



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Monuments on the horizon : the formation of the barrow landscape throughout the 3rd and the 2nd millennium BCE

Bourgeois, Q.P.J.

Citation

Bourgeois, Q. P. J. (2013, January 10). *Monuments on the horizon : the formation of the barrow landscape throughout the 3rd and the 2nd millennium BCE*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20381>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20381>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20381> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Bourgeois, Quentin

Title: Monuments on the horizon : the formation of the barrow landscape throughout the 3rd and 2nd millennium BC

Date: 2013-01-10

MONUMENTS ON THE HORIZON



Sidestone Press

MONUMENTS ON THE HORIZON

THE FORMATION OF THE BARROW LANDSCAPE
THROUGHOUT THE 3RD AND 2ND MILLENNIUM BC

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus prof. mr. P.F. van der Heijden,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op
donderdag 10 januari 2013
klokke 13.45 uur

door

Quentin Philippe Jean Bourgeois

Geboren te Gent
In 1982

Promotiecommissie

Promotor: Prof.dr. H. Fokkens

Co-promotor: Dr. D.R. Fontijn

Overige leden: Prof.dr. S. Wirth, Université de Bourgogne
Dr. D.W. Wheatley, University of Southampton
Dr. M.K. Holst, Aarhus University

© 2013 Q.P.J. Bourgeois

Published by Sidestone Press, Leiden

www.sidestone.com

Sidestone registration number: SSP131520001

ISBN 978-90-8890-104-1

Lay-out design: Sidestone Press

Lay-out: M. Kerkhof

Cover design: K. Wentink, Sidestone Press

Cover photograph: Barrows on the Rechte Heide close to the town of Goirle,
Noord-Brabant, The Netherlands. Photograph by Quentin Bourgeois

This research project was funded by the Dutch Organisation for Scientific
Research (NWO).

This publication was financially supported by the Stichting Nederlands Museum
voor Anthropologie en Praehistorie (SNMAP) and Leiden University.



Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>XI</i>
1 Outlining the problem: barrows, barrow groups and barrow landscapes	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 The European barrow phenomenon	3
1.2.1 The concept of a barrow landscape	3
1.3 What is so different about the barrow landscape?	5
1.3.1 The barrow landscape as characteristic for the 3 rd and 2 nd Millennium BC	5
1.3.2 Variability as key to the barrow landscape	5
1.3.3 Understanding the variability: researching the formation of barrow landscapes	7
1.4 Research questions	7
1.5 Methodology and Research area	8
1.6 The dataset	8
1.7 The structure of the research	9
2 Making sense of the barrow landscape	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 The barrow as an exclusive and visible burial ritual	11
2.3 Barrow-centric approaches: barrows as the resting place of individuals, the elite, warrior aristocracies and ancestors	12
2.4 The scale of the barrow landscape: from individual barrows and barrow groups to barrow landscapes	13
2.5 Why barrows are built in certain locations: barrows as the creation of lineal histories, genealogies, demarcating territories and ritual landscapes	15
2.5.1 The visual nature of the barrow	15
2.5.2 Barrows marking out ancestral presence	16
2.5.3 Barrows as territorial markers	16
2.5.4 Cosmological landscapes	17
2.6 Problems with the previous approaches to the barrow landscape	18
2.6.1 Barrows as claiming land	18
2.6.2 The temporality of barrow landscapes: single logic and retrospective explanations	19
2.7 Approaching the problem: reconstructing the development of the barrow landscape	20

