



McDONALD INSTITUTE MONOGRAPHS

Temple landscapes

Fragility, change and resilience of Holocene environments in the Maltese Islands

By Charles French, Chris O. Hunt, Reuben Grima,
Rowan McLaughlin, Simon Stoddart & Caroline Malone



Volume 1 of Fragility and Sustainability – Studies on Early Malta,
the ERC-funded *FRAGSUS Project*

Temple landscapes



McDONALD INSTITUTE MONOGRAPHS

Temple landscapes

Fragility, change and resilience of Holocene environments in the Maltese Islands

By Charles French, Chris O. Hunt, Reuben Grima,
Rowan McLaughlin, Simon Stoddart & Caroline Malone

With contributions by

Gianmarco Alberti, Jeremy Bennett, Maarten Blaauw, Petros Chatzimpaloglou,
Lisa Coyle McClung, Alan J. Cresswell, Nathaniel Cutajar, Michelle Farrell,
Katrin Fenech, Rory P. Flood, Timothy C. Kinnaird, Steve McCarron,
Rowan McLaughlin, John Meneely, Anthony Pace, Sean D.F. Pyne-O'Donnell,
Paula J. Reimer, Alastair Ruffell, George A. Said-Zammit, David C.W. Sanderson,
Patrick J. Schembri, Sean Taylor, David Trumpp, Jonathan Turner, Nicholas C. Vella
& Nathan Wright

Illustrations by

Gianmarco Alberti, Jeremy Bennett, Sara Boyle, Petros Chatzimpaloglou,
Lisa Coyle McClung, Rory P. Flood, Charles French, Chris O. Hunt, Michelle Farrell,
Katrin Fenech, Rowan McLaughlin, John Meneely, Anthony Pace, David Redhouse,
Alastair Ruffell, George A. Said-Zammit & Simon Stoddart



Volume 1 of Fragility and Sustainability – Studies on Early Malta,
the ERC-funded *FRAGSUS Project*



This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7-2007-2013) (Grant agreement No. 323727).

Published by:

McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research
University of Cambridge
Downing Street
Cambridge, UK
CB2 3ER
(0)(1223) 339327
eaj31@cam.ac.uk
www.mcdonald.cam.ac.uk



McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 2020

© 2020 McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Temple landscapes is made available under a
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-
NoDerivatives 4.0 (International) Licence:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

ISBN: 978-1-902937-99-1

Cover design by Dora Kemp and Ben Plumridge.
Typesetting and layout by Ben Plumridge.

On the cover: *View towards Nadur lighthouse and Ghajnsielem church
with the Gozo Channel to Malta beyond, from In-Nuffara (Caroline Malone).*

Edited for the Institute by James Barrett (*Series Editor*).

CONTENTS

Contributors		xi
Figures		xiii
Tables		xvi
Preface and dedication		xix
Acknowledgements		xxi
Foreword		xxiii
<i>Introduction</i>	CAROLINE MALONE, SIMON STODDART, CHRIS O. HUNT, CHARLES FRENCH, ROWAN McLAUGHLIN & REUBEN GRIMA	1
0.1. Introduction		1
0.2. Background to <i>FRAGSUS</i> as an archaeological project		3
0.3. Environmental research in Malta and the Mediterranean		5
0.4. The development of the <i>FRAGSUS Project</i> and its questions		6
0.5. Archaeological concerns in Maltese prehistory and the <i>FRAGSUS Project</i>		8
0.6. The research programme: the sites and their selection		9
0.7. Investigating the palaeoenvironmental context		10
0.8. Archaeological investigations		11
Part I	The interaction between the natural and cultural landscape – insights into the fifth–second millennia BC	17
<i>Chapter 1</i>	The geology, soils and present-day environment of Gozo and Malta PETROS CHATZIMPALOGLOU, PATRICK J. SCHEMBRI, CHARLES FRENCH, ALASTAIR RUFFELL & SIMON STODDART	19
1.1. Previous work		19
1.2. Geography		19
1.3. Geology		21
1.4. Stratigraphy of the Maltese Islands		23
1.4.1. Lower Coralline Limestone Formation		23
1.4.2. Globigerina Limestone Formation		23
1.4.3. Chert outcrops		25
1.4.4. Blue Clay Formation		26
1.4.5. Greensand Formation		28
1.4.6. Upper Coralline Limestone Formation		28
1.4.7. Quaternary deposits		29
1.5. Structural and tectonic geology of the Maltese Islands		29
1.6. Geomorphology		29
1.7. Soils and landscape		31
1.8. Climate and vegetation		32
<i>Chapter 2</i>	Chronology and stratigraphy of the valley systems CHRIS O. HUNT, MICHELLE FARRELL, KATRIN FENECH, CHARLES FRENCH, ROWAN McLAUGHLIN, MAARTEN BLAAUW, JEREMY BENNETT, RORY P. FLOOD, SEAN D. F. PYNE-O'DONNELL, PAULA J. REIMER, ALASTAIR RUFFELL, ALAN J. CRESSWELL, TIMOTHY C. KINNAIRD, DAVID SANDERSON, SEAN TAYLOR, CAROLINE MALONE, SIMON STODDART & NICHOLAS C. VELLA	35
2.1. Methods for dating environmental and climate change in the Maltese Islands		35
2.1.1. Data sources for chronology building		35
2.1.2. Pottery finds		41

2.2. Basin infill ground penetrating radar surveys	41
ALASTAIR RUFFELL, CHRIS O. HUNT, JEREMY BENNETT, RORY P. FLOOD, SIMON STODDART & CAROLINE MALONE	
2.2.1. <i>Rationale</i>	41
2.2.2. <i>Geophysics for basin fill identification</i>	41
2.2.3. <i>Valley locations</i>	43
2.3. The sediment cores	43
CHRIS O. HUNT, MICHELLE FARRELL, RORY P. FLOOD, KATRIN FENECH, ROWAN McLAUGHLIN, NICHOLAS C. VELLA, SEAN TAYLOR & CHARLES FRENCH	
2.3.1. <i>Aims and methods</i>	43
2.3.2. <i>The core descriptions</i>	49
2.3.3. <i>Magnetic susceptibility and XRF analyses of the cores</i>	59
2.4. Age-depth models	64
MAARTEN BLAUW & ROWAN McLAUGHLIN	
2.4.1. <i>Accumulation rates</i>	64
2.5. A local marine reservoir offset for Malta	65
PAULA J. REIMER	
2.6. Major soil erosion phases	65
RORY P. FLOOD, ROWAN McLAUGHLIN & MICHELLE FARRELL	
2.6.1. <i>Introduction</i>	65
2.6.2. <i>Methods</i>	66
2.6.3. <i>Results</i>	67
2.6.4. <i>Discussion</i>	68
2.6.5. <i>Conclusions</i>	71
Chapter 3 The Holocene vegetation history of the Maltese Islands	73
MICHELLE FARRELL, CHRIS O. HUNT & LISA COYLE McCLUNG	
3.1. Introduction	73
CHRIS O. HUNT	
3.2. Palynological methods	74
LISA COYLE-McCLUNG, MICHELLE FARRELL & CHRIS O. HUNT	
3.3. Taxonomy and ecological classification	75
CHRIS O. HUNT	
3.4. Taphonomy	75
CHRIS O. HUNT & MICHELLE FARRELL	
3.5. The pollen results	87
MICHELLE FARRELL, LISA COYLE-McCLUNG & CHRIS O. HUNT	
3.5.1. <i>The Salina cores</i>	87
3.5.2. <i>Wied Żembaq</i>	87
3.5.3. <i>Xemxija</i>	87
3.5.4. <i>In-Nuffara</i>	87
3.5.5. <i>Santa Verna</i>	95
3.5.6. <i>Ġgantija</i>	105
3.6. Synthesis	107
3.6.1. <i>Pre-agricultural landscapes (pre-5900 cal. BC)</i>	107
3.6.2. <i>First agricultural colonization (5900–5400 cal. BC)</i>	108
3.6.3. <i>Early Neolithic (5400–3900 cal. BC)</i>	109
3.6.4. <i>The later Neolithic Temple period (3900–2350 cal. BC)</i>	110
3.6.5. <i>The late Neolithic–Early Bronze Age transition (2350–2000 cal. BC)</i>	111
3.6.6. <i>The Bronze Age (2000–1000 cal. BC)</i>	112
3.6.7. <i>Late Bronze Age, Punic and Classical periods (c. 1000 cal. BC to AD 1000)</i>	112
3.6.8. <i>Medieval to modern (post-AD 1000)</i>	113
3.7. Conclusions	113

Chapter 4	Molluscan remains from the valley cores	115
	KATRIN FENECH, CHRIS O. HUNT, NICHOLAS C. VELLA & PATRICK J. SCHEMBRI	
	4.1. Introduction	115
	4.2. Material	117
	4.3. Methods	117
	4.4. Radiocarbon dates and Bayesian age-depth models	117
	4.5. Results	117
	4.5.1. Marsaxlokk (MX1)	127
	4.5.2. Wied Żembaq (WŻ)	127
	4.5.3. Mġarr ix-Xini (MĠX)	128
	4.5.4. Marsa 2	128
	4.5.5. Salina Deep Core	133
	4.5.6. Xemxija 1 and 2	152
	4.6. Interpretative discussion	153
	4.6.1. Erosion – evidence of major events from the cores	153
	4.7. Environmental reconstruction based on non-marine molluscs	155
	4.7.1. Early Holocene (c. 8000–6000 cal. BC)	155
	4.7.2. Mid-Holocene (c. 6000–3900 cal. BC)	155
	4.7.3. Temple Period (c. 3900–2400 cal. BC)	155
	4.7.4. Early to later Bronze Age (2400–c. 750 cal. BC)	155
	4.7.5. Latest Bronze Age/early Phoenician period to Late Roman/Byzantine period (c. 750 cal. BC–cal. AD 650)	156
	4.8. Concluding remarks	156
	4.9. Notes on selected species	157
	4.9.1. Extinct species	157
	4.9.2. Species with no previous fossil record	158
	4.9.3. Other indicator species	158
Chapter 5	The geoarchaeology of past landscape sequences on Gozo and Malta	161
	CHARLES FRENCH & SEAN TAYLOR	
	5.1. Introduction	161
	5.2. Methodology and sample locations	164
	5.3. Results	165
	5.3.1. Santa Verna and its environs	165
	5.3.2. Ġgantija temple and its environs	174
	5.3.3. Skorba and its immediate environs	183
	5.3.4. Taċ-Ċawla settlement site	188
	5.3.5. Xagħra town	190
	5.3.6. Ta' Marżiena	192
	5.3.7. In-Nuffara	192
	5.3.8. The Ramla valley	193
	5.3.9. The Marsalforn valley	195
	5.3.10. Micromorphological analyses of possible soil materials in the Xemxija 1, Wied Żembaq 1, Marsaxlokk and Salina Deep (SDC) cores	196
	5.4. The Holocene landscapes of Gozo and Malta	213
	5.5. A model of landscape development	217
	5.6. Conclusions	221
Chapter 6	Cultural landscapes in the changing environments from 6000 to 2000 BC	223
	REUBEN GRIMA, SIMON STODDART, CHRIS O. HUNT, CHARLES FRENCH, ROWAN McLAUGHLIN & CAROLINE MALONE	
	6.1. Introduction	223
	6.2. A short history of survey of a fragmented island landscape	223
	6.3. Fragmented landscapes	225

