</td>
<td>Leckie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torwoodlee</td>
<td>Hurly Hawkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurly Hawkin</td>
<td>Castle Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcastle</td>
<td>Tealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tealing</td>
<td>Hurly Hawkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of sherds</td>
<td>Site Reused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-mural chamber</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside walls</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quernstones</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal-working</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric-making</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reused Roman material</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate deconstruct/ closure</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial/ cremation/ human remains</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very little in the way of artefactual evidence was recovered from Teroy, Dumfries and Galloway, and the shallow nature of floor deposits led the excavator to conclude that the structure did not have a long occupational sequence, although he does note that the floor surface could have been destroyed by the removal of flagging stones (Curle 1912, 187). It is also possible that the excavator did not reach the true floor of the structure, as earlier work at Torwoodlee (Curle 1892) has been found to have been less than thorough (Piggott 1951). A deposit of dark soil mixed with charcoal, burnt bone and two small oxidized pot sherds was placed in the crevice of a rock adjacent to a flagstone in the west-southwest, that is, on the wall directly opposite the entrance. Close to this deposit, a small lump of iron was recovered as well as the upper stone of a rotary quern, whilst half of a very coarse pottery disc with central perforation, probably a loom weight, was found in the main passage.

Given that the report was written a century ago, it should perhaps raise no surprise that the excavator does not recognize any potential significance attached to the apparently deliberate placement of objects adjacent to the flagstone opposite the broch entrance. The presence of charcoal as well as burnt bone in the darkened soil deposit may signify the remains of a ritual event involving burning. Significantly, the two very small and undiagnostic pottery sherds contained within this deposit are extremely abraded and therefore challenging to identify with absolute confidence; however, they could be Roman, possibly manufactured at Inveresk as the fabric appears to conform to the vessels from there (Swan 1988). More importantly, neither sherd has been subject to burning, suggesting that they were not incorporated into the fire from which the remainder of the deposit derives. These could, therefore, have been added after the burning of wood and bones as a further layer of structured material deposition.

Roman material dating to the Flavian period, including pottery and glass, has been recovered over a layer of ashes at Torwoodlee broch in the Scottish Borders which the earlier excavators (Curle 1892, 75) incorrectly identified as the broch’s occupational floor, although Piggott (1951, 96) does note that the paving appears to have been removed. The actual floor lay 6–9 inches below and contained a scatter of Roman pottery and glass fragments which Piggott (1951, 96) assumed derived from the levels accumulated above. Some pits in the broch interior contained Roman pottery sherds and Roman glass was recovered from a post hole. Three sections through the broch wall also contained Roman material, including a BB2 pot sherd from within the large upper stones and earth, a fragment of Roman glass from the wall base and a Drag 18 or Drag 15/17 Samian platter sherd from above a section of the hillfort rampart which had been incorporated into the broch wall.

Additional Roman grey coarse ware sherds were recovered from a pit under the entrance of the stairwell chamber, whilst carrot-shaped amphora and Samian sherds were recovered from a pit in the southwest of
the broch interior (Piggott 1951, 102). The central pit appears to have been deliberately filled then overlain with flat slabs. It contained two rubbers or whetstones, a sherd of a Samian platter, two amber glass fragments and charcoal of alder and willow (Piggott 1951, 102). Several sherds of Samian platter, grey ware and carrot-shaped amphora were also recovered from the broch floor, whilst Dressel 20 amphora and whitish mortaria sherds (unseen in the NMS collection) were found in the entrance passageway floor. It seems not unreasonable, therefore, to interpret the sherds recovered above an ash layer during the early excavations as deliberately placed after a burning episode at the closure of the structure. Like at Leckie (MacKie 1979; 1982), Piggott (1951, 96–114) posits that Torwoodlee was also deliberately deconstructed, possibly as a result of Roman military attack, as evidenced by the very minimal amount of silt accumulation within the surrounding ditch prior to its filling with tumbled building-stones.