3	The chronology of barrow construction in the Low Countries	23
3.1	Introduction	23
3.2	Barrow chronologies, the creation of a chronological framework	24
3.2.1	Existing typochronologies	24
3.2.2	Problems with the previous typochronologies	25
3.2.3	The need for a revision	27
3.3	Barrow Jargon	28
3.3.1	Primary barrows versus mound phases	28
3.3.2	Surrounding features	28
3.3.3	The distinction between primary and central graves	28
3.3.4	Secondary graves	30
3.3.5	Tangential graves	30
3.4	A chronology of the barrow ritual	30
3.4.1	Barrow construction	31
3.4.2	Burial types	35
3.5	A new chronology	36
3.6	Concluding remarks	38
4	Map formation processes and the dataset: assessing what is left of the barrow landscape	39
4.1	Introduction	39
4.2	Putting barrows into perspective: the representativity of the dataset	39
4.3	Map formation processes	40
4.3.1	Natural processes	41
4.3.2	Anthropogenic processes	44
4.3.3	Research factors	47
4.4	Selecting and assessing the Research Areas	48
4.5	Conclusion	50
5	The development of the barrow landscape: case studies from the Low Countries	51
5.1	Introduction	51
5.2	The Epe-Niersen barrow alignment	51
5.2.1	Introduction	51
5.2.2	Geomorphology of the region	52
5.2.3	Research history	54
5.2.4	The representativity of the dataset	55
5.2.5	The development of the Epe-Niersen barrow landscape	58
5.2.6	Summary	66
5.3	The Renkum stream valley	67
5.3.1	Introduction	67
5.3.2	Geomorphology of the region	67
5.3.3	Research history	67
5.3.4	Estimates of archaeological visibility	71
5.3.5	The development of the Renkum barrow landscape	71
5.3.6	Summary	77

5.4	The Ermelo Barrow Landscape	78
5.4.1	Introduction	78
5.4.2	Geomorphology of the region	78
5.4.3	Research history	80
5.4.4	Estimates of archaeological visibility	80
5.4.5	The development of the Ermelo Barrow Landscape	82
5.4.6	Summary	88
5.5	The Toterfout barrow group	89
5.5.1	Introduction	89
5.5.2	Geomorphology of the region	89
5.5.3	Research history	89
5.5.4	Estimates of archaeological visibility	90
5.5.5	The development of the Toterfout barrow landscape	93
5.5.6	Summary	102
5.6	Conclusion	102
6	The visual characteristics of a barrow	105
6.1	Introduction	105
6.2	The importance of visibility in Prehistory	107
6.2.1	Monumental mounds	107
6.2.2	Barrows as ritual platforms?	107
6.3	Visibility studies within archaeology	108
6.3.1	Phenomenology and barrow landscapes	108
6.3.2	GIS and viewshed maps	111
6.3.3	Temporality and visibility	114
6.4	Visualising prehistoric landscapes	116
6.4.1	Colourful mounds	116
6.4.2	Post circles, ditches and palisaded ditches	117
6.4.3	Vegetation reconstructions	124
6.4.4	Combining the elements: an impression	126
6.5	Researching visibility patterns	128
6.5.1	The visibility analyses: some technical details and constraints	128
6.5.2	Modelling vegetation within a GIS	131
6.5.3	To see ...	133
6.5.4	... or to be seen	138
6.5.5	To see each other?	142
6.5.6	Cresting the horizon	149
6.5.7	Moving along the alignments	153
6.6	Interpreting the results	156
6.6.1	All barrows are equal...	156
6.6.2	... but some are more equal than others	156
6.6.3	Barrow landscapes and cosmological landscapes	156
7	The reinterpretation of the barrow landscape	159
7.1	Introduction	159
7.2	The reinterpretation of past monuments	159

7.3	Patterns of reuse in the Low Countries	160
7.3.1	The restoration of ancient mounds	160
7.3.2	Burial within ancient mounds	162
7.4	Changing attitudes to barrows and barrow landscapes	163
7.4.1	Corded Ware mounds	163
7.4.2	Sporadic Bell Beaker reuse	164
7.4.3	The Early Bronze Age gap?	164
7.4.4	The Middle Bronze Age revival	165
7.5	The reinterpretation of barrow landscapes	168
7.5.1	The Bronze Age barrow as a resting place for multiple individuals	170
7.5.2	Reuse was pre-ordained	173
7.5.3	Reuse was totalizing	174
7.5.4	Reuse was selective	174
7.6	Conclusion	176
8	The creation of a barrow landscape: constructing new mounds	177
8.1	Introduction	177
8.2	The frequency of barrow construction	177
8.3	The episodic nature of barrow construction	178
8.4	Heathland Barrows	181
8.5	Barrow landscapes in the Low Countries	183
8.5.1	Late Neolithic A	183
8.5.2	Late Neolithic B	185
8.5.3	The Early Bronze Age intermezzo	186
8.5.4	Middle Bronze Age	187
8.6	Understanding barrow landscapes	188
8.6.1	Barrow Lines	188
8.6.2	Dispersed barrow groups	192
8.7	Conclusion	194
9	The formation of the barrow landscape	195
9.1	Introduction	195
9.2	The time-depth of the barrow landscape and its implications	195
9.3	The Barrow Choreography	198
9.4	Idiosyncratic groups	198
9.5	Barrow communities	199
9.6	The creation of barrow communities	201
9.6.1	Collective memory and the barrow landscape	201
9.6.2	Non-discursive construction of community	202
9.6.3	Semiotic and relational landscapes	203
9.7	Conclusion	205

<i>References</i>	209
<i>Appendices</i>	231
<i>Samenvatting (Dutch summary)</i>	233
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	237
<i>Curriculum vitae</i>	239

Preface

Barrows, as burial markers, are ubiquitous throughout North-Western Europe. Tens of thousands of these monuments are still visible in the present day landscape, while probably ten times as many vanished over the centuries since their construction.

It is therefore not surprising that barrows, as of old, are the most researched elements of later prehistory. Early antiquarian interest in these monuments ensured that thousands of them were dug into. Notably England and Denmark saw hundreds of these monuments being excavated – more or less scientifically – in the 19th Century. This interest continued into the 20th Century, when thousands more barrows were investigated.

And it is not surprising as well that several generations of archaeologists have dug their teeth into the topic. Especially within Dutch Archaeology, several of the great household names were ‘barrow’ archaeologists. Holwerda started excavating barrows in the early 20th Century and in the following decades his assistants Remouchamps and Bursch took over from him. Van Giffen quickly followed in the 1920’s and continued excavating barrows for more than three decades, often preceding their imminent destruction. His legacy was succeeded by Glasbergen, Modderman and Waterbolk, particularly in the 1950’s. From the 1960’s onwards, interest in these monuments decreased considerably and shifted to settlement archaeology. The old excavations nevertheless provided food for generations to follow, and several syntheses were published in the second half of the 20th Century.

So indeed, we know quite a lot of these monuments and many of the artefacts coming from these mounds are central to our image of later prehistory. We know the majority of these mounds was built in the 3rd and 2nd Millennium BC. We know the contents and form of the graves and we think we know who built them and for whom. And when the Faculty of Archaeology at Leiden started excavating barrows anew in 2004, it was often remarked that we knew ‘enough’ about these barrows and that all there was to be said about them, was already said. Yet the excavations disproved this and several monographs – now published or in press – continue to add to our knowledge of these ancient mounds.

Yet this book is not so much about the barrow itself. Rather, it is more about the role of a barrow within the wider landscape. This difficult subject is often not addressed or dealt with in passing, or – especially in the early days – was not considered of any relevance. It is also an understandable oversight given the difficulty of creating an overview from such a vast dataset. The issue is complicated by the fact that it is not uncommon for hundreds of these barrows to be spread out over several square kilometres, forming veritable *barrow landscapes*. Areas, where everywhere you look you will see these monuments, close by and far off in the distance. In some cases they form up in kilometre long alignments while in others they are dispersed in small groups or are found in apparent isolation. Why is that? It is this fundamental issue which is at the heart of this research, how did this peculiar and vast configuration of mortuary monuments originate and how did it develop?