6.4. The Neolithic appropriation of the landscape	227
6.5. A world in flux (5800–4800 cal. BC)	227
6.6. The fifth millennium BC hiatus (4980/4690 to 4150/3640 cal. BC)	228
6.7. Reappropriating the landscape: the ‘Temple Culture’	230
6.8. Transition and decline	236
6.9. Conclusion	237
Part II The interaction between the natural and cultural landscape – insights from the second millennium BC to the present: continuing the story	239
<i>Chapter 7</i> Cultural landscapes from 2000 BC onwards	241
SIMON STODDART, ANTHONY PACE, NATHANIEL CUTAJAR, NICHOLAS C. VELLA, ROWAN McLAUGHLIN, CAROLINE MALONE, JOHN MENEELY & DAVID TRUMPT	
7.1. An historiographical introduction to the Neolithic–Bronze Age transition into the Middle Bronze Age	241
7.2. Bronze Age settlements in the landscape	243
7.3. The Bronze Age Phoenician transition and the Phoenician/Punic landscape	246
7.4. Entering the Roman world	250
7.5. Arab	250
7.6. Medieval	251
7.7. The Knights and the entry into the modern period	251
<i>Chapter 8</i> The intensification of the agricultural landscape of the Maltese Archipelago	253
JEREMY BENNETT	
8.1. Introduction	253
8.2. The <i>Annales</i> School and the Anthropocene	254
8.3. The Maltese Archipelago and the <i>longue durée</i> of the Anthropocene	255
8.4. Intensification	257
8.5. Population	258
8.5.1. <i>Sub-carrying capacity periods</i>	258
8.5.2. <i>Post-carrying capacity periods</i>	260
8.6. The agrarian archipelago	262
8.6.1. <i>The agricultural substrate</i>	262
8.6.2. <i>The development of agricultural technology</i>	262
8.7. Discussion: balancing fragility and sustainability	264
<i>Chapter 9</i> Locating potential pastoral foraging routes in Malta through the use of a Geographic Information System	267
GIANMARCO ALBERTI, REUBEN GRIMA & NICHOLAS C. VELLA	
9.1. Introduction	267
9.2. Methods	267
9.2.1. <i>Data sources</i>	267
9.2.2. <i>Foraging routes and least-cost paths calculation</i>	268
9.3. Results	271
9.3.1. <i>Garrigue to garrigue least-cost paths</i>	271
9.3.2. <i>Stables to garrigues least-cost paths</i>	273
9.4. Discussion	276
9.4. Conclusions	283
<i>Chapter 10</i> Settlement evolution in Malta from the Late Middle Ages to the early twentieth century and its impact on domestic space	285
GEORGE A. SAID-ZAMMIT	
10.1. The Medieval Period (AD 870–1530)	285
10.1.1. <i>Medieval houses</i>	288

10.1.2. <i>Giren and hovels</i>	289
10.1.3. <i>Cave-dwellings</i>	292
10.1.4. <i>Architectural development</i>	292
10.2. The Knights' Period (AD 1530–1798)	293
10.2.1. <i>The phase AD 1530–1565</i>	293
10.2.2. <i>The phase AD 1565–1798</i>	293
10.2.3. <i>Early modern houses</i>	294
10.2.4. <i>Lower class dwellings</i>	297
10.2.5. <i>Cave-dwellings and hovels</i>	298
10.2.6. <i>The houses: a reflection of social and economic change</i>	298
10.3. The British Period (AD 1800–1900)	298
10.3.1. <i>The houses of the British Period</i>	299
10.3.2. <i>The effect of the Victorian Age</i>	300
10.3.3. <i>Urban lower class dwellings</i>	301
10.3.4. <i>Peasant houses, cave-dwellings and hovels</i>	301
10.4. Conclusions	302
Chapter 11 Conclusions	303
CHARLES FRENCH, CHRIS O. HUNT, MICHELLE FARRELL, KATRIN FENECH, ROWAN McLAUGHLIN, REUBEN GRIMA, NICHOLAS C. VELLA, PATRICK J. SCHEMBRI, SIMON STODDART & CAROLINE MALONE	
11.1. The palynological record	303
CHRIS O. HUNT & MICHELLE FARRELL	
11.1.1. <i>Climate</i>	303
11.1.2. <i>Farming and anthropogenic impacts on vegetation</i>	307
11.2. The molluscan record	308
KATRIN FENECH, CHRIS O. HUNT, NICHOLAS C. VELLA & PATRICK J. SCHEMBRI	
11.3. The soil/sediment record	310
CHARLES FRENCH	
11.4. Discontinuities in Maltese prehistory and the influence of climate	313
CHRIS O. HUNT	
11.5. Environmental metastability and the <i>longue durée</i>	314
CHRIS O. HUNT	
11.6. Implications for the human story of the Maltese Islands	316
CHARLES FRENCH, CHRIS O. HUNT, CAROLINE MALONE, KATRIN FENECH, MICHELLE FARRELL, ROWAN McLAUGHLIN, REUBEN GRIMA, PATRICK J. SCHEMBRI & SIMON STODDART	
References	325
Appendix 1 How ground penetrating radar (GPR) works	351
ALASTAIR RUFFELL	
Appendix 2 Luminescence analysis and dating of sediments from archaeological sites and valley fill sequences	353
ALAN J. CRESSWELL, DAVID C.W. SANDERSON, TIMOTHY C. KINNAIRD & CHARLES FRENCH	
A2.1. Summary	353
A2.2. Introduction	354
A2.3. Methods	355
A2.3.1. <i>Sampling and field screening measurements</i>	355
A2.3.2. <i>Laboratory calibrated screening measurements</i>	355
A2.4. Quartz OSL SAR measurements	356
A2.4.1. <i>Sample preparation</i>	356
A2.4.2. <i>Measurements and determinations</i>	356

A2.5. Results	357
A2.5.1. <i>Sampling and preliminary luminescence stratigraphies</i>	357
A2.5.2. <i>Gozo</i>	357
A2.5.3. <i>Skorba</i>	363
A2.5.4. <i>Tal-Istabal, Qormi</i>	363
A2.6. Laboratory calibrated screening measurements	363
A2.6.1. <i>Dose rates</i>	367
A2.6.2. <i>Quartz single aliquot equivalent dose determinations</i>	367
A2.6.3. <i>Age determinations</i>	371
A2.7. Discussion	372
A2.7.1. <i>Ġgantija Temple (SUTL2914 and 2915)</i>	372
A2.7.2. <i>Ramla and Marsalforn Valleys (SUTL2917–2923)</i>	373
A2.7.3. <i>Skorba Neolithic site (SUTL2925–2927)s</i>	373
A2.7.4. <i>Tal-Istabal, Qormi (SUTL2930)</i>	376
A2.7. Conclusions	376
<i>Appendix 2 – Supplements A–D</i>	379
<i>Appendix 3</i> Deep core borehole logs	401
CHRIS O. HUNT, KATRIN FENECH, MICHELLE FARRELL & ROWAN McLAUGHLIN	
<i>Appendix 4</i> Granulometry of the deep cores	421 (online edition only)
KATRIN FENECH	
<i>Appendix 5</i> The molluscan counts for the deep cores	441 (online edition only)
KATRIN FENECH	
<i>Appendix 6</i> The borehole and test excavation profile log descriptions	535
CHARLES FRENCH & SEAN TAYLOR	
<i>Appendix 7</i> The detailed soil micromorphological descriptions from the buried soils and Ramla and Marsalforn valleys	549
CHARLES FRENCH	
A7.1. Santa Verna	549
A7.2. Ġgantija Test Pit 1	551
A7.3. Ġgantija WC Trench 1	552
A7.4. Ġgantija olive grove and environs	553
A7.5. Skorba	553
A7.6. Xagħra town	554
A7.7. Taċ-Ċawla	555
A7.8. In-Nuffara	555
A7.9. Marsalforn Valley Profile 626	556
A7.10. Ramla Valley Profile 627	556
A7.11. Dwerja	556
<i>Appendix 8</i> The micromorphological descriptions for the Malta deep cores of Xemxija 1, Wied Żembaq 1, Marsaxlokk and the base of the Salina Deep Core (21B)	557
CHARLES FRENCH & SEAN TAYLOR	
<i>Appendix 9</i> The charcoal data	563
NATHAN WRIGHT	
Index	565

CONTRIBUTORS

DR GIANMARCO ALBERTI

Department of Criminology, Faculty for Social
Wellbeing, University of Malta, Msida, Malta
Email: gianmarco.alberti@um.edu.mt

JEREMY BENNETT

Department of Archaeology, University of
Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
Email: jmb241@cam.ac.uk

DR MAARTEN BLAAUW

School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's
University, University Road, Belfast, Northern
Ireland
Email: marten.blaauw@qub.ac.uk

DR PETROS CHATZIMPALOGLOU

Department of Archaeology, University of
Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
Email: pc529@cam.ac.uk

DR LISA COYLE MCCLUNG

School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's
University, University Road, Belfast, Northern
Ireland
Email: l.coylemcclung@qub.ac.uk

DR ALAN J. CRESSWELL

SUERC, University of Glasgow, East Kilbride,
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland
Email: alan.cresswell@glasgow.ac.uk

NATHANIEL CUTAJAR

Deputy Superintendent of Cultural Heritage,
Heritage Malta, Valletta, Malta
Email: nathaniel.cutajar@gov.mt

DR MICHELLE FARRELL

Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience,
School of Energy, Construction and Environment,
Coventry University, Coventry, UK
Email: ac5086@coventry.ac.uk

DR KATRIN FENECH

Department of Classics & Archaeology, University
of Malta, Msida, Malta
Email: katrin.fenech@um.edu.mt

DR RORY P. FLOOD

School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's
University, University Road, Belfast, Northern
Ireland
Email: r.flood@qub.ac.uk

PROF. CHARLES FRENCH

Department of Archaeology, University of
Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
Email: caif2@cam.ac.uk

DR REUBEN GRIMA

Department of Conservation and Built Heritage,
University of Malta, Msida, Malta
Email: reuben.grima@um.edu.mt