Hurly Hawkin lies much further to the northeast of Scotland in Angus and is the only southern broch associated with a later souterrain. A fragment of second-century AD glass bracelet made from reused Roman glass was recovered from the wall chamber floor, whilst a glass bead similar to types found in the possible third- to fourth-century AD layer at Traprain Law and made from reused Roman glass was recovered from the broch filling and a much corroded sestertius of Geta dated to AD 210 has also been found nearby. Roman pottery sherds were also recovered from the broch wall filling and thought to post-date the broch (Taylor 1982), potentially signifying ritual activity associated with a ‘rite of termination’ (Merrifield 1987) at the end of the structure’s lifecycle. A similar practice of the deliberate placement of objects and the by-products of metalworking in closure contexts is also evident at some souterrains (Campbell 2011, 198–205), potentially constituting votive offerings (Turner, forthcoming, 7). Roman objects have also been recovered from recent excavations at a new discovered lowland broch at Castle Craig, Perth and Kinross (Fig. 5.1), and it remains to be seen whether post-excavation analysis by Archaeology at the University of Glasgow will reveal any interesting depositional practices at this site.

Wider settlement depositional trends

Some intriguing depositional trends have also arisen for enclosed settlements, such as late first- to second-century Roman flagon and bowl sherds recovered associated with seven Iron Age pottery sherds from the northernmost house enclosure bank at Boonies, Dumfries and Galloway (Jobey 1974, 135–7). Two very abraded and possibly reused second-century Samian sherds came from the upper fill of the enclosure ditch at Drum Farm, West Lothian (Rees 1998, 423); one undated Samian sherd came from the upper fill of the enclosure ditch and one from a central post hole of a ring-groove house at the settlement enclosure at St Germins, East Lothian (Alexander and Watkins 1998, 233–4); two undated Samian sherds were recovered from the ringwork bank at Queen’s Park, Glasgow (Fairhurst and Scott 1951); and one coarseware sherd came from the post hole of a roundhouse at the pali-saded enclosure at Bannockburn, Lower Greenyards, Stirling (Rideout 1996, 208, 257). A first-century Samian platter sherd (Dunbar 2003) came from the upper fill of the v-sectioned rectilinear enclosure ditch at Longnewton Mill in the Scottish Borders, suggesting deposition long after the site ceased to be occupied. The short-lived rectilinear enclosure at Culltburn immediately east of the Roman road at Perth and Kinross is almost barren of small finds. However, Woolliscroft and Hoffmann (2001, 163) consider a single first-century Samian sherd from a Drag 37 decorated bowl a stray loss during construction of buildings in a later period, but the presence of two possible BB1 sherds in the fill of another foundation trench may confirm deliberate deposition. A first-century grey ware sherd, also from Perth and Kinross, came from the upper fills of the enclosure ditch at Mains of Fullarton (Strong 1985, 218).

Taken together, the evidence suggests the deliberate deposition of Roman material culture at key phases in the life cycle of structures and enclosures, particularly at their birth and death. The incorporation of Roman objects into funerary and other contexts with potentially ritual connotations, including hoards and places associated with water (Campbell 2016), is similarly enigmatic and suggests deliberate votive deposition of objects perceived as culturally significant.

Discussion

Given the deliberate placement of querns and other specific objects such as cup-marked stones built into walls close to entranceways at some souterrains and hillforts, such as Broxmouth (Hill 1982) in East Lothian (Fig. 5.2), it should perhaps raise no surprise that other objects could have been subject to similarly deliberate placement. While it is admittedly risky to generalize on the topic of depositional practices based upon a select number of sites, the lack of recorded data for many of the finds from earlier excavations precludes their detailed interrogation. That such data is predominantly available from hillforts, brochs and souterrains is unsurprising given that archaeological attention
has traditionally been fixed firmly upon such sites. Where depositional information is recorded, some intriguing practices have emerged and it is tempting to ponder whether unusual contextual circumstances have encouraged such recording, particularly in earlier excavation reports. However, a detailed contextual survey confirms that deliberate deposition is not restricted to these supposed ‘elite’ structures and extends to several enclosed settlement ditches, pits and post holes. Certainly, placement of Roman ceramics within rampart cores is evident in hillforts such as Eildon Hill North (Owen 1992) and Clatchard Craig (Close-Brooks 1986) as well as enclosure banks of settlements such as Boonies, Drum Farm and St Germaines.

Meanwhile, more comprehensive and systematically recorded modern excavation of lowland brochs such as Fairy Knowe, Hurly Hawkin and Torwoodlee confirm clear deliberate placement of Roman ceramic sherds, glass fragments and other material during the construction and closure of the structures, a pattern also observable at Broxmouth and other hillforts as well as souterrains. Such practices are also apparent in Orcadian brochs, where single Samian sherds have been recovered from destruction deposits such as the main entrance rubble layer at Howe of Howe (Ballin Smith 1994, 250), the wall debris at Knowe of Taft (Watt 1882, 450) and two Samian sherds from the gallery entrance at Rousay Midhowe (Callander & Grant 1934; Hedges 1987c, 116).

Reliance must therefore be placed upon stratigraphic relationships of material including horizontal stratigraphy and contextual data to provide interpretive insights into the placement of foreign objects. A good number of the lowland brochs appear to confirm that Roman pottery and non-ceramic material were being deliberately placed, particularly within construction and destruction contexts of these monuments. This confirms that rites of passage (van Gennep 1960 [1909]) can be appropriately applicable to the life cycles of structures as well as people, and that rites of termination (Merrifield 1987) at the closure of sites involved the manipulation and incorporation of foreign objects into their ultimate closure deposits, probably in a locally specific, relevant and acceptable manner (Kopytoff 1986; Thomas 1991; 1992; Thomas 2002).

Single or very small numbers of Roman ceramic sherds deriving from entirely different vessels predominate on northern sites and most fall within the range of 3–5 cm, suggesting secondary deposition (Campbell 2007; Campbell 2012b) of vessel parts or more likely long-term curation of objects prior to deliberate deposition. These patterns are intriguing and could support the proposal that some pots, particularly Samian vessels, were ascribed ideological significance before being subject to breakage then proportioned out to individuals, possibly as part of ritual events (Campbell 2016). However, such cultural significance is unlikely to have been immediately ascribed to foreign objects and it is entirely possible that these objects, or parts thereof, were subject to curation over extended timescales and incorporated into oral histories and story-telling traditions and thereafter inextricably linked to the memories of people and special places.
Memories, monumentality and materiality in Iron Age Scotland

Conclusion

This study confirms that only a detailed and holistic assessment of evidence from sites spatially and chronologically separated, combined with micro and macro comparisons between sites and across regions, can elucidate meanings ascribed to material, places and practices. Wider research suggests that local strategies for appropriating Roman objects could be seen as objectification, a non-verbal means by which people embodied and manipulated material and places in a social landscape to create, idealize, negotiate, transform and reinforce social concepts (Hoskins 1998, 2; 2006; Tilley 2006). These objectified objects and places may have come to be regarded as socially meaningful (Shankar 2006, 298) for their recipient communities and were objectified through their consumption and transformation (Miller 2006) during the latter part of their life cycles in a culturally relevant and contextually specific manner, perhaps also associated with ritual practices.

This social redefinition of incoming Roman objects which have been ascribed with new meanings may have enabled the incorporation of foreign material culture into traditional practices. Thereafter, the manipulation of this material within monumental structures located in traditionally important places which evidence multiple occupational sequences is deeply enigmatic. Such practices speak to the interconnectedness of material and monuments in the construction of social memories, perhaps as a means of negotiating changing cultural identities or to tame foreign objects (Thomas 1991; 1992) so that they can be appropriated into existing social conditions to reinforce traditional social concepts.
Gardening time

Gardening may seem worlds away from Nuraghi and brochs, but tending a garden is a long process involving patience, accretion and memory. Scholars argue that memories are also cultured, developed and regained. The monuments in Scotland and Sardinia are testament to the importance of memory and its role in maintaining social relations.

This collection of twenty-one papers addresses the theme of memory anchored to the enduring presence of monuments, mainly from Scotland and Sardinia, but also from Central Europe and the Balkans.
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