

# Place as Material Culture



Place as Material Culture:  
Objects, Geographies and the Construction  
of Time

Edited by

Dragoş Gheorghiu and George Nash

**CAMBRIDGE  
SCHOLARS**

---

P U B L I S H I N G

Place as Material Culture:  
Objects, Geographies and the Construction of Time,  
Edited by Dragoş Gheorghiu and George Nash

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2013 by Dragoş Gheorghiu and George Nash and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4261-3, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4261-7

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	viii
List of Tables.....	xv
Acknowledgements .....	xvi
Introduction .....	1
Place, Materiality, Time and Ritual: Towards a Relational Archaeology Dragoş Gheorghiu and George Nash	
Chapter One.....	13
Prehistoric Place: Studies in Material Culture, Time and Space Ezra B. W. Zubrow	
Chapter Two .....	34
A Place in Time: Temporal Dimensions of the Human Experience in a Material World Roberta Robin Dods	
Chapter Three .....	55
Space and Time as Cultural Artefacts: Blackpool as <i>Heterotopy</i> and <i>Heterochrony</i> Paul Bouissac	
Chapter Four.....	65
Hunter-Gatherer Territories in the European Upper Palaeolithic François Djindjian	
Chapter Five .....	86
Experience and Perception of Memorable Places: Lithic Scatters and Mapping the British Neolithic Clive Jonathon Bond	

Chapter Six .....	123
The Importance of Acoustics and Illumination when Creating a Chronotope: Reflections about Two Middle Neolithic Palisades from Southern Sweden Raimond Thörn	
Chapter Seven .....	134
Concepts of Space, Place and Time in The late Neolithic Carpathian Basin: The Geometry of Rondels of the <i>Lengyel</i> Complex Emília Pásztor and Judit P. Barna	
Chapter Eight .....	163
Space and Place as Artefact: On the Life and Death of Tell Settlements of the South Eastern Europe Chalcolithic Dragoş Gheorghiu	
Chapter Nine .....	183
The Mountains during The Bronze Age in Southern and Central Italy: Spaces Becoming Places Cristiana Ruggini and Valentina Copat	
Chapter Ten .....	213
Art for those Visiting the Underworld: An Appraisal of the Later Prehistoric Menhir of Robin Hood's Stone, Allerton, Liverpool George Nash	
Chapter Eleven .....	231
Materiality of Place, Performative Time and Mortuary Space as Locality in the Early Iron Age of Southwest Germany James A. Johnson and Seth A. Schneider	
Chapter Twelve .....	258
The Power and the Glory: Hillforts, Ironworking and the Monumental Landscape in the Early Iron Age of Central and South Eastern Slovenia Philip Mason	
Chapter Thirteen .....	277
How Natural Are Natural Places? Challenging Stereotypes in the Interpretation of Landscape in Iron Age Veneto, Italy Sarah de Nardi	

Chapter Fourteen .....	299
Relationship between People, Space and Places during the Iron Age: Exploitation of Coastal Space and Resources through the Island Settlements in Western France Anna Baudry and Marie-Yvane Daire	
Contributors.....	319
Index .....	321

# LIST OF FIGURES

- Cover image: The reconstruction of a prehistoric house in Vădastra village by Dragoș Gheorghiu (Grant PN II IDEI, Maps of Time).
- 0-1 Artificiality of materials to create a landscape focus. (Photo G. Nash)
  - 0-2 *Omphalos* in the courtyard of Malia Palace, Crete. (Photo D. Gheorghiu)
  - 1-1 Locating a prehistoric pick near the Yli-ii, Finland (Pick, Reindeer, GPS, Field Survey).
  - 1-2 A fallen English oak and the Norman church at Hales, England.
  - 1-3 All the artefacts (47353) from Verberie in their spatial and temporal locations.
  - 1-4 Time series plot of all the artefacts from Verberie.
  - 1-5 Time series plot of six floors from Verberie.
  - 1-6 Verberie cultural level (floor) II.6.
  - 1-7 Verberie cultural level (floor) II.4 and II.5.
  - 1-8 Verberie cultural level (floor) II.4.
  - 1-9 Verberie cultural level (floor) II.3.
  - 1-10 Verberie cultural level (floor) II.2.2.
  - 1-11 Verberie cultural level (floor) II.2.1.
  - 1-12 Verberie cultural level (floor) II.1.
  - 1-13 Seventy sites from Yli-II in northern Finland located by temporal and spatial coordinates.
  - 1-14 Dendrogram showing the clustering of sites by time and space (like sites near like sites to form cluster).
  - 1-15 The spatial organization of Yli-II Clusters of Sites.
  - 1-16 The temporal organization of Yli-II Clusters of Sites.
  - 2-1 Reproduction of Hall's Map of Time (Hall 1983: 16).
  - 2-2 Thirteen Towers of Chankillo, Peru (4<sup>th</sup> century BCE). Running north-south, the thirteen toothed ridges (towers) align summer and winter solstices as well as equinox with a solar observatory at a distance below on the plain (Ghezzi and Ruggles 2007). (Image source: <http://img460.imageshack.us/img460/3708/observatoriosolarne9.jpg>).
  - 2-3 Tshi-Zun-Hau-Kau (He-Who-runs-with-Deer), Winnebago, ca. 1832-1833. The lunar-solar calendar stick discussed by Marshack is in the right hand. Portrait by Henry Inman (1801-1846). (source: <http://www.flickr.com/photos/maulleigh/3183673878/>).
  - 2-4 The engraved marks on the Blanchard bone. Courtesy Harvard University, Peabody Museum.
  - 2-5 Marshack's schematic of the engraved marks on the Blanchard bone. Courtesy Harvard University, Peabody Museum.
  - 2-6 Marshack's drawing of the serpentine form created by the markings on the Blanchard bone.