DR EVAN A. HILL

School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's
University, University Road, Belfast, Northern
Ireland
Email: ehill08@qub.ac.uk

PROF. CHRIS O. HUNT

Faculty of Science, Liverpool John Moores
University, Liverpool, UK
Email: c.o.hunt@ljmu.ac.uk

DR TIMOTHY C. KINNAIRD

School of Earth and Environmental Sciences,
University of St Andrews, St. Andrews, Scotland
Email: tk17@st-andrews.ac.uk

PROF. CAROLINE MALONE

School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's
University, University Road, Belfast, BT7 1NN,
Northern Ireland
Email: c.malone@qub.ac.uk

DR STEVE MCCARRON

Department of Geography, National University of
Ireland, Maynooth, Ireland
Email: stephen.mccarron@mu.ie

DR ROWAN McLAUGHLIN

School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's
University, University Road, Belfast, Northern
Ireland
Email: r.mclaughlin@qub.ac.uk

JOHN MENEELY
School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's
University, University Road, Belfast, Northern
Ireland
Email: j.meneely@qub.ac.uk

DR ANTHONY PACE
UNESCO Cultural Heritage, Valletta, Malta
Email: anthonypace@cantab.net

DR SEAN D.F. PYNE-O'DONNELL
Earth Observatory of Singapore, Nanyang
Technological University, Singapore
Email: sean.1000@hotmail.co.uk

PROF. PAULA J. REIMER
School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's
University, University Road, Belfast, Northern
Ireland
Email: p.j.reimer@qub.ac.uk

DR ALASTAIR RUFFELL
School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's
University, University Road, Belfast, Northern
Ireland
Email: a.ruffell@qub.ac.uk

GEORGE A. SAID-ZAMMIT
Department of Examinations, Ministry for
Education and Employment, Government of Malta,
Malta
Email: george.said-zammit@gov.mt

PROF. DAVID C.W. SANDERSON
SUERC, University of Glasgow, East Kilbride,
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland
Email: david.sanderson@glasgow.ac.uk

PROF. PATRICK J. SCHEMBRI
Department of Biology, University of Malta,
Msida, Malta
Email: patrick.j.schembri@um.edu.mt

DR SIMON STODDART
Department of Archaeology, University of
Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
Email: ss16@cam.ac.uk

DR SEAN TAYLOR
Department of Archaeology, University of
Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
Email: st435@cam.ac.uk

DR DAVID TRUMPT

DR JONATHAN TURNER
Department of Geography, National University
of Ireland, University College, Dublin, Ireland
Email: jonathan.turner@ucd.ie

PROF. NICHOLAS C. VELLA
Department of Classics and Archaeology, Faculty
of Arts, University of Malta, Msida, Malta
Email: nicholas.vella@um.edu.mt

DR NATHAN WRIGHT
School of Social Science, The University of
Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
Email: n.wright@uq.edu.au

Figures

0.1	<i>Location map of the Maltese Islands in the southern Mediterranean Sea.</i>	2
0.2	<i>Location of the main Neolithic archaeological and deep coring sites investigated on Malta and Gozo.</i>	11
0.3	<i>Some views of previous excavations on Malta and Gozo.</i>	12–13
0.4	<i>Some views of recent excavations.</i>	14
1.1	<i>The location of the Maltese Islands in the southern Mediterranean Sea with respect to Sicily and North Africa.</i>	20
1.2	<i>Stratigraphic column of the geological formations reported for the Maltese Islands.</i>	22
1.3	<i>Geological map of the Maltese Islands.</i>	22
1.4	<i>Typical coastal outcrops of Lower Coralline Limestone, forming sheer cliffs.</i>	23
1.5	<i>Characteristic geomorphological features developed on the Lower Coralline Limestone in western Gozo (Dwerja Point).</i>	24
1.6	<i>The Middle Globigerina Limestone at the Xwejini coastline.</i>	24
1.7	<i>An overview of the area investigated in western Malta.</i>	25
1.8	<i>The end of the major fault system of Malta (Victorian Lines) at Fomm Ir-Rih.</i>	26
1.9	<i>An overview of the western part of Gozo where the chert outcrops are located.</i>	27
1.10	<i>Chert outcrops: a) and c) bedded chert, and b) and d) nodular chert.</i>	27
1.11	<i>Four characteristic exposures of the Blue Clay formation on Gozo and Malta.</i>	28
1.12	<i>Map of the fault systems, arranged often as northwest–southeast oriented graben, and strike-slip structures.</i>	30
2.1	<i>Summary of new radiocarbon dating of Neolithic and Bronze Age sites on Gozo and Malta.</i>	36
2.2	<i>Summed radiocarbon ages for the main sediment cores.</i>	36
2.3	<i>The location of the Birżebbuġa Għar Dalam and Borġ in-Nadur basins and their GNSS-located GPR lines.</i>	42
2.4	<i>The core locations in Malta and Gozo.</i>	44
2.5	<i>Radiocarbon activity in settlement cores.</i>	48
2.6	<i>The Xemxija 2 core by depth.</i>	51
2.7	<i>The Wied Żembaq 1 and 2 cores by depth.</i>	52
2.8	<i>The Mġarr ix-Xini core by depth.</i>	54
2.9	<i>The Marsaxlokk 1 core and part of 2 by depth.</i>	55
2.10	<i>The resistivity and magnetic susceptibility graphs for Xemxija 1 core.</i>	60
2.11	<i>The resistivity and magnetic susceptibility graphs for Xemxija 2 core.</i>	60
2.12	<i>The multi-element data plots for Xemxija 1 core.</i>	61
2.13	<i>The multi-element data plots for Wied Żembaq 1 core.</i>	62
2.14	<i>The multi-element data plots for Marsaxlokk 1 core.</i>	63
2.15	<i>RUSLE models of soil erosion for the Maltese Islands in September and March.</i>	69
2.16	<i>R and C factors and their product.</i>	70
3.1	<i>Valley catchments and core locations in the Mistra area of Malta.</i>	79
3.2	<i>The modern pollen spectra.</i>	81
3.3	<i>Pollen zonation for the Salina Deep Core.</i>	82–3
3.4	<i>Pollen zonation for the Salina 4 core.</i>	88–9
3.5	<i>Pollen zonation for the Wied Żembaq 1 core.</i>	92–3
3.6	<i>Pollen zonation for the Xemxija 1 core.</i>	96–7
3.7	<i>Pollen zonation for the pit fills at In-Nuffara.</i>	101
3.8	<i>Pollen and palynofacies from the buried soils below the temple at Santa Verna.</i>	102
3.9	<i>Pollen and palynofacies from Test Pit 1 on the southwestern edge of the Ġgantija platform.</i>	104
3.10	<i>Photomicrographs (x800) of key components of the palynofacies at Santa Verna and Ġgantija.</i>	106
4.1	<i>Marsaxlokk 1 molluscan histogram.</i>	120
4.2	<i>Wied Żembaq 1 molluscan histogram.</i>	122
4.3	<i>Mġarr ix-Xini molluscan histogram.</i>	129
4.4	<i>Marsa 2 molluscan histogram.</i>	134
4.5	<i>Salina Deep Core molluscan histogram.</i>	138
4.6	<i>Marine molluscan histogram for the Salina Deep Core.</i>	139

4.7	<i>Xemxija 1 molluscan histogram.</i>	144
4.8	<i>Base of Xemxija 2 molluscan histogram.</i>	145
5.1	<i>Location map of the test excavation/sample sites and geoarchaeological survey areas on Gozo and Malta.</i>	164
5.2	<i>Plan of Santa Verna temple and the locations of the test trenches.</i>	166
5.3	<i>Santa Verna excavation trench profiles all with sample locations marked.</i>	167
5.4	<i>The red-brown buried soil profiles in Trench E, the Ashby and Trump Sondages within the Santa Verna temple site.</i>	170
5.5	<i>Santa Verna soil photomicrographs.</i>	172–3
5.6	<i>Plan of Ġgantija temple and locations of Test Pit 1 and the WC Trench excavations, with as-dug views of the WC Trench and TP1.</i>	175
5.7	<i>Section profiles of Ġgantija Test Pit 1 on the southwest side of Ġgantija temple and the east-west section of the Ġgantija WC Trench on the southeast side.</i>	176
5.8	<i>Ġgantija TP 1 photomicrographs.</i>	178
5.9	<i>Ġgantija WC Trench 1 photomicrographs.</i>	180
5.10	<i>Section profiles of Trench A at Skorba showing the locations of the micromorphological and OSL samples.</i>	183
5.11	<i>Skorba Trench A, section 1, photomicrographs.</i>	185
5.12	<i>Skorba Trench A, section 2, photomicrographs.</i>	186
5.13	<i>Taċ-Ċawla soil photomicrographs.</i>	189
5.14	<i>A typical terra rossa soil sequence in Xaghra town at construction site 2.</i>	191
5.15	<i>Xaghra soil photomicrographs.</i>	191
5.16	<i>In-Nuffara photomicrographs.</i>	193
5.17	<i>The Marsalforn (Pr 626) and Ramla (Pr 627) valley fill sequences, with the micromorphology samples and OSL profiling/dating loci marked.</i>	194
5.18	<i>Ramla and Marsalforn valley profiles soil photomicrographs.</i>	195
5.19	<i>Photomicrographs of the Blue Clay and Greensand geological substrates from the Ramla valley.</i>	199
5.20	<i>Xemxija 1 deep valley core photomicrographs.</i>	202
5.21	<i>Wied Żembaq 1 deep valley core photomicrographs.</i>	206
5.22	<i>Marsaxlokk and Salina Deep Core photomicrographs.</i>	210
5.23	<i>Scrub woodland on an abandoned terrace system and garrigue plateau land on the north coast of Gozo.</i>	213
5.24	<i>Terracing within land parcels (defined by modern sinuous lanes) on the Blue Clay slopes of the Ramla valley with Xaghra in the background.</i>	216
6.1	<i>The location of the Cambridge Gozo Project survey areas.</i>	224
6.2	<i>Fieldwalking survey data from around A. Ta Kuljat, B. Santa Verna, and C. Ghajnsielem on Gozo from the Cambridge Gozo survey and the FRAGSUS Project.</i>	227
6.3	<i>The first cycle of Neolithic occupation as recorded by the Cambridge Gozo survey using kernel density analysis for the Ghar Dalam, Red Skorba and Grey Skorba phases.</i>	229
6.4	<i>The first half of the second cycle of Neolithic occupation as recorded by the Cambridge Gozo survey using kernel density analysis implemented for the Żebbuġ and Mġarr phases.</i>	232
6.5	<i>The second half of the second cycle of Neolithic occupation as recorded by the Cambridge Gozo survey using kernel density analysis for the Ġgantija and Tarxien phases.</i>	233
7.1	<i>Kernel density analysis of the Tarxien Cemetery, Borġ in-Nadur and Bahrija periods for the areas covered by the Cambridge Gozo survey.</i>	244
7.2a	<i>The evidence for Bronze Age settlement in the Mdina area on Malta.</i>	245
7.2b	<i>The evidence for Bronze Age settlement in the Rabat (Gozo) area.</i>	245
7.3	<i>Distribution of Early Bronze Age dolmen on the Maltese Islands.</i>	246
7.4	<i>Distribution of presses discovered in the Mġarr ix-Xini valley during the survey.</i>	248
7.5	<i>The cultural heritage record of the Punic tower in Żurrieq through the centuries.</i>	249
7.6	<i>The changing patterns of social resilience, connectivity and population over the course of the centuries in the Maltese Islands.</i>	252
8.1	<i>An oblique aerial image of the northern slopes of the Maghtab land-fill site, depicting landscaping efforts including 'artificial' terracing.</i>	256
8.2	<i>RUSLE estimates of areas of low and moderate erosion for Gozo and Malta.</i>	259
9.1	<i>a) Sheep being led to their fold in Pwales down a track; b) Sheep grazing along a track on the Bajda Ridge in Xemxija, Malta.</i>	269

9.2	<i>Least-cost paths (LCPs), connecting garrigue areas, representing potential foraging routes across the Maltese landscape.</i>	271
9.3	<i>Density of LCPs connecting garrigue areas to random points within the garrigue areas themselves.</i>	272
9.4	<i>Location of 'public spaces', with size proportional to the distance to the nearest garrigue-to-garrigue LCP.</i>	273
9.5	<i>LCPs connecting farmhouses hosting animal pens to randomly generated points within garrigue areas in northwestern (A) and northeastern (B) Malta.</i>	274
9.6	<i>As for Figure 9.5, but representing west-central and east-central Malta.</i>	274
9.7	<i>As for Figure 9.5, but representing southern and southwestern Malta.</i>	275
9.8	<i>Location of 'public spaces', with size proportional to the distance to the nearest outbound journey.</i>	276
9.9	<i>a) Public space at Tal-Wei, between the modern town of Mosta and Naxxar; b) Tal-Wei public space as represented in 1940s survey sheets.</i>	277
9.10	<i>Approximate location of the (mostly disappeared) raħal toponyms.</i>	279
9.11	<i>Isochrones around farmhouse 4 representing the space that can be covered at 1-hour intervals considering animal walking speed.</i>	280
9.12	<i>Isochrones around farmhouse 2 representing the space that can be covered at 1-hour intervals considering animal walking speed (grazing while walking).</i>	281
9.13	<i>a) Isochrones around farmhouse 5 representing the space that can be covered at 1-hour intervals; b) Isochrones around farmhouse 6; c) Isochrones around farmhouse 7.</i>	282
10.1	<i>The likely distribution of built-up and cave-dwellings in the second half of the fourteenth century.</i>	286
10.2	<i>The lower frequency of settlement distribution by c. AD 1420.</i>	286
10.3	<i>The distribution of settlements just before AD 1530.</i>	288
10.4	<i>The late medieval Falson Palace in Mdina.</i>	289
10.5	<i>A girna integral with and surrounded by stone dry walling.</i>	290
10.6	<i>A hovel dwelling with a flight of rock-cut steps.</i>	291
10.7	<i>The hierarchical organisation of settlements continued, with the addition of Valletta, Floriana and the new towns around Birgu.</i>	295
10.8	<i>An example of a seventeenth century townhouse with open and closed timber balconies.</i>	296
10.9	<i>An example of a two-storey razzett belonging to a wealthier peasant family.</i>	297
10.10	<i>The distribution of built-up settlements in about AD 1900.</i>	299
10.11	<i>An example of a Neo-Classical house.</i>	301
11.1	<i>Summary of tree and shrub pollen frequencies at 10 sample sites.</i>	304
11.2	<i>Summary of cereal pollen frequencies at 14 sample sites.</i>	305
11.3	<i>Schematic profiles of possible trajectories of soil development in the major geological zones of Malta and Gozo.</i>	311
11.4	<i>The main elements of a new cultural-environmental story of the Maltese Islands throughout the last 10,000 years.</i>	317
A2.1	<i>Marsalforn valley, Gozo.</i>	360
A2.2	<i>Marsalforn valley, Gozo.</i>	361
A2.3	<i>Ramla valley, Gozo.</i>	361
A2.4	<i>Ġgantija Test Pit 1, Gozo.</i>	361
A2.5	<i>Skorba Neolithic site; trench A, East section; trench A, South section.</i>	362
A2.6	<i>Skorba, Trench A, South section.</i>	362
A2.7	<i>Tal-Istabal, Qormi, Malta.</i>	364
A2.8	<i>Tal-Istabal, Qormi, Malta.</i>	364
A2.9	<i>Photograph, showing locations of profile sample and OSL tubes, and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profile 1.</i>	365
A2.10	<i>Photograph, and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profile 3.</i>	365
A2.11	<i>Photograph, and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profile 2.</i>	366
A2.12	<i>Photograph, and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profiles 4 and 6.</i>	366
A2.13	<i>Photograph, and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profile 5.</i>	367
A2.14	<i>Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL and IRSL profile measurements for SUTL2916 (P1).</i>	370
A2.15	<i>Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL and IRSL profile measurements for SUTL2920 (P2).</i>	370
A2.16	<i>Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL and IRSL profile measurements for SUTL2913 (P3).</i>	370
A2.17	<i>Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL and IRSL profile measurements for SUTL2924 (P4).</i>	370

A2.18	<i>Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL and IRSL profile measurements for SUTL2929 (P5).</i>	371
A2.19	<i>Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL and IRSL profile measurements for SUTL2928 (P6).</i>	371
A2.20	<i>Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL and IRSL profile measurements for SUTL2931 (P7).</i>	371
A2.21	<i>Probability Distribution Functions for the stored dose on samples SUTL2914 and 2915.</i>	374
A2.22	<i>Probability Distribution Functions for the stored dose on samples SUTL2917–2919.</i>	374
A2.23	<i>Probability Distribution Functions for the stored dose on samples SUTL2921–2923.</i>	375
A2.24	<i>Probability Distribution Functions for the stored dose on samples SUTL2925–2927.</i>	375
A2.25	<i>Probability Distribution Function for the stored dose on sample SUTL2930.</i>	376
SB.1	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2914.</i>	385
SB.2	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2915.</i>	385
SB.3	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2917.</i>	386
SB.4	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2918.</i>	386
SB.5	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2919.</i>	387
SB.6	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2921.</i>	387
SB.7	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2922.</i>	388
SB.8	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2923.</i>	388
SB.9	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2925.</i>	389
SB.10	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2926.</i>	389
SB.11	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2927.</i>	390
SB.12	<i>Dose response curves for SUTL2930.</i>	390
SC.1	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2914.</i>	391
SC.2	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2915.</i>	391
SC.3	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2917.</i>	392
SC.4	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2918.</i>	392
SC.5	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2919.</i>	392
SC.6	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2921.</i>	393
SC.7	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2922.</i>	393
SC.8	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2923.</i>	393
SC.9	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2925.</i>	394
SC.10	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2926.</i>	394
SC.11	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2927.</i>	394
SC.12	<i>Abanico plot for SUTL2930.</i>	395
SD.1	<i>Apparent ages for profile 1, with OSL ages.</i>	397
SD.2	<i>Apparent ages for profile 2, with OSL ages.</i>	397
SD.3	<i>Apparent ages for profile 3, with OSL ages.</i>	398
SD.4	<i>Apparent ages for profiles 4 and 6, with OSL ages.</i>	398
SD.5	<i>Apparent ages for profile 5, with OSL ages.</i>	399
SD.6	<i>Apparent ages for profile 7.</i>	399

Tables

1.1	<i>Description of the geological formations found on the Maltese Islands.</i>	21
2.1	<i>The cultural sequence of the Maltese Islands (with all dates calibrated).</i>	37
2.2	<i>Quartz OSL sediment ages from the Marsalforn (2917–2919) and Ramla (2921–2923) valleys, the Skorba temple/buried soil (2925–2927) and Tal-Istabal, Qormi, soil (2930).</i>	40
2.3	<i>Dating results for positions in the sediment cores.</i>	45
2.4	<i>Summary stratigraphic descriptions of the sequences in the deep core profiles.</i>	57
2.5	<i>Mean sediment accumulation rates per area versus time for the deep cores.</i>	64
2.6	<i>Radiocarbon measurements and ΔR values from early twentieth century marine shells from Malta.</i>	65
2.7	<i>Calibrated AMS ^{14}C dates of charred plant remains from Santa Verna palaeosol, Gozo.</i>	68
2.8	<i>Physical properties of the catchments.</i>	68
2.9	<i>Normalized Diffuse Vegetation Index (NDVI) for the catchments in 2014–15 and average rainfall data for the weather station at Balzan for the period 1985 to 2012.</i>	69
3.1	<i>Semi-natural plant communities in the Maltese Islands.</i>	76

3.2	<i>Attribution of pollen taxa to plant communities in the Maltese Islands and more widely in the Central Mediterranean.</i>	77
3.3	<i>Characteristics of the taphonomic samples from on-shore and off-shore Mistra Valley, Malta.</i>	80
3.4	<i>The pollen zonation of the Salina Deep Core with modelled age-depths.</i>	84
3.5	<i>The pollen zonation of the Salina 4 core with modelled age-depths.</i>	90
3.6	<i>The pollen zonation of the Wied Żembaq 1 core with modelled age-depths.</i>	94
3.7	<i>The pollen zonation of the Xemxija 1 core with modelled age-depths.</i>	98
3.8	<i>The pollen zonation of the fill of a Bronze Age silo at In-Nuffara, Gozo.</i>	103
3.9	<i>Summary of the pollen analyses of the buried soil below the Santa Verna temple structure.</i>	103
3.10	<i>Summary of the pollen analyses from the buried soil in Ġgantija Test Pit 1.</i>	105
3.11	<i>Activity on Temple sites and high cereal pollen in adjacent cores.</i>	105
4.1	<i>List of freshwater molluscs and land snails found in the cores, habitat requirement, palaeontological record and current status and conservation in the Maltese Islands.</i>	118
4.2	<i>Molluscan zones for the Marsaxlokk 1 core (MX1).</i>	121
4.3	<i>Molluscan zones for the Wied Żembaq 1 core (WŻ1).</i>	123
4.4	<i>Molluscan zones for the Wied Żembaq 2 core (WŻ2).</i>	125
4.5	<i>Integration of molluscan zones from the Wied Żembaq 1 and 2 cores.</i>	128
4.6	<i>Molluscan zones for the Mġarr ix-Xini 1 core (MĠX1).</i>	130
4.7	<i>Molluscan zones for the Marsa 2 core (MC2).</i>	135
4.8	<i>The non-marine molluscan zones for the Salina Deep Core (SDC).</i>	140
4.9	<i>Molluscan zones for the Salina Deep Core (SDC).</i>	142
4.10	<i>Molluscan zones for the Xemxija 1 core (XEM1).</i>	146
4.11	<i>Molluscan zones for the Xemxija 2 core (XEM2).</i>	148
4.12	<i>Correlation and integration of molluscan data from Xemxija 1 (XEM1) and Xemxija 2 (XEM2).</i>	151
5.1	<i>Micromorphology and small bulk sample sites and numbers.</i>	162
5.2	<i>Summary of available dating for the sites investigated in Gozo and Malta.</i>	163
5.3	<i>pH, magnetic susceptibility, loss-on-ignition, calcium carbonate and % sand/silt/clay particle size analysis results for the Ġgantija, Santa Verna and the Xaghra town profiles, Gozo.</i>	168
5.4	<i>Selected multi-element results for Ġgantija, Santa Verna and Xaghra town buried soils, and the Marsalforn and Ramla valley sequences, Gozo.</i>	169
5.5	<i>Summary of the main soil micromorphological observations for the Santa Verna, Ġgantija and the Xaghra town profiles, Gozo.</i>	181
5.6	<i>pH, magnetic susceptibility and selected multi-element results for the palaeosols in section 1, Trench A, Skorba.</i>	184
5.7	<i>Loss-on-ignition organic/carbon/calcium carbonate frequencies and particle size analysis results for the palaeosols in section 1, Trench A, Skorba.</i>	184
5.8	<i>Summary of the main soil micromorphological observations of the buried soils in sections 1 and 2, Trench A, Skorba.</i>	188
5.9	<i>Summary of the main soil micromorphological observations of the possible buried soils at Taċ-Ċawla.</i>	189
5.10	<i>Field descriptions and micromorphological observations for the quarry and construction site profiles in Xaghra town.</i>	190
5.11	<i>Sample contexts and micromorphological observations for two silo fills at In-Nuffara.</i>	192
5.12	<i>Summary of the main soil micromorphological observations from the Ramla and Marsalforn valley fill profiles.</i>	196
5.13	<i>Main characteristics of the Upper and Lower Coralline Limestone, Globigerina Limestone, Blue Clay and Greensand.</i>	197
5.14	<i>Summary micromorphological descriptions and suggested interpretations for the Xemxija 1 core.</i>	200
5.15	<i>Summary micromorphological descriptions and suggested interpretations for the Wied Żembaq 1 core.</i>	207
5.16	<i>Summary micromorphological descriptions and suggested interpretations for the Marsaxlokk 1 core.</i>	209
5.17	<i>Summary micromorphological descriptions and suggested interpretations for the base zone of the base of the Salina Deep Core.</i>	211
8.1	<i>Carrying capacity estimates for the Neolithic/Temple Period of the Maltese Archipelago.</i>	258
8.2	<i>Summary of population changes in the Maltese Archipelago.</i>	261
11.1	<i>Summary of the environmental and vegetation changes in the Maltese Islands over the longue durée.</i>	306

11.2	<i>Summary of events revealed by the molluscan data in the deep cores.</i>	309
11.3	<i>Major phases of soil, vegetation and landscape development and change during the Holocene.</i>	312
11.4	<i>Occurrence of gypsum in FRAGSUS cores and contemporary events.</i>	314
A2.1	<i>Sample descriptions, contexts and archaeological significance of the profiling samples used for initial screening and laboratory characterization.</i>	358
A2.2	<i>Sample descriptions, contexts and archaeological significance of sediment samples SUTL2914–2930.</i>	360
A2.3	<i>Activity and equivalent concentrations of K, U and Th determined by HRGS.</i>	368
A2.4	<i>Infinite matrix dose rates determined by HRGS and TSBC.</i>	368
A2.5	<i>Effective beta and gamma dose rates following water correction.</i>	369
A2.6	<i>SAR quality parameters.</i>	369
A2.7	<i>Comments on equivalent dose distributions of SUTL2914 to SUTL2930.</i>	372
A2.8	<i>Quartz OSL sediment ages.</i>	372
A2.9	<i>Locations, dates and archaeological significance of sediment samples SUTL2914–2930.</i>	373
SA.1	<i>Field profiling data, as obtained using portable OSL equipment, for the sediment stratigraphies examined on Gozo and Malta.</i>	379
SA.2	<i>OSL screening measurements on paired aliquots of 90–250 µm 40% HF-etched ‘quartz’.</i>	380
SA.3	<i>OSL screening measurements on three aliquots of 90–250 µm 40% HF-etched ‘quartz’ for SUTL2924.</i>	382
SA.4	<i>IRSL screening measurements on paired aliquots of 90–250 µm 15% HF-etched ‘polymineral’.</i>	382
SA.5	<i>IRSL screening measurements on three aliquots of 90–250 µm 15% HF-etched ‘polymineral’ for SUTL2924.</i>	383
A3.1	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Salina Deep Core.</i>	401
A3.2	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Salina 4 core.</i>	405
A3.3	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Salina 2 core.</i>	407
A3.4	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Xemxija 1 core.</i>	408
A3.5	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Xemxija 2 core.</i>	411
A3.6	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Wied Żembaq 1 core.</i>	413
A3.7	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Wied Żembaq 2 core.</i>	413
A3.8	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Mgarr ix-Xini core.</i>	414
A3.9	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Marsaxlokk core.</i>	416
A3.10	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Marsa 2 core.</i>	417
A3.11	<i>Stratigraphy and interpretation of the Mellieha Bay core.</i>	418
A3.12	<i>Key to the scheme for the description of Quaternary sediments.</i>	419
A4.1	<i>Marsa 2.</i>	421 (online edition only)
A4.2	<i>Mgarr ix-Xini.</i>	424 (online edition only)
A4.3	<i>Salina Deep Core.</i>	427 (online edition only)
A4.4	<i>Wied Żembaq 2.</i>	429 (online edition only)
A4.5	<i>Wied Żembaq 1.</i>	430 (online edition only)
A4.6	<i>Xemxija 1.</i>	432 (online edition only)
A4.7	<i>Xemxija 2.</i>	435 (online edition only)
A4.8	<i>Marsaxlokk 1.</i>	438 (online edition only)
A5.1	<i>Marsa 2.</i>	442 (online edition only)
A5.2	<i>Mgarr ix-Xini.</i>	456 (online edition only)
A5.3	<i>Salina Deep Core non-marine.</i>	466 (online edition only)
A5.4	<i>Salina Deep Core marine.</i>	478 (online edition only)
A5.5	<i>Wied Żembaq 2.</i>	490 (online edition only)
A5.6	<i>Wied Żembaq 1.</i>	496 (online edition only)
A5.7	<i>Xemxija 1.</i>	502 (online edition only)
A5.8	<i>Xemxija 2.</i>	516 (online edition only)
A5.9	<i>Marsaxlokk 1.</i>	528 (online edition only)
A8.1	<i>Xemxija 1 core micromorphology sample descriptions.</i>	557
A8.2	<i>Wied Żembaq 1 core micromorphology sample descriptions.</i>	559
A8.3	<i>Marsaxlokk core micromorphology sample descriptions.</i>	560
A8.4	<i>Salina Deep Core micromorphology sample descriptions.</i>	561
A9.1	<i>The charcoal data from the Skorba, Kordin, In-Nuffara and Salina Deep Core.</i>	563

Preface and dedication

Caroline Malone

The *FRAGSUS Project* emerged as the direct result of an invitation to undertake new archaeological fieldwork in Malta in 1985. Anthony Bonanno of the University of Malta organized a conference on 'The Mother Goddess of the Mediterranean' in which Colin Renfrew was a participant. The discussions that resulted prompted an invitation that made its way to David Trump (Tutor in Continuing Education, Cambridge University), Caroline Malone (then Curator of the Avebury Keiller Museum) and Simon Stoddart (then a post-graduate researcher in Cambridge). We eagerly took up the invitation to devise a new collaborative, scientifically based programme of research on prehistoric Malta.

What resulted was the original Cambridge Gozo Project (1987–94) and the excavations of the Xagħra Brochtorff Circle and the Ġhajnsielem Road Neolithic house. Both those sites had been found by local antiquarian, Joseph Attard-Tabone, a long-established figure in the island for his work on conservation and site identification.

As this and the two other volumes in this series report, the original Cambridge Gozo Project was the germ of a rich and fruitful academic collaboration that has had international impact, and has influenced successive generations of young archaeologists in Malta and beyond.

As the Principal Investigator of the *FRAGSUS Project*, on behalf of the very extensive *FRAGSUS* team I want to dedicate this the first volume of the series to the enlightened scholars who set up this now 35 year-long collaboration of prehistoric inquiry with our heartfelt thanks for their role in our studies.

We dedicate this volume to:

Joseph Attard Tabone
Professor Anthony Bonanno
Professor Lord Colin Renfrew

and offer our profound thanks for their continuing role in promoting the prehistory of Malta.

Acknowledgements

This volume records research undertaken with funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013)/ERC Grant Agreement n. 323727 (*FRAGSUS Project: Fragility and sustainability in small island environments: adaptation, cultural change and collapse in prehistory* – <http://www.qub.ac.uk/sites/FRAGSUS/>). All the authors of this volume are indebted to the ERC for its financial support, and to the Principal Investigator of the *FRAGSUS Project*, Prof. Caroline Malone (Queen's University, Belfast, UK), for her central role in devising the project and seeing this research through to publication.

For Chapter 2, we extend warm thanks to the staff of the ¹⁴CHRONO centre at QUB, especially Stephen Hoper, Jim McDonald, Michelle Thompson and Ron Reimer, all of whom took a keen interest in the *FRAGSUS Project*. The success of the *FRAGSUS Project* in general and the radiocarbon dating exercise has depended on their work. We thank the Physical Geography Laboratory staff at the School of Geography, University College Dublin, for the use of their ITRAX XRF core scanner. In particular, we would like to thank Dr Steve McCarron, Department of Geography, National University of Ireland, Maynooth and Dr Jonathan Turner, Department of Geography, National University of Ireland, University College, Dublin. We thank Prof. Patrick Schembri for sourcing and collecting the *Acanthocardia* samples from the Natural Museum of Natural History. Sean Pyne O'Donnell thanks Dr Chris Hayward at the Tephrochronology Analytical Unit (TAU), University of Edinburgh, for help and advice during microprobe work. Dr Maxine Anastasi, Department of Classics and Archaeology, University of Malta, helped identify the pottery from the settlement cores. Dr Frank Carroll helped show us the way forward; but sadly is no longer with us. Chris Hunt, Rory Flood, Michell Farrell, Sean Pyne O'Donnell and Mevrick Spiteri were the coring team.

They were helped by Vincent Van Walt, who provided technical assistance. Al Ruffell and John Meneely did geophysical evaluation and GRP location of the cores. During fieldwork, Tim Kinnaird and Charles French were assisted by Sean Taylor, Jeremy Bennett and Simon Stoddart. We are grateful to the Superintendence of Cultural Heritage, Malta and Heritage Malta for permission to undertake the analyses and much practical assistance.

For Chapter 5, we would like to thank all at Heritage Malta, the Ġgantija visitor's centre and the University of Malta for their friendly and useful assistance throughout. In particular, we would like to thank George Azzopardi, Daphne Caruana, Josef Caruana, Nathaniel Cutajar, Chris Gemmell, Reuben Grima, Joanne Mallia, Christian Mifsud, Anthony Pace, Ella Samut-Tagliaferro, Mevrick Spiteri, Katya Stroud, Sharon Sultana and Nick Vella. We also thank Tonko Rajkovača of the McBurney Laboratory, Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge, for making the thin section slides, the Physical Geography Laboratory, Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, and the ALS Global laboratory in Seville, Spain, for processing the multi-element analyses.

For Chapter 6, Reuben Grima wrote the first draft of this contribution, receiving comments and additions from the other authors.

For Chapter 7, Simon Stoddart wrote the first draft of this contribution, receiving comments and additions from the other authors.

For Chapter 9, we thank Sharlo Camilleri for providing us with a copy of the GIS data produced by the MALSIS (MALtese Soil Information System) project. We are grateful to Prof. Saviour Formosa and Prof. Timmy Gambin, both of the University of Malta, who facilitated the donation of LiDAR data, together with computer facilities, as part of the European project ERDF156 *Developing National Environmental Monitoring Infrastructure and Capacity*, from the former Malta

Environment and Planning Authority. A number of individuals were happy to share their recollections of shepherding practices in Malta and Gozo over the last sixty or seventy years; others facilitated the encounters. We are grateful to all of them: Charles Gauci, Grezzju Meilaq, Joseph Micallef, Louis Muscat, Ċettina and Anglu Vella, Ernest Vella and Renata Zerafa.

Simon Stoddart would like to thank Prof. Martin Jones and Rachel Ballantyne for their advice in constructing Figure 11.4. The editors would like to thank Emma Hannah for compiling the index.

Firstly, the FRAGSUS Project is the result of a very generous research grant from the European Research Council (Advanced Grant no' 323727), without which this and its two partner volumes and the research undertaken could not have taken place. We heartily thank the ERC for its award and the many administrators in Brussels who monitored our use of

the grant. The research team also wants to record our indebtedness to the administrators of the grant within our own institutions, since this work required detailed and dedicated attention. In particular we thank Rory Jordan in the Research Support Office, Stephen Hoper and Jim McDonald – CHRONO lab, and Martin Stroud (Queen's University Belfast), Laura Cousens (Cambridge University), Glen Farrugia and Cora Magri (University of Malta), the Curatorial, Finance and Designs & Exhibitions Departments in Heritage Malta and Stephen Borg at the Superintendence of Cultural Heritage. Finally, we thank Fr. Joe Inguanez (Emeritus Head of Department, Department of Sociology, University of Malta) for offering us the *leitmotif* of this volume while a visiting scholar in Magdalene College, Cambridge: '*Mingħajr art u ħamrija, m'hemmx sinjorija*' translating as 'without land and soil, there is no wealth'.

Foreword

Anthony Pace

Sustainability, as applied in archaeological research and heritage management, provides a useful perspective for understanding the past as well as the modern conditions of archaeological sites themselves. As often happens in archaeological thought, the idea of sustainability was borrowed from other areas of concern, particularly from the modern construct of development and its bearing on the environment and resource exploitation. The term sustainability entered common usage as a result of the unstoppable surge in resource exploitation, economic development, demographic growth and the human impacts on the environment that has gripped the World since 1500. Irrespective of scale and technology, most human activity of an economic nature has not spared resources from impacts, transformations or loss irrespective of historical and geographic contexts. Theories of sustainability may provide new narratives on the archaeology of Malta and Gozo, but they are equally important and of central relevance to contemporary issues of cultural heritage conservation and care. Though the archaeological resources of the Maltese islands can throw light on the past, one has to recognize that such resources are limited, finite and non-renewable. The sense of urgency with which these resources have to be identified, listed, studied, archived and valued is akin to that same urgency with which objects of value and all fragile forms of natural and cultural resources require constant stewardship and protection. The idea of sustainability therefore, follows a common thread across millennia.

It is all the more reason why cultural resource management requires particular attention through research, valorization and protection. The *FRAGSUS Project* (Fragility and sustainability in small island environments: adaptation, cultural change and collapse in prehistory) was intended to further explore and enhance existing knowledge on the prehistory of Malta and Gozo. The objective of the project as

designed by the participating institutional partners and scholars, was to explore untapped field resources and archived archaeological material from a number of sites and their landscape to answer questions that could be approached with new techniques and methods. The results of the *FRAGSUS Project* will serve to advance our knowledge of certain areas of Maltese prehistory and to better contextualize the archipelago's importance as a model for understanding island archaeology in the central Mediterranean. The work that has been invested in *FRAGSUS* lays the foundation for future research.

Malta and Gozo are among the Mediterranean islands whose prehistoric archaeology has been intensely studied over a number of decades. This factor is important, yet more needs to be done in the field of Maltese archaeology and its valorization. Research is not the preserve of academic specialists. It serves to enhance not only what we know about the Maltese islands, but more importantly, why the archipelago's cultural landscape and its contents deserve care and protection especially at a time of extensive construction development. Strict rules and guidelines established by the Superintendence of Cultural Heritage have meant that during the last two decades more archaeological sites and deposits have been protected in situ or rescue-excavated through a statutory watching regime. This supervision has been applied successfully in a wide range of sites located in urban areas, rural locations and the landscape, as well as at the World Heritage Sites of Valletta, Ġgantija, Haġar Qim and Mnajdra and Tarxien. This activity has been instrumental in understanding ancient and historical land use, and the making of the Maltese historic centres and landscape.

Though the cumulative effect of archaeological research is being felt more strongly, new areas of interest still need to be addressed. Most pressing are those areas of landscape studies which often become

peripheral to the attention that is garnered by prominent megalithic monuments. *FRAGSUS* has once again confirmed that there is a great deal of value in studying field systems, terraces and geological settings which, after all, were the material media in which modern Malta and Gozo ultimately developed. There is, therefore, an interplay in the use of the term sustainability, an interplay between what we can learn from the way ancient communities tested and used the very same island landscape which we occupy today, and the manner in which this landscape is treated in contested economic realities. If we are to seek factors of sustainability in the past, we must first protect its relics and study them using the best available methods in our times. On the other hand, the study of the past using the materiality of ancient peoples requires strong research agendas and thoughtful stewardship. The *FRAGSUS Project* has shown us how even small fragile deposits, nursed through protective legislation and guardianship, can yield significant information which the methods of pioneering scholars of Maltese archaeology would not have enabled access to. As already outlined by the Superintendence of Cultural Heritage, a national research agenda for cultural heritage and the humanities is a desideratum. Such a framework, reflected in the institutional partnership of the

FRAGSUS Project, will bear valuable results that will only advance Malta's interests especially in today's world of instant e-knowledge that was not available on such a global scale a mere two decades ago.

FRAGSUS also underlines the relevance of studying the achievements and predicaments of past societies to understand certain, though not all, aspects of present environmental challenges. The twentieth century saw unprecedented environmental changes as a result of modern political-economic constructs. Admittedly, twentieth century developments cannot be equated with those of antiquity in terms of demography, technology, food production and consumption or the use of natural resources including the uptake of land. However, there are certain aspects, such as climate change, changing sea levels, significant environmental degradation, soil erosion, the exploitation and abandonment of land resources, the building and maintenance of field terraces, the rate and scale of human demographic growth, movement of peoples, access to scarce resources, which to a certain extent reflect impacts that seem to recur in time, irrespectively of scale and historic context.

Anthony Pace
Superintendent of Cultural Heritage (2003–18).

Appendix 2

Luminescence analysis and dating of sediments from archaeological sites and valley fill sequences

Alan J. Cresswell, David C.W. Sanderson, Timothy C. Kinnaird
& Charles French

A2.1. Summary

This report describes Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) investigations to provide a temporal framework to underpin investigations into the early Holocene topography of the Ramla and Marsalforn valleys, Gozo, and excavations at the Neolithic temple sites of Ġgantija, Gozo and Skorba, Malta, and the Punic-Roman site of Tal-Istabal, Qormi, on the outskirts of Valletta in Malta. These chronologies are also of benefit in understanding the development and history of these World Heritage Site monuments.

Although the local limestone geology was not expected to generate quartz-rich sediments, micromorphology conducted by the FRAGSUS team had shown the presence of sand sized quartz within local soils and sediments. Field and laboratory profile measurements were conducted on 60 samples from seven sequences to provide initial assessments of the brightness of luminescence signals from different silicate fractions, and the stratigraphic relationships between the range of signals measured, to assess the prospects of being able to determine robust age quantifications from these materials, and guide the collection of larger tube samples for OSL dating. Laboratory profiling measurements confirmed the presence of quartz in prepared sediments with generally bright luminescence signals, and opening the way for Single Aliquot Regenerative (SAR) OSL dating of quartz fractions from 12 tube samples collected from five sites, with accompanying field and laboratory dose rate measurements.

At both the Ġgantija Temple (Gozo) and Skorba Temple/settlement (Malta), profile samples collected from below the modern agricultural soils show photon counts and apparent doses that increase steadily with depth, indicating that these buried soils accumulated gradually without subsequent disturbance. The OSL equivalent dose measurements showed no significant

variation between aliquots, again indicating that the quartz minerals had been zeroed prior to deposition without subsequent disturbance, allowing robust ages to be determined. For both these locations, the OSL dates for the bottom of the sequences indicating the onset of soil accumulation were consistent at 8560 ± 630 BC (Ġgantija) and 8780 ± 710 BC (Skorba). At Ġgantija the top of this buried soil gives a Bronze Age OSL date of 1140 ± 250 BC, whereas the OSL date for the top of the buried soil at Skorba is 7760 ± 560 BC, predating the known Neolithic activity at the site.

At Ramla and Marsalforn Valleys, OSL investigations were conducted on sequences of buried palaeosols, hillwash and alluvial deposits. For Marsalforn Valley, the profile samples show a slight increase in photon counts and dose with depth, suggesting a gradual build-up of material. However, the OSL samples show evidence of multiple dose components, including high dose residuals, consistent with variations in light exposure during the reworking of soils. The upper sample could not be reliably dated, and the lower two samples generate the same age within uncertainties (1560 ± 240 BC and 1480 ± 340 BC). The Ramla Valley profiles are complex, showing relatively high photon counts in the upper samples decreasing with depth, and no clear trend in the apparent dose estimates. The OSL samples all show evidence of multiple dose components, including both high dose residuals and modern OSL dates in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries AD.

The investigations reported here are the first applications of luminescence techniques on these sites. The results show that quartz OSL is an applicable approach to investigations of these sites, and that luminescence profiling techniques using field instruments and laboratory methods are highly informative. There is clearly the potential to apply these techniques to establish more detailed chronologies in future work.

A2.2. Introduction

Situated in the Mediterranean, the archipelago of Malta and Gozo lies close to the route of the spread of agricultural practices from the Fertile Crescent along the southern coast of Europe, and later dispersions of Neolithic cultural practices including monumental architecture. Agriculture based on wheat cultivation developed in the Fertile Crescent of the Near East around 9000 BC, and spread along the southern coast of Europe, largely associated with maritime movement, with early farming communities on Crete (c. 7000 BC), east-central Greece (c. 6500 BC), Dalmatia (c. 5700 BC), southern Italy (c. 6000 BC) and southern Iberia (c. 6000 BC). The first evidence of Holocene human activity on Malta, evidenced by pottery shards and the charred remains of fires and bones, has been dated to approximately 5000 BC (Trump 1966; Renfrew 1972). The emergence of visible social complexity is evidenced in enclosed sites and communal tombs in southeast Spain in the later fourth millennium BC. It has been suggested that the necessity of water control in arid regions lead, in part, to the emergence of such social complexity.

The archipelago of Malta and Gozo has a seasonally dry and hot climate which makes the natural landscape marginal for agriculture, and it has been presumed that from prehistoric times terracing has been extensively adopted to conserve soils and moisture, improving the landscape for agriculture (Sagona 2015). In addition, common to other parts of the Mediterranean, the islands are believed to have been prone to deforestation, drought and soil erosion since Neolithic times (Bevan & Conolly 2013; Brandt and Thornes 1996; Djamali *et al.* 2013; Grima 2008a; Grove & Rackham 2003; Hughes 2011). The research on these islands within the *FRAGSUS Project* aimed to examine these assumptions through a detailed geoarchaeological and micromorphological study of two significant Neolithic palaeosol contexts from beneath the Santa Verna and Ġgantija Neolithic temple sites and the associated Marsalforn and Ramla valleys to either side of the Xagħra plateau on Gozo.

The work reported here uses luminescence techniques to develop chronological frameworks for these investigations. Chronologies have previously been developed based on radiocarbon analysis (Trump 1966; Renfrew 1972) for the temple complex at Skorba with calibrated dates ranging from c. 5000 BC to 3200 BC, however luminescence approaches have not to date been widely used on Malta and Gozo. Luminescence techniques have, however, been widely used in Neolithic contexts in the Mediterranean, and beyond, for establishing robust chronologies. Examples in

the Mediterranean region include megalithic tombs at Cabeço dos Pendentes in Portugal (Kinnaird *et al.* 2015), Neolithic monuments in Corsica (Sanderson *et al.* 2014), deltaic sediments associated with cultural activity from the Neolithic onwards on Crete (Zacharias *et al.* 2000), and Neolithic settlements, cemeteries and landscapes in Cyprus (Kinnaird *et al.* 2007, 2013). These techniques have also been used to investigate rates of soil erosion in Greece (Fuchs *et al.* 2004) using material largely devoid of quartz minerals, and river development in Crete (Macklin *et al.* 2010) where quartz minerals are derived from local sandstone.

The geology of Malta is dominated by limestone, resulting in locally derived soils largely devoid of silicate minerals suitable for luminescence dating. However, windblown sands from the Sahara are expected to deliver small quantities of silicates to the island. The Sahara is the largest source of aeolian dust, accounting for approximately half of the total atmospheric mineral dust burden (Scheuvsens *et al.* 2013), with dust from the Sahara deposited in south and central America, the Atlantic Ocean, Europe and the Mediterranean, India and sub-Saharan Africa over the last 5 million years. In the Western Mediterranean, the dominant source of dust is from Tunisia and northern Algeria with dust generated from dry lakes and alluvial deposits (Scheuvsens *et al.* 2013). Dust emission is a complex relationship between wind and surface conditions. Generally, small particles (<70 µm) experience large interparticle cohesive forces relative to aerodynamic forces acting on the particles, with aerodynamic forces becoming relatively larger with larger grain size. Thus, larger grains are mobilized first and follow ballistic curves with impacts on the ground mobilizing the smaller particles (Schepanski 2018). Alluvial sediments are very prone to wind erosion, with temporally varying erodibility as the most susceptible particles are removed from the sediment with refreshing of sediments during floods (Schepanski 2018). Thus, dust emission strongly reflects environmental conditions, being largest in dry periods. The transport distance strongly depends on residence time in the atmosphere; fine particles (<70 µm) are kept aloft by atmospheric turbulence for durations of weeks and can be transported thousands of km, with larger particles generally depositing within a day although larger particles are occasionally found >1000 km from their source (Schepanski 2018). The typical red Mediterranean soils, or *terra rossa*, on limestone substrates found throughout this region are also common on Malta and Gozo. The silicate minerals in similar soils in Greece have been attributed to aeolian deposition of material blown from North Africa (MacLeod 1980; Mizota *et al.* 1988), although larger mineral grains in low lying

regions have been attributed to local beaches (Mizota *et al.* 1988). Yaalon (1997) argues that aeolian dust from the Sahara contributes to all soils in the Mediterranean region, with up to 50 per cent of aeolian material in limestone derived soils. Micromorphological investigations conducted within the *FRAGSUS Project* have already shown the presence of sand sized silicates within local soils and sediments (French *et al.* 2018).

Quartz grains from the Sahara are expected to be well suited to OSL dating, with a reputation for being bright (e.g. Bevan *et al.* 2013; Kinnaird *et al.* 2013; Mauz *et al.* 2009; Russell & Armitage 2012), but may not be abundant. Fuchs *et al.* (2004) have shown that similar soils in Greece without abundant quartz can be accurately dated. The relative abundance of these grains may reflect climatic variations, in particular changes in aridity in the Sahara which may alter the supply of grains and prevailing wind directions and strengths affecting the transport of these grains to Malta. Although it is expected that aeolian grains will be bleached in transit, many of the grains in the soils will have been transported to the islands before incorporation in the soils having been reworked from earlier soils. The aim of the OSL investigations reported here is to provide a temporal framework to underpin investigations into the earlier Holocene topography of the Ramla and Marsalforn valleys, Gozo, and on the excavations at the Neolithic temple sites of Ġgantija, Gozo and Skorba, Malta. The objective of the field campaign was to retrieve samples from existing soil/sediment profiles in Gozo for OSL dating, and to sample the new test excavations at Skorba in Malta for micromorphology, physical characterization and OSL dating.

On Gozo, three sites were visited: the Neolithic temple site of Ġgantija on the Xagħra plateau; the Ramla valley, which separates the Xagħra plateau from the Nuffara plateau to the south; and the Marsalforn valley, a tributary valley of the Ramla. From the more extensive fieldwork of French and Taylor (see Chapter 5), it is known that the plateaus are largely denuded of soil and vegetation (i.e. Holocene strata), the little that remains in terms of (Holocene) hillwash (colluvium) and alluvial deposits is concentrated on the lower slopes and in the lower parts of the topography, such as in the Ramla and Marsalforn valleys. The OSL investigations in the Ramla and Marsalforn valleys were undertaken with the aim of generating a chronology for the sequences of buried palaeosols, hillwash and alluvial deposits preserved there, and thus the means to re-construct the earlier Holocene to Recent development of the Gozo valley-scale with time. At Ġgantija, the objective was to provide a chronology for the buried soil sequence located off-site, in

Test Pit 1, to establish the soil catena history for this part of Gozo.

On Malta, two sites were visited: the Neolithic temple site of Skorba and a development site with Punic-Roman archaeology present at Marsa in Valletta. Test excavations in 2016 on the western edge of the Skorba temple/settlement had revealed a 1.5 m deep sequence, within which three curvilinear stone walls of the Neolithic period effectively sealed c. 70 cm of soil accumulation. From field excavations, it is suggested that the lower c. 50 cm of this soil was in fact a buried soil, albeit with the upper c. 20 cm probably being disturbed (in the past) (see Chapter 5). The objective here, was again to provide a chronology for the buried soil sequence, and identify any correlations between the soil formation/properties and prehistoric activity.

A2.3. Methods

A2.3.1. Sampling and field screening measurements

The aim of the April 2016 fieldwork was to retrieve samples from existing soil/sediment profiles in Gozo for OSL dating, and to sample the new test excavations at Skorba in Malta for OSL dating, physical characterization and micromorphology. In addition, a development site with Punic-Roman archaeology present at Marsa in Valletta was also sampled.

All samples were first appraised using the SUERC portable OSL reader, following an interleaved sequence of system dark count (background), infra-red stimulated luminescence (IRSL) and OSL, similar to that described by Sanderson and Murphy (2010). This method allows for the calculation of IRSL and OSL net signal intensities, depletion indices and IRSL:OSL ratios, which are then used to generate luminescence-depth profiles. The patterns in these data allow initial inferences and conjectures about trends or discontinuities in field profiles to be made, in combination with other initial observations of the sedimentology, which are used to refine further sampling. These can be refined and evaluated through further laboratory assessments.

A2.3.2. Laboratory calibrated screening measurements

Having established that there were measureable stratigraphic trends in the luminescence 'field' profiles, it remained to be determined whether these signal progressions are influenced, or indeed controlled, by sensitivity variations. Laboratory profiling provides one means to assess luminescence sensitivity distributions, and the first preliminary assessment of apparent doses.

All profiling samples were wet sieved at 90 and 250 μm . The 90–250 μm fractions were then subjected

to acid treatments of 1M HCl for 10 minutes, 15 per cent HF for 15 minutes and 1M HCl for 10 minutes. The samples were split into two fractions, one for polymineral analysis and one for quartz analysis. The quartz fraction was submitted to further acid treatments of 40 per cent HF for 40 minutes and 1M HCl for 10 minutes.

Luminescence sensitivities (Photon Counts per Gy) and stored doses (Gy) were evaluated from paired aliquots of the polymineral and HF-etched quartz fractions, using Risø DA-15 automatic readers (following procedures established in Burbidge *et al.* 2007; Sanderson *et al.* 2001, 2003). The readout cycles comprised a natural readout, followed by readout cycles for a nominal 1 Gy test dose, a 5 Gy regenerative dose, and a further 1 Gy test dose. For the polymineral samples, a 220°C preheat was followed by 60s OSL measurements using the IR LEDs at 50°C, the blue LEDs at 125°C, and a TL measurement to 500°C. For the quartz samples, a 220°C pre-heat was used with 60s OSL measurements using the blue LEDs.

A2.4. Quartz OSL SAR measurements

A2.4.1. Sample preparation

Water contents

Dating materials and bulk sediment samples were weighed, saturated with water and re-weighed. Following oven drying at 50 °C to constant weight, the actual and saturated water contents were determined as fractions of dry weight. These data were used, together with information on field conditions to determine water contents and an associated water content uncertainty for use in dose rate determination.

HRGS and TSBC sample preparation

Bulk quantities of material, weighing 50–100 g, were removed from each full dating and bulk sediment sample for environmental dose rate determinations. These dried materials were transferred to high-density-polyethylene (HDPE) pots and sealed with epoxy resin for high-resolution gamma spectrometry (HRGS). Each pot was stored for three weeks prior to measurement to allow equilibration of ²²²Rn daughters. A further 20 g of the dried material was used in thick source beta counting (TSBC; Sanderson 1988).

Quartz mineral preparation

Approximately 5–10 g of material was removed for each tube and processed to obtain sand-sized quartz grains for luminescence measurements. Each sample was wet sieved to obtain the 90–150 and 150–250 µm fractions. The 90–150 µm fractions were treated with

1 M hydrochloric acid (HCl) for 10 minutes, 15 per cent hydrofluoric acid (HF) for 15 minutes, and 1 M HCl for a further 10 minutes. The HF-etched sub-samples were then centrifuged in sodium polytungstate solutions of ~2.58, 2.62, and 2.74 g cm⁻³, to obtain concentrates of potassium-rich feldspars (<2.58 g cm⁻³), sodium feldspars (2.58–2.62 g cm⁻³) and quartz plus plagioclase (2.62–2.74 g cm⁻³). The selected quartz fraction was then subjected to further HF and HCl washes (40 per cent HF for 40 minutes, followed by 1M HCl for 10 minutes).

All materials were dried at 50° C and transferred to Eppendorf tubes. The 40 per cent HF-etched, 2.62–2.74 g cm⁻³ ‘quartz’ 90–150 µm fractions were dispensed to 10 mm stainless steel discs for measurement. The purity of which was checked using a Hitachi S-3400N scanning electron microscope (SEM), coupled with an Oxford Instruments INCA EDX system, to determine approximate elemental concentrations for each sample. 8–32 aliquots were dispensed for each sample, depending on quartz yield.

A2.4.2. Measurements and determinations

Dose rates

Dose rates were measured in the laboratory using HRGS and TSBC. Full sets of laboratory dose rate determinations were made for all samples.

HRGS measurements were performed using a 50 per cent relative efficiency ‘n’ type hyper-pure Ge detector (EG&G Ortec Gamma-X) operated in a low background lead shield with a copper liner. Gamma ray spectra were recorded over the 30 keV to 3 MeV range from each sample, interleaved with background measurements and measurements from SUERC Shap Granite standard in the same geometries. Sample counts were for 80 ks. The spectra were analysed to determine count rates from the major line emissions from ⁴⁰K (1461 keV), and from selected nuclides in the U decay series (²³⁴Th, ²²⁶Ra + ²³⁵U, ²¹⁴Pb, ²¹⁴Bi and ²¹⁰Pb) and the Th decay series (²²⁸Ac, ²¹²Pb, ²⁰⁸Tl) and their statistical counting uncertainties. Net rates and activity concentrations for each of these nuclides were determined relative to Shap Granite by weighted combination of the individual lines for each nuclide. The internal consistency of nuclide specific estimates for U and Th decay series nuclides was assessed relative to measurement precision, and weighted combinations used to estimate mean activity concentrations (Bq kg⁻¹) and elemental concentrations (per cent K and ppm U, Th) for the parent activity. These data were used to determine infinite matrix dose rates for alpha, beta and gamma radiation.

Beta dose rates were also measured directly using the SUERC TSBC system (Sanderson 1988). Count rates were determined with six replicate 600 s counts on

each sample, bracketed by background measurements and sensitivity determinations using the Shap Granite secondary reference material. Infinite-matrix dose rates were calculated by scaling the net count rates of samples and reference material to the working beta dose rate of the Shap Granite ($6.25 \pm 0.03 \text{ mGy a}^{-1}$). The estimated errors combine counting statistics, observed variance and the uncertainty on the reference value.

The dose rate measurements were used in combination with the assumed burial water contents, to determine the overall effective dose rates for age estimation. Cosmic dose rates were evaluated by combining latitude and altitude specific dose rates ($0.17 \pm 0.01 \text{ mGy a}^{-1}$) for the site with corrections for estimated depth of overburden using the method of Prescott and Hutton (1994).

Quartz SAR luminescence measurements

All measurements were conducted using a Risø DA-15 automatic reader equipped with a $^{90}\text{Sr}/^{90}\text{Y}$ β -source for irradiation, blue LEDs emitting around 470 nm and infrared (laser) diodes emitting around 830 nm for optical stimulation, and a U340 detection filter pack to detect in the region 270–380 nm, while cutting out stimulating light (Bøtter-Jensen *et al.* 2000).

Equivalent dose determinations were made on sets of 8–32 aliquots per sample, using a single aliquot regeneration (SAR) sequence (cf. Murray & Wintle 2000). Using this procedure, the OSL signal levels from each individual disc were calibrated to provide an absorbed dose estimate (the equivalent dose) using an interpolated dose-response curve, constructed by regenerating OSL signals by beta irradiation in the laboratory. Sensitivity changes which may occur as a result of readout, irradiation and preheating (to remove unstable radiation-induced signals) were monitored using small test doses after each regenerative dose. Each measurement was standardized to the test dose response determined immediately after its readout, to compensate for changes in sensitivity during the laboratory measurement sequence. The regenerative doses were chosen to encompass the likely value of the equivalent (natural) dose. A repeat dose point was included to check the ability of the SAR procedure to correct for laboratory-induced sensitivity changes (the 'recycling test'), a zero dose point is included late in the sequence to check for thermally induced charge transfer during the irradiation and preheating cycle (the 'zero cycle'), and an IR response check included to assess the magnitude of non-quartz signals. Regenerative dose response curves were constructed using doses of 0.5, 1, 2.5, 10 and 2.5 Gy, with test doses of 1.5 Gy. The 32 aliquot sets were sub-divided into eight subsets of four aliquots, such that eight preheating

regimes were explored (200° to 270° C, in 10° C increments), the small aliquot sets were divided into a small number of sub-sets.

A2.5. Results

A2.5.1. Sampling and preliminary luminescence stratigraphies

Field work was conducted in April 2016, with the collection of seven profiles and 12 OSL dating samples, as summarized in Tables A2.1 and A2.2, with selected photographs of the sampling sites in Figures A2.1 to A2.8. Field gamma spectrometry measurements were also collected for each of the OSL sampling sites, reported in Table A2.4. All samples were first appraised using the SUERC portable OSL reader, to produce IRSL and OSL net signal intensities, depletion indices and IRSL:OSL ratios, and luminescence-depth profiles. The results are shown in Figures A2.9 to A2.13, and presented in the Table A2.1.

A2.5.2. Gozo

Three profiles were sampled on Gozo:

Profile 1: an erosion cut profile in the middle Marsalforn valley, opposite Ta'Manea in Weid ir-Rigu (profile BH110; N 36 03.472/ E 014 14.946) was cut back and sampled for OSL. This profile comprised *c.* 3.7 m of rubbly fine sandy/silt loam which was interrupted by two incipient buried soil horizons at *c.* 1.75–2.10 and 2.70–2.85 m down-profile. Figures A2.1 and A2.2 show photographs of this site. A series of 10 small bulk samples were taken for luminescence profiling from 1.75–3.25 m. Initial field impressions, including the luminescence profiles (Fig. A2.9) showing broadly similar luminescence intensities within and between the soils with the exception of P1/2, were that this represents an age-related gradual accumulation of hillwash-type sediment throughout the profile. Three OSL tube samples at 1.75, 2.65 and 3.2 m down-profile were collected (as indicated in Fig. A2.9), representing the top of the upper buried soil and the top and bottom of the lower soil.

Profile 2: an erosion cut profile in the lower Ramla valley about 200 m inland from Ramla Bay (profile BH 66; N 36 03.442/E 014 17.045) was cut back and sampled for OSL. This profile is comprised of a series of alternating horizons of calcitic silt loam and coarse sand/pebble horizons, with the whole profile generally fining upwards, over a depth of *c.* 1.4 m. The site is shown in Figure A2.3. A series of 11 small bulk samples were taken from the finer silt loam horizons for profiling (Fig. A2.10). These indicate that parts of the sedimentary sequence are likely to have been re-deposited without the luminescence signals being

Appendix 2

Table A2.1. Sample descriptions, contexts and archaeological significance of the profiling samples used for initial screening and laboratory characterization (estimated from local datums).

	Field no.	SUTL no.	Depth /cm	Field description/ context	Archaeological significance
Ta'Manea, Marsalforn valley, Gozo off-site palaeoenvironmental proxy record; reconstruct earlier Holocene landscape of Gozo					
Profile 1	P1/1	2916A	180	above soil; pale yellowish-grey silty clay loam; hillwash	TAQ for age of buried soil (upper horizon)
	P1/2	2916B	195	buried old land surface/incipient soil in hillwash; pale yellowish brown silty clay loam with columnar ped structure	Buried soil surface 1.75–2.10 m (upper horizon)
	P1/3	2916C	205		
	P1/4	2916D	215	rounded limestone pebbles (<5 cm); erosion event/ temporary stream	TPQ for age of buried soil (upper horizon)
	P1/5	2916E	225	mix of greyish brown fine-medium sand and silt with limestone gravel pebbles	-
	P1/6	2916F	270		TAQ for age of buried soil (lower horizon)
	P1/7	2916G	290	buried old land surface/incipient soil in hillwash; pale yellowish brown fine sandy/silt loam with columnar blocky ped structure	Buried soil surface 2.70–2.85 m (lower horizon)
	P1/8	2916H	300		TPQ for age of buried soil (lower horizon)
	P1/9	2916I	310		-
	P1/10	2916J	320	pale grey silty clay loam with abundant rounded stone pebbles (<10 cm)	-
Ramla valley, Gozo exploited in the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, with two superimposed systems of field and property boundaries; significance of profile – response to intensification of landscape/arable development on adjacent slopes					
Profile 2	P2/1	2920A	7.5	pale grey calcitic silt loam; calcitic alluvial lens	temporal constraints on degradation of upper slope
	P2/2	2920B	15		
	P2/3	2920C	27.5	fine pebbles (<2 cm); pebbly hillwash lens	fluvial phase
	P2/4	2920D	45	pale grey calcitic silt loam; calcitic alluvial lens	temporal constