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 active embodied Iron Age landscapes. 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 dividualism 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 interpretative framework for the identification of deliberate construction, closure and reconstruction of
buildings over previous structures as a means of creat-
ing 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 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 manipulate the 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 a study of Pirahmet et al. 1988, land can be shared, but it can never really be lost. Therefore, northern socie-
ties 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 installa-
tions directly overlying existing settlements, such as the camps constructed on top of settlements at Car-
tonbridge and Dun in Montrose or the Antonine Wall cutting through the hillfort at Castlehill, must surely have caused a certain amount of resentment and dis-
ruption 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 monumental, cutting a landscape perceived as culturally and symbolically 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 tradi-
tions over time could transform culturally significant places to embody cultural tradition, identity or ideology (Garcia Sanjuan et al. 2007, 1). Bradley (1990; 1998a, 66) highlights how ‘ancient 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. The reinvention of significant places and landscapes, resonated throughout the Bronze and Iron Ages of European societies. Oral tradition imbibed connections to place and identity, their significance and their physical properties, including monumentality, location, visibility, material and symbolic associations, to enable people to understand and manipulate the past, what it would have altered over time and successive genera-
tions may have transformed these sites to embody changing social conditions. People engage with social spaces to understand and acquiesce to the past (Hutton 1993) through selectively remembering and forgetting (van Dyke & Alocok 2003b) different versions of that past to negotiate their needs and validate their actions in the present (Sanjuan 2007, 24).

Religion and ideology are likely to have been intrinsically 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, 24). In this way, reuse of traditional sites by enabling provincial peoples to legitimize the present by manipulating the past in the same way that a resur-
gence 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, a swatch, the cultural component to which we may add glassmaking. That such evidence predominates on sites with lengthy occupational sequences might further corroborate the proposal that certain activi-
ties were being performed in ‘special places’ within a landscape perceived as culturally and symbolically significant (Halfwach 1992; Hingley 1996; Garcia Sanjuan 1999; Campbell et al. 2013). Northern landscapes 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 local appropriation of 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 exist-
ing population. These embodied landscapes would most likely have been imbued with oral histories and experience through a swatch, including deposition into places inscribed with ritual significance.

Changing perceptions, interpretations and use of cultural landscapes before, during and after Roman occupation of territories (Potts 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 2011, 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 pas-
tage (Brück 1999) and changes in context (Barrett 1994; Gardner 2004) whilst ensuring that we do not unconsciously impose motiva-
tional models or theoretical frameworks onto the past, and if, their appropriateness can be demonstrated.

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 cen-
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sites, whilst palaeobotanical evidence confirms cereal production. For instance, historical sources report that the latter two, suggesting a mixed farming economy.

Contention surrounds the appearance of brochs in southern Scotland. For instance, MacKie (1988) has argued that brochs are 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 growing evidence that 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 idiosyncrasies (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 Hawk conﬁrms that the occupants of these brochs, in common with several Iron Age fort sites, 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 be evidence of changes in traditional storage practices. Internal divisioners follow the tradition of timber roundhouse predecessors (Piggott 1951; Mackie 1979, 1982; Main 1998), although brochs contain an added vertical dimension which may 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 exotic to the community. However, analysis of amphorae sherds 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 have reflected 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 conflict with the Roman world (Armit 2003b, 132).

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 burnt glass and some sites including Leckie and the destruction 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 note that the destruction 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, 312). The opposing view, that 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 ballistae (MacKie 2016, 81). No evidence was found 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 southern sherd has been recovered from a third 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; wider polychrome motifs were also found on the overlying muraide mullings of the small 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 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 conflict with the Roman world (Armit 2003b, 132).

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.

| Date of sherds | Brach | Southern
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairy Knows</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leckie</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torwoodlee</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurlay Hawkins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Craig</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcastle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurlay Hawkins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1.

Very little in the way of artefactual evidence was recovered from Teryo, Dumfries and Galloway, and the shallow nature of floor deposits led the excavator to conclude that the structure did not have a long occupation 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 building-stone, 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 sherds has been subjected to burning, suggesting that they were not incorporated into the fire from an upper floor 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 potteries and Roman 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 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 southwestern of the broch interior (Piggott 1951, 102). The central pit apparently to have been deliberately filled then overlain with flat slabs. It contained two rubbers or whehestones, a sherd of a Samian platter, two amber glass fragments and charcoal of alder and willow (Piggott 1951, 102). Several sherd of Samian platter, grey ware and carrot-shaped amphora were also recovered from the broch floor, whilst Dressed 20 amphora and whitish mortaria sherds (unseen in the NMS collection) were found in the entrance passage and 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 tumbling building-stones.

Hurlay Hawkins 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 A.D. 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 1998). Such processes and the subsequent deposition of objects perceived as culturally significant 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). 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 central house enclosure bank at Boosom Hill, 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 Watts 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 paled 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 rectangular 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 Culbourn immediately east of the Roman road at Perth and Kinross is almost barren of small finds. However, Woots 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 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, which 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 within hillforts, such as Broxmouth (Hill 1982) in East Lothian and walls close to entranceways at some souterrains and hillforts, such as Brossom Hill (Hill 1982) in East Lothian (Fig. 5.2), it should perhaps raise no surprise that other objects could have been subjected 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 Germins.

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 Boonies, Drum Farm and St Germins.

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.

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 even to tame foreign objects (Thomas 1991; 1992) so that they can be appropriated into existing social conditions to reinforce traditional social concepts.