- 2-7 Marshack's schematic of the Blanchard bone marks laid out flat next to his own lunar schema for comparison. (source: [www.cabinetmagazine.org/issues/28/rosenberg.php](http://www.cabinetmagazine.org/issues/28/rosenberg.php))
- 2-8 "The Hand of Time" (Dods 2007). Found in 2005 on the bank of the Similkameen River in British Columbia. Personal time message composed of an alignment of stones in the form of an open hand and an indicator stone indicating cultural content by the designation of a specific number with this number determined by the cultural convention of how fingers and a thumb are counted. Here the Personal, Physical and Profane Times intersect in our interpretation.
- 2-9 Glaze V Pecos New Mexico (Dods 2007). A pot of charm and intricacy that gains its stunning place in an analysis on time from its demonstration of transformation by its movement in the hand of the holder or the act of walking towards it when it is placed with the rim at eye-level from a distance causes the interior to come slowly into view. Arising first is the image of feathers from the head of the rim bird. This transforms into a wing shape and ultimately manifests a man in a headdress standing on the back of the bird. Is this mythic time and/or metaphysical time?
- 4-1 The Mas d'Azil cave entrance and the River Arize (photograph: F. Djindjian)
- 4-2 The Arcy-sur-Cure cliffs and the Palaeolithic caves along the Cure River (after Baffier and Girard 1998: Fig. 4b)
- 4-3 A plan of the Grimaldi Caves (Graziosi 1976: Fig. 6).
- 4-4 The La Salpêtrière cave (Gard, France) on the right bank of a Gardon ford (photographs: F. Djindjian)
- 4-5 The bank of the river Udaï near the Gontsy site (Poltava region, Ukraine) (Photograph: F. Djindjian)
- 4-6 The La Madeleine rock-shelter near Les Eyzies (Périgord, France) (Photograph: F. Djindjian)
- 4-7 The Middle Palaeolithic & Upper Palaeolithic bivouac of the Boccard cave and the Baume-les-Creancey cliffs (Burgundy, France) (Drawing by courtesy of the Archaeological Museum of Dijon, France)
- 5-1 *Location* – A: the British Isles and the location of the two case studies; B: South-West and central Somerset, the Brue Valley and Shapwick Burtle, Shapwick; C: East Anglia, eastern Britain and the Norfolk fen-edge and Wissey embayment, Catsholme Farm, Methwold Hythe, Methwold. Note the diagonal etched box in B and C are insets of study area, as shown in Fig. 5-2.
- 5-2 *Case studies and landscape context: Top: the field survey and shovel test pit survey at Catsholme Farm, Methwold Hythe, Methwold, Norfolk.* Known lithic scatters recovered by the Fenland Project are shown, small triangles, numbered; ranged circles are lithics, recorded either within the north-west corner of the field (grid survey), or extend north and west (shovel test pit survey). The grid walked plots were set within two 50m x 50m squares, divided into 5m x 5m squares, collected timed at 20 minutes per square. The shovel test pit survey extended this sample frame west and north down

- slope into the fen-edge and peat. Grid walked data is plotted in intervals of 5 artefact, from 0 (x), 5 to 23-47 artefacts. The shovel test pit survey is plotted in intervals of 2-5 artefacts, from 0 (x), 1-2 to 12 artefacts. The peat and chalk upland of the promontory are clearly labelled. *Bottom: the survey and shovel test pit survey at Shapwick Burtle, Shapwick, Somerset:* lithic scatters recorded as Historic Environment Records are plotted, as open circles (HER 30434; 30270; 30274; 30430; 30267, at distance from the Burtle HER 30293 and 30282). These represent historic collections and more recent collections, e.g. Mr. Hayes' assemblages. Squares indicate the location of shovel test pits across, surveyed as part of the Shapwick Project (Bond 2007; Thorpe and Gerrard 2007). The 6m O.D. rise of the sand slopes of Shapwick Burtle are clearly illustrated. Ordnance Survey data, Licence Number: LA07683X.
- 5-3 *Landscape and artefacts: 1. Shovel test pit survey, spring 2003.* Shovel-testing is taking place in the 50m x 50m square just off the slope into the peat on the northern slopes of the Catsholme Ridge. The slope is discernable to the left, with a tractor's trailer parked in the pasture. The ploughed peat of the Black Fens is shown to the right background. *2: Lithics recovered by field survey at Catsholme Farm, spring 2003.* Flint cores, core fragments, irregular waste and flakes are all mostly later Mesolithic and earlier Neolithic in date. Scale, the flint core length is just over 8cm. *3: The Shapwick Burtle, the northern slope, rising above the peat, spring 2010.* The Burtle slope rise 3-6m above the O.D. Left of the trees is the location of the Post Track/Sweet Track terminal, trench B; lithic scatter HER 30274 is just off the picture. Scatter HER 30434 extends over the crest of the Burtle slope, the open ground central in the picture. *4: Lithics recovered by freestyle survey of mole hills from Shapwick Burtle.* Flint and chert cores, core fragments, flaked and blades, all mostly dating to the early Mesolithic. Scale, the flint core length at the top right is just over 8cm.
- 6-1 The palisade at Annetorpsleden according to the documentations from 1988-9, 1999, and 2001-2.
- 6-2 The palisade at Skjutbanorna according to the documentation from 1995, 2005 and 2006.
- 7-1 Distribution of Lengyel sites in the Carpathian Basin. After Pásztor *et al* 2008: Figure 1, complemented.
- 7-2 Locations of the rondels at Sormás – Török – földék site. After P. Barna-Pásztor 2007. Fig. 1.
- 7-3 The longest and shortest diameters of investigated rondels.
- 7-4 Proportions of diameters of investigated rondels. The grey shade represents more-than-two-ditch monuments.
- 7-5 Distribution of the orientations of the eastern causeways after Pásztor *et al*. 2008.
- 7-6 'Rondel' symbolism on Lengyel pots: 1: Sormás-Török-földék, 29. obj. (enclosure I., outer ditch), unpublished. 2: Zengővárkony, after Kalicz 1998. Fig.

51. 3: Kamegg, after Stadler, P. and Ruttkay, E. 2007. Tab. 2, 3. 4: Friebritz, after Pavúk 2007, Fig. 5,5. 5: After Daim and Neubauer 2005. Fig. 4.29.
- 8-1 Map of Danube's tributaries.
- 8-2 The Gumelnița eponymous site seen from the Danube.
- 8-3 The Balkans and the Danube river seen from Gumelnița tell settlement.
- 8-4 The author's reconstruction of a Chalcolithic settlement at Vădastra, 2003.
- 8-5 A wattle and daub wall, Vădastra 2011.
- 8-6 The collapsed walls of burned wattle and daub house. Author's experiment, Vădastra 2006.
- 8-7 The ditch and a partially collapsed palisade surrounding a settlement. Author's experiments Vădastra 2003-2011.
- 8-8 The emergent complexity of the built surface in a tell settlement. (after Todorova 1982)
- 8-9 Weaving on a horizontal loom. (Performant A. Rusu, Vădastra 2011)
- 8-10 The outside and the inside of a Chalcolithic house. Author's experiment, Vădastra 2012, Maps of Time, grant PN II IDEI
- 8-11 Double wattle and daub palisade. Author's experiment, Vădastra 2003.
- 8-12 The metaphorical representation of a tell settlement under the shape of a vase lid. (Gumelnița tradition. History Museum of Giurgiu)
- 8-13 Another metaphorical representation of a tell settlement (Căscioarele tell) surrounded by a high palisade and seen from afar. This object can function as a brasier, the holes for smoke evacuation evoking the number of hearths in a settlement. (National History Museum, Bucharest).
- 8-14 The reconstruction of a tell settlement. Author's experiments, Vădastra 2003-2012.
- 9-1 Geographic map of the considered area with the indication of the main river valleys and pasture areas.
- 9-2 Geographic map of the considered area with the indication of Apennine sites considered (site number corresponds to Table 9-1).
- 9-3 Geographic map of the considered area with the indication of the main passes, historical routes and pastures.
- 9-4 Geometric basic elements of Apennine decoration, with the indication of site in which they are attested (the number coincides with Table 9-1 and Fig. 9-2).
- 9-5 Curvilinear basic elements of Apennine decoration, with the indication of site in which they are attested (the number coincides with Table 9-1 and Fig. 9-2).
- 9-6 Linear basic elements of Apennine decoration, with the indication of site in which they are attested (the number coincides with Table 9-1 and Fig. 9-2).
- 9-7 Visualisation on the map of stylistic similarity concerning technical features and relative tree diagram.
- 9-8 Visualisation on the map of stylistic similarity concerning elements used and relative tree diagram.
- 10-1 The present location of the Robin Hood's Stone, enclosed within iron railings.

- 10-2 The southern face of Robin Hood's Stone prior to its relocation in 1928 (Photo: Stuart-Brown 1911)
- 10-3 Ordnance Survey map section of 1893 showing the original location of the Robin Hood's Stone and its present location.
- 10-4 Rock-art including cupmarks and cup-in-rings occupying the lower section of the Robin Hood's Stone, discovered following an excavation of the site (Photo: Stuart-Brown 1911)
- 10-5 Map showing the location of the Robin Hood's Stone, the Calderstones Monument and their surround topography.
- 11-1 Map showing the location of the early Iron Age Heuneburg region in the state of Baden-Württemberg in southwest Germany (after Arnold 1991 and Schneider 2003: Figures 1 and 2).
- 11-2 Map showing the layout of burial mounds in the Langenlonsheim mound group in the state of Rheinland-Pflaz, Germany. Note the solitary burial mound in the center surrounded by groups of mounds forming an elliptical pattern (after Rieckhoff and Biel 2001: 413).
- 11-3 Map showing the location of the early Iron Age Heuneburg hillfort, the Speckhau Mound Group, the Gießübel-Talhau mound group, the Roßhau mound group, and other burial mounds in the vicinity (after Arnold 1991 and Reim 2002).
- 11-4 Map showing the Speckhau mound group in the Heuneburg region and the possible relationship between early Iron Age burial mounds and settlements in the area (after Kurz 2002: Fig. 40 and Reim 2002).
- 11-5 Schematic profile of the Hohmichele showing the location of burials and non-burial features on pre-existing mound surfaces towards the center of the mound (after Kurz and Schiek 2002).
- 11-6 Plan of Tumulus 17 showing the location of the central chamber, secondary burials and selected features (after Arnold *et al.* 2003 and Schneider 2007).
- 11-7 Idealized mound profile of Tumulus 17 showing the path of sherd refits between Feature 45 within the central chamber and Stratum 5/Feature 10, as well as from Stratum 5/Feature 10 and Feature 8. Note the location of Grave 3 near the boundary of the mound mantle and Stratum 4, the gray clay layer (after Schneider 2007: Fig.8).
- 11-8 Plan of Features 45 and 46 underneath looter's shaft in the central chamber (Arnold *et al.* 2000c and Schneider 2003: Figure 27) (Illustration: M. L. Murray).
- 11-9 Partial profile (south profile) and plan drawing of the northeast quadrant in Tumulus 17 showing stratigraphy and mound construction (after Arnold 2002: Figure 8.5 and Arnold *et al.* 2000b: Figures 2.1 and 2.2) (Illustration: A. Chojnacki).
- 12-1 Distribution of Late Bronze Age upland settlements and Early Iron Age hillforts in Central Slovenia (After Dular 1993: 103, fig. 1, with additions from Dular *et al.* 1995: 90, fig. 1; Dular *et al.* 2000: 120, fig. 1; Dular *et al.* 2003: 160, fig. 1; drawing by Ildikó Pintér).

- 12-2 The Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age centre at Novo mesto (Source: Agencija za okolje RS; adapted from Križ 1997a: 21; drawing by Ildikó Pintér).
- 12-3 The Early Iron Age centre at Vinji vrh (Source: Agencija za okolje RS; adapted from Dular, A. 1991: fig. 3; with addition of recent data; drawing by Ildikó Pintér).
- 12-4 The Early Iron Age centre at Cvinger near Dolenjske Toplice (After Križ 1992: 88).
- 12-5 The Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age centre at Kučar near Podzemelj (Source: Agencija za okolje RS; adapted from Dular, J., Ciglencečki, and Dular, A. 1995: 8, fig. 2; with the addition of recent data; drawing by Ildikó Pintér).
- 12-6 Figural frieze on the situla from Nad Lazom, Vače (After Turk 2005: fig. 52 and Stare 1955: Appendix 1).
- 12-7 Plan of Early Iron Age Barrow on a Late Bronze Age burial platform at Dolge njive (Archive ZVKDS, CPA; drawing by Ildikó Pintér).
- 12-8 The Iron Age paved road at Požarnica. View from the southwest towards the Iron Age hillfort of Veliki Vinji vrh (Photo Mateja Ravnik, by permission of Gojko Tica).
- 12-9 View of the Mačkovec area from the north towards the river Krka (Photo Marko Pršina, Archive ZVKDS, CPA).
- 13-1 The Veneto region in Northeast Italy with the main votive deposits mentioned in this chapter (adapted from Google Earth).
- 13-2 Colle del Principe, Este, in the Po plain (Photograph image: author).
- 13-3 Bronze sheet lamina from Colle del Principe depicting a procession. Photograph by Giorgio Arnosti.
- 13-4 Going up in the world: the steep path leading to the top of Colle del Principe. (Photographic images: author)
- 13-5 Monte Altare in the Northeast piedmont of the Veneto (Photographic images: author)
- 13-6 Bronze sheet laminae depicting stylised peaks from Monte Altare (6<sup>th</sup> - 4<sup>th</sup> centuries BC). Photograph by Giorgio Arnosti.
- 13-7 The 'staircase' or corridor or upright stones leading to the top of Monte Altare (Photographic images: author)
- 13-8 The top of Monte Altare (Photographic images: author)
- 13-9 The waterscape of Lagole. (Photographic image: author)
- 13-10 The mouth of cave Bocca Lorenza, Northwest piedmont. (Photographic images: author)
- 14-1 Carte de situation et principales îles mentionnées dans le texte (DAO M.Y. Daire et L. Quesnel).
- 14-2 Vue du site de Port-Blanc sur l'île d'Hoedic (Morbihan, France), en cours de fouille (cliché M. Y. Daire).
- 14-3 Amas coquillier de Triélen, Archipel de Molène (Finistère, France) (cliché M. Y. Daire).

- 14-4 Squelette de mouton (*Ovis aries*) en connexion anatomique en cours de fouille, Port-Blanc sur l'île d'Hoedic (Morbihan, France) (cliché A. Baudry).
- 14-5 Traces de découpe sur une phalange proximale de *Halichoerus grypus* (phoque gris) (cliché A. Baudry).
- 14-6 Pourcentage de restes des 5 principales espèces domestiques dans les assemblages de l'île de Hoedic (Morbihan), de l'île aux Moutons (Finistère), de Basly (Calvados) et de Touffréville (Calvados) (DAO A. Baudry).
- 14-7 Schéma théorique du nombre d'espèces présentes sur une île (DAO B. Larmignat d'après MacArthur R. H. and Wilson E. O. 1967).

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1. Chronology.

Table 5-1. A summary of the type of artefacts, their attributes, as assigned to broad groupings - data quality and period filters.

Table 5-2. The quantification of five field walked assemblages and shovel test pit survey-derived lithics from Shapwick Burtle, Somerset.

Table 5-3. The quantification of grid-walked and shovel test pit survey lithics from Catsholme Farm, Methwold Hythe, Methwold, Norfolk, 2003.

Table 5-4. Human generations and lithic discard at Catsholme Farm, Methwold Hythe, Methwold, Norfolk and Shapwick Burtle, Shapwick, Somerset.

Table 7-1. Investigated four causewayed enclosures.

Table 7-2. Investigated three causewayed enclosures

Table 7-3. Investigated two causewayed enclosures

Table 7-4. Investigated multicausewayed enclosures

Table 7-5. Investigated incomplete enclosures

Table 9-1. List of considered sites with the indication of the number of potsherds available and relative references.

Table 9-2. Results of similarity index on the technical features.

Table 9-3. Results of similarity index on the elements used.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors thank the following people for their help during the editing process: Cornelia Cătuna, Bogdan Căpruciu, Abby George, and Amanda Millar.

## INTRODUCTION

# PLACE, MATERIALITY, TIME AND RITUAL: TOWARDS A RELATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGY

DRAGOȘ GHEORGHIU AND GEORGE NASH

*“Place is perceived as in some sense ‘bounded’,  
particularly in relation to the seemingly endless  
extension of space.”*

—Dean and Millar 2005

This book intends to explore the knowledge of the complexity of the *past*, by analysing the relationships between place, territory, material value of objects and landscape, time and ritual; concepts that occur within archaeological investigation. It presents the archaeology of place as a series of interconnecting and interactive relationships. It is clear that things and places do not emerge without some form of agency, usually through the concept of material manipulation, coupled with elaboration, innovation and time. Depending on the raw material used and the process of manipulation and its relationship with the environment, materiality gains value. At this juncture, we refer the reader to the collection, fabrication and exchange of shell valuables within the *kula* exchange system. This classic and extensively researched anthropological system clearly shows how a mundane item such as a cowrie shell can gain intrinsic and ritual value over time and space (Munn 1973). Here, all the ingredients of agency – place, materiality, time, and ritual – are employed to construct and secure a successful event. Arguably, this can be regarded as an ideal example of how the ingredients of agency work. But what of the mundane? How do we as modern humans work within the complexity of place, materiality, time, and ritual? True, collectively, Western society has become a cynical creature and, in many ways, the ritual element has all but disappeared, especially the ritual associated with religion. Arguably though, we appear to believe in something, albeit in an intrinsic and novel way. We are certainly materialistic, albeit towards monetary and property

value. These elements, although cohesive, are merely separate strands of a set of experiences that involve more robust components, such as time and place. This rather judgmental and generalised statement is partially based on the transient way we live our lives, the concept of *place* (or places) being a series of recognised theatrical performances within a hectic lifetime. The novelty here is how *place* is constructed and perceived. Perception would more than likely be the result of witnessing the boundaries (physical or otherwise) of a defined space, an assemblage of artefacts, distant and near memories, experiences or a series of events.

## Finding Place

The notion that *place* can take on many guises and mean different things to different people is not new and, certainly within archaeology, we have made a number of observations suggesting that place is a multifaceted component of understanding who we are and where we stand in the grand scheme of things (Nash and Gheorghiu 2009). Place can be seen as a small feature within, say, a park or a road, or it can be an island, region or even a country, defined by the physicality of boundaries but also by cultural identity, linguistics, politics and religion. Place creates individual and group identity through a number of interconnected constituents that include agency, behaviour and, of course, history.

*The question, 'what is place?' presents many difficulties. An examination of all the relevant facts seems to lead to different conclusions. Moreover, we have inherited nothing from previous thinkers, whether in the way of a statement of difficulties or of a solution. (Aristotle, Book V, The Physics)*

*Place* as a concept has its philosophical origins with Plato (Burnet 1902) and is represented in modern philosophical thought (e.g. Heidegger 1971; Dean and Millar 2005; Tilley 2005; Jones *et al.* 2012). Many branches of philosophy have incorporated, for example, aesthetics and rhetoric into contemporary and histo-geographical studies in order to tease out the concept of place, place being the antiphrasis of landscape (e.g. Berleant 2003). Here, place is sometimes difficult to locate, to define and to explore. These concepts, or what we would term as intellectually solvable problems, have also been approached by anthropologists (e.g. Tuan 1977; Augé 1992) and archaeologists (Tilley 1997; Bradley 2000; Nash and Gheorghiu 2009; Rubertone 2009). In archaeology, the first notion employed to designate a *place* is that of *site* (for an extended bibliography of the beginning of the use of this concept see Dunnell 1992: 22 *ff*) because of the presence of archaeological desposits, features,

structures and artefacts (see Hurcombe 2009: 38 *ff*). However, the extent of the archaeological place is in many ways artificial, in that archaeological excavation is an arbitrary practice, usually defined by the limit of excavation based on funding or development. Clearly (sub-surface) archaeology extends beyond the mindset of the 21<sup>st</sup> century archaeologist and his or her limit of excavation. In order to achieve the ‘complete picture’, one would need to excavate everything! Here, in an ideal archaeological world, *place* (the site) is extended to include, say, the Roman villa and its landscape. Lewis Binford’s relationist description of a site as being not only a collection of artefacts but also the relationship between them (Binford 1964), defines better the synchronous relationship between the artefacts that create an archaeological place (say, a prehistoric lithic scatter). Moreover, and sometimes ignored, one can also consider the effect of time with *place*; in other words, can an event, a drama, a performance or multiples of the forementioned constitute place? Although Binford identifies a limited one-dimensional relationship between artefacts, can an additional dimension be established when one witnesses the complex stratigraphy of a site that involves artefacts from different periods? This is clearly seen with landscapes that contain, for example, Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age sites. Even though the archaeology from each period is diverse, a relationship does exist in terms of *place*; in this case, the place could represent a large upland area. The bond that draws these different sites together is the rhetorical nature of place. However, the narrative theme for each period could be different, i.e. different stories for the same components with the *place* (or different performances in the same theatre).

A further relational concept used in archaeology is *territoriality*, perceived as a connection between personal perception (i.e. travelling) and geographic constraints that link different landscape points delineated by the physicality of place (i.e. geographic landmarks or cultural/economic/political limits) (e.g. Djindjan, this volume; Ruggini and Copat, this volume). Sometimes *territory* is substituted with *space* (Baudry and Daire, this volume).<sup>1</sup> In a similar vein, Michael Shanks (1992) talks about the idea of familiar and unfamiliar space, each separated by a ritual barrier; one is governed by cognition – the looking, the seeing, the experiencing and the knowing – the other an unknown quantity; one a place, the other a space (neither are defined by boundaries).

---

<sup>1</sup> At this juncture, we wish to stress that we are not intellectually playing with words. For this volume we are more concerned with the physical entities and extent of the elements that socially and politically construct space.

*Once knowledge can be analysed in terms of region, domain, implantation, displacement, transposition, one is able to capture the process by which knowledge functions as a form of power and disseminates the effects of power. There is an administration of knowledge, a politics of knowledge, relations of power which pass via knowledge and which, if one tries to transcribe them, leads one to consider forms of domination designated by such notions as field, region and territory. (Foucault 1972)*

As stated earlier, *place* must be bounded either physically or metaphysically; it cannot be infinite. However, as we have demonstrated, place is sometimes difficult to define (e.g. the artificiality of the boundary that defines the archaeological site). If this is a fundamental problem, can we relax the sometimes rigid physicality of place? The answer is probably yes, but only as an archaeological construct, especially in the way we apply, say, taphonomies to a physical object or structure. Usually, we can only assume the extent of a bounded place, entity or curtilage based on a fragmentary record; gone are the banks and ditches, gone is the palisaded fence and gone is the boundary wall. We can only assume through, say, the distribution of certain types pottery or metalwork where a territory was, but are the boundaries that we construct rigid enough? What about ethnicity and the influence of religion; *things* that are difficult to see within the archaeological record? At best, we can argue that *place* is very much a social construct, the physical boundaries being arbitrary and formed from history, conformity and consensus (see Ingold 1980, 1986; Tilley 1994; Ruggini and Copat, this volume).

*Boundaries, as with virtually everything else in the Aboriginal system of knowledge, are related to mythologies. (Tilley 1994)*

As we have seen, boundaries are socially constructed. In many societies, these constructs are the result of history ... *it's always been there and there it remains!* Strehlow (1965) in commenting on Western Desert Aboriginal groups, recognises boundaries that were demarcated by places or points (within the landscape), which are associated with powerful myth. Ancestors would have travelled from one point to another, further legitimising the boundary. Here, cultural constraints determine the boundary of place and natural points, such as natural bridges, mounds, passages, fords, lakes and pools, valleys, terraces and rock shelters, or even stones on a beach become encultured. (Fig. 0-1)



Fig. 0-1. Artificiality of materials to create a landscape focus. (Photo G. H. Nash)

*Human activities become inscribed within a landscape such that every cliff, large tree, stream, swampy area becomes a familiar place. Daily passages through the landscape become biographic encounters for individuals, recalling traces of past activities and previous events and the reading of signs [elements of the natural landscape] – a split log here, a stone marker there. (Tilley 1994: 27).*

The same principles and values can be applied to the culturation and legitimisation of points that are constructed by us, such as ditches, enclosures and palisades (Thorn, and Pasztor and Barna, this volume).

Cultural boundaries ritualise a place by different acts of *separation* materialised under the shape of symbolic and ritual limits, consequently generating a *rite of passage and ownership*; and, as a result, a *place* becomes a ritualised fragment from a whole, establishing a series of places (or points) within a place (Zubrow, this volume).

## Finding Materiality

In the first part of this chapter, we explored some of the issues concerning *place*. These issues are by no means definitive. Still within the theme of *place*, we now want to ask the question: can place be materiality?

Archaeology is, by its nature, an exploration of material culture, whether a handy artefact, a rock-art panel, even a feature or structure. Therefore, can the elements of *place*, in particular artefacts that define boundaries, points or zones of place, such as fences, hedges or walls, establish a materiality of *place* (e.g. Miller 2005)? Using philosophical discourse, Bradley (2000), Hurcombe (2009: 40) and, recently, Jones *et al.* (2012) have applied a number of approaches to understanding the materiality of natural and cultural places; here, place becomes an artefact that is experienced and sometimes feared and revered.

Cultural places are structured in a fractal way, their smallest material element being the object, followed by object assemblages (representing the various levels of occupation within, say, a site) and, finally, the material culture that defines the form, function and personality of a territory or region, sometimes referred to as a *tradition*. (Djindjan, this volume) Objects with clear intentionality of design and style can be considered rhetorical, the indexes of places (Bond, this volume; Ruggini and Copat, this volume). The structure which gives the identity of a place is sometimes known as *genius loci*, i.e. an animistic and sacred symbol. For natural places, their *genius loci* shall be investigated in the materiality of geomorphs, not only as human interventions in nature but natural interventions with people (de Nardi, this volume).

Sometimes, some of the material of a place and, at other times, the whole place, is re-used (or recycled) through a process of monumentalisation (Gheorghiu, this volume), this ideological practice creating the premises for social competition (Mason, this volume).

## Finding Time

As a fundamental subject of archaeology, time has been frequently approached in contemporary literature (Bradley 1991, 2002; Thomas 1996; van der Leeuw and McGlade 1997; Murray 1999; Gardner 2001; Lucas 2005; Holdaway and Wansnider 2008). This book attempts to place emphasis on the idea that time is, in itself, a means to measure the materiality of the world and also that a material place is an indissoluble mix of material and time. A place seen as a chrono-material relationship (Dods, this volume) in a determined location of the territory is a *chronotope* (Thorn, this volume); therefore, the spatial-temporal experience of a place implies a *heterotopic* and a *heterochronic* (Bouissac, this volume) experientiality. Although the temporal dimensions of the human experience are complex (Hall 1983; Dods, this volume), in the material archaeological record of a place, two kinds of time can be

discerned: a linear time (since making an object or walking through a landscape involves a sequential experience of time) and a circular or cyclical one.

One can suppose that the recurring time of the seasons generated the perception of a cyclical time in traditional societies (Thorn, this volume), which had material consequences on diverse places (Gheorghiu, this volume). Both linear and cyclical times could have a sacred value (see Hall 1983; Dods, this volume), which ancient Greeks labeled *kairos* (Sipiora and Baumlín 2002).

Compared with natural places, where the time of human life plays an insignificant role, cultural places such as settlements imply both kinds of time, this aspect being visible in identity strategies, since a group identity has a dominant temporal trait. It is generally agreed that the relationship with the past is a key element in forming collective identities (Lowenthal 1985; Gosden 1994; Olivier 2004). Discussing place and time in Maori society, the archaeologist Christopher Tilley (1999: 181) described a case of identity construction using a circular time: “the places were not, for the Maori, symbols of past time, of a dead and distanced history, but of a past living in and informing the present”.

One “material” way to build group identity is to relate objects with time, since “objects anchor time” (Tuan 1977: 123). The materialisation of the past through objects and, consequently, the manipulation of memories through materials (Johnson and Schneider, this volume) is very visible in monuments (Bradley 2002; Rubertone 2009). A relationship between the living and the dead through social “technologies of remembrance” (Johnson and Schneider, this volume) is possible with the use of material monuments. This material support of collective memory can produce “memorable places” (Bond, this volume).

Such continuity in time of a specific place becomes a problem of rituality (Gheorghiu, this volume) and the generation of a ritual time (see Bloch 1977).

## **Finding Being and Ritual**

The relationship of the materiality of natural places with their phenomenological experience through ritual and performance, more than through rational thinking (de Nardi, this volume), offers to the archaeology of place a novel insight into the better understanding of the relationship of humans with nature. People connect space or territory with place (Baudry and Daire, this volume) not only visually and kinaesthetically, but also involving other sensorial modalities: haptic (touch), acoustic and olfactory.

These sensorial experiences of a place, defined as a *heterotopy* (Bouissac, this volume), are quantifiable qualities of the built environment and represent the relationship of being with place.

*Lived bodily experience of place and landscape involve constant shifts in sensory appearances, a continuous process of sensorial interactions. The body is both encultured and emplaced.* (Tilley 1999: 180)

An emplacement can be the result of a two-way reciprocal influence between the phenomenology of the performance of the human body and the materiality of a place (de Nardi, this volume) and depends also on the rituality of that place, to cite only the *rites of passage* (van Gennep 1960; Barnard and Spencer 2002). These rituals emplace the individual (see Bourdieu 1977: 89; Bell 1992: 98) in positions of separation, liminality (Turner 1977) and re-incorporation (Thorn, this volume). When a place is ritually structured, with stages of separation and liminality, its fabric becomes discontinuous (Thorn, this volume) and is visually emphasized with various ritual markers, such as palisades (Pasztor and Barna, this volume; Thorn, this volume), technological structures (Mason, this volume) or artwork (Nash, this volume). Such markings could even have possessed an artistic character (Nash, this volume), when the phenomenological experience of the individual acquired an aesthetic degree (for the ancient Greeks *aisthesis* meant the very “perception by the senses”; see Berleant 2003: 44). (Fig. 0-2)



Fig. 0-2. *Omphalos* in the courtyard of Malia Palace, Crete. (Photo D. Gheorghiu)

### **Finding Place, Body and Measurement**

It is possible that the symbolic anthropomorphic perspective of the world (Tuan 1977: 90 *ff*) influenced the custom to measure the planet using the human body as indicator. One can say the “human being is the measure of all places”, since different units of measurement derived from the dimensions of the body, such as the human step or the cubit (Pasztor and Barna, this volume) are to be found in monuments or in the plan of settlements. The measurement of a place entails geo-metry, which is the science of the relationships between parts. Another type of symbolic relationship involving geometry is the scale which relates, for example, natural places to cultural objects (de Nardi, this volume).

### **Finding Place and Sacredness**

When discussing the relationship between human beings and nature one cannot ignore the religious connotations of this connection, to cite only the anthropomorphisation of places creating supernatural beings, with an identity role, like *genius loci* or Lares, the gods of places, protecting deities (for a relationship between identity, sacredness, and places see Eliade 1959; Thompson 2003).

Sacredness can be generated also from the position of a place in the world. There is, for example, the sacred place of ancestors, or the underworld (see Bradley 2000). Within the relationship between place and sacredness a special trait is represented by orientation (Pasztor and Barna, this volume), with, say, the relationship of human beings and the rising, setting and movement of celestial bodies such as the sun and moon.

### **Arriving at a Conclusion: The Syncretism of Place, Material, Time and Ritual**

The aim of this book is to present a series of essays that illustrate the philosophical and physical construction of place and we make no apologies for the disparate approaches of the authors: the over-riding theme has been place and the agencies that construct, govern and manipulate it. What has been made clear is that bounded places are constructed in a variety of ways, sometimes via the use of objects, sometimes using natural points and sometimes through the rhetoric of language, the latter creating a fluidity in the consequence and novelty of place. The consequence and novelty of place are certainly bound up with how places (and objects within them) become ritualised. This process is

usually the result of history through time; the longer the history, the more power it gains.

A conclusion to consider is that a relational nature of *place* (Djindjan, this volume; Baudry and Daire, this volume) necessitates different strategies in terms of approach, such as the determination of coordinates and position (Zubrow, this volume; Pásztor and Barna, this volume), temporality (Dods; Bouissac; Thorn; Gheorghiu; Johnson and Schneider, this volume), materiality (Bond, this volume) and of the relationships with the natural context (Djindjan; de Nardi; Ruggini and Copat, this volume).

A place could represent a temporal relationship between present and past, between living people and their ancestors (Mason, this volume; Johnson and Schneider, this volume), becoming an image of memory. A place could be made visible when using material markers with ritual and aesthetic value (Nash, this volume), which transform themselves into monuments when they relate time and material to a specific spot (Johnson and Schneider, this volume).

In this book we have demonstrated that place, materiality, time and ritual are, in many ways, difficult to disconnect and are autonomous in their own right, since they form a sort of syncretism, an identity syncretism which explains the toponymy of human beings and the existence of *genius loci*.

## Bibliography

- Augé, M. 1992. *Non-lieux, Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité*. Paris: Le Seuil.
- Barnard, A. and Spencer, J. 2002. Rite of passage, pp. 489-90. In Barnard, A. and Spencer, J. (eds.) *Encyclopaedia of social and cultural anthropology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bell, C. 1992. *Ritual theory. Ritual practice*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berleant, A. 2003. The Aesthetic in place, pp. 41-54. In Menin, S. (ed.) *Constructing place. Mind and matter*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Binford, L. R. 1964. A consideration of archaeological research design. *American Antiquity* 31: 203-210.
- Bloch, M. 1977. The past and the present in the present. *Man* (N.S.) 12: 278-292.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*, transl. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bradley, R. 1991. Ritual, time, and history. *World Archaeology* 23 (2): 209-219.
- . 2000. *An archaeology of natural places*. London: Routledge.
- . 2002. *The Past in Prehistoric Societies*. London: Routledge.
- Burnet, J. (ed.) 1902. *Platonis Opera*, vol. IV, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dean, T. and Millar, J. 2005. *Place*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Dunnell, R. C. 1992. The notion site. In Rossignol, J and Wandsnider, L. A. (eds.) *Space, time and archaeological landscape*. New York and London: Plenum Press.
- Eliade, M. 1959. *Cosmos and history*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Random House.
- Gardner, A. 2001. The Times of Archaeology and Archaeologies of Time. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 12: 35-47.
- Gosden, C. 1994. *Social being and time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, E. T. 1983. *The Dance of Life: The other dimension of time*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Heidegger, M. 1971. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Holdaway, S. and Wandsnider, L. A. (eds.) 2008. *Time in archaeology: Time perspectivism revisited*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Hurcombe, L. M. 2009. *Archaeological artefacts as material culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. 1980. *Hunters, pastoralists and ranchers: reindeer economies and their transformations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1986. *Evolution and social life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, A. M., Freedman, D., Blaze O'Connor, B., Lamdin-Whymark, H., Tipping, R. and Watson, A. 2012. *An Animate Landscape: Rock art and the Prehistory of Kilmartin, Argyll, Scotland*. Oxford: Windgather Press.
- Lowenthal, D. 1985. *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lucas, G., 2005. *The Archaeology of Time*. London: Routledge.
- Miller, D. (ed.). 2005. *Materiality*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Munn, N. 1973. *Walbirian Iconography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murray, T. (ed.) 1999. *Time and archaeology*. One World Archaeology series. London: Routledge.

- Nash, G. H. and Gheorghiu, D. 2009. *The Archaeology of Territoriality*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Olivier, L. 2004. The past of the present. Archaeological memory and time. *Archaeological Dialogues* 10 (2): 204–213.
- Rubertone, P. (ed.) 2009. *Archaeologies of Placemaking: Monuments, memories and engagement in Native North America*, One World Archaeology Series 59. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Shanks, M. 1992. *Experiencing the Past: On the character of Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Sipiora, P. and Baumlin, J. S. (eds.) 2002. *Rhetoric and Kairos. Essays in history, theory and praxis*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Strehlow, T. 1965. Cultural, social structure and environment in Aboriginal Central Australia. In Berndt, R. and Berndt, C. (eds.) *Aboriginal Man in Australia*. London: Argus and Robertson.
- Tilley, C. 1994. *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Paths, Places and Monuments*. London: Berg.
- . 1997. *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*. Oxford: Berg.
- . 1999. *Metaphor and Material Culture*. London: Berg.
- . 2005. *The Materiality of Stone*. London: Berg.
- Thomas, J. 1996. *Time, culture and identity: An interpretative archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Thompson, I. 2003. What use is the *genius loci*? pp. 66-76. In Menin, S. (ed.) *Constructing place. Mind and matter*. London: Routledge.
- Tuan, Y. F. 1977. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Turner, V. 1977. Variation on a theme of liminality. pp. 36-52. In Moore, S. F. and Myerhoff, B. G. (eds.) *Secular ritual*. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- van der Leeuw, S. E. and McGlade, J. (eds.) 1997. *Time, Process, and Structured Transformation in Archaeology*. One World Archaeology series. London: Routledge.
- van Gennep, A. 1960[1909]. *The Rites of Passage*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

# CHAPTER ONE

## PREHISTORIC PLACE: STUDIES IN MATERIAL CULTURE, TIME AND SPACE

EZRA B. W. ZUBROW

*“... There is a place for everything. There is a place for everything ... every single thing ... even that old thin g...”*

—Anne Winkler Zubrow (1915-1993)

### Introduction

Archaeology has always been concerned with material culture – that’s what it does! Objects reflect some of the best attributes of humanity. They include some of the greatest pieces of creative endeavor known - aesthetics that soar; material innovations that improve the human condition; entertainment that provides happiness. They also include some of the worst. Objects designed for the efficient killing, torturing, and maiming of people is complemented by those that destroy, enslave and constrain others.

Material culture appeals to everyone. The objects of the past have a peculiar fascination. They relate the present to the past and contemporary society to its heritage. Today nations, states, communities and even individuals collect the objects of their pasts. Although not the cause of warfare, these objects often become its symbol and even justification (Zubrow 2002). There is a certain empowering quality about the material objects of the past that remind one of partially remembered narratives about ancestors in the broadest definition who did things out of love, fear, and desire. Once situated in time and space they symbolize when people were either agents of change or the backdrop upon which environmental and cultural processes of the past acted.

This fascination is hardly new. Nabonidus (556-539 BC), known for his famous cylinder, neglected royal Babylonian affairs in order to find objects of antiquity, which resulted in both the end of his kingship and the Babylonian empire.

Shortly after the first archaeologist put the first object into the first cabinet of curiosities, the questions of where, when, why and how became important. Once situated in time and space these objects are the agents of change and where general processes are enacted.

## **Some Introductory Issues**

For “material places”, a short hand term that this paper uses to indicate a “prehistoric object” located at a particular space and time, one needs to distinguish clearly between the physical realities of those “material places” and the representations of such “material places” in space and time by both the prehistoric participants and by the much later analysts.

A “material place” archaeology has to be concerned with both non-culturally and culturally constructed places. There are a range of “cultural constructions”. They range from a minimal construction with a maximum of physical realities to a maximal construction and minimal physical realities. For both extremes and for the numerous cases in the middle there has to be a successful methodology that allows one to find and represent the actual “material places” in the prehistoric record. On one hand, one may note the .7 kg grey stone object found at 1:00 PM on May 12 2009 at 65 17 03 09 N 25 47 45 94E. The photograph of the object was taken at 65 21 51 16N 25 56 59 98E and presently resides at 65 3 29 12 N 25 28 8 29E (One may note the stone object, the discovery group, the measuring “GPS” from UNAVCO, accurate to a cm, and “on looking animals” in Fig. 1-1.) In the middle, an archaeologist culturally constructs the “material place” by stating that, “there was a prehistoric ice pick found at a habitation site dating from approximately 5500 BC. He continues by pointing out the photograph of the object was taken in the reconstructed prehistoric coastal houses of the Kierikki Stone Age Center and finally notes that it presently resides in the University of Oulu Archaeology Laboratory.” Construction and interpretation go hand in hand in the archaeologist’s statement. The prehistoric native would have a name for both the location of their home site and for the tool that was left. They might continue to speculate as to why it was lost or deposited at that time providing a far greater cultural construction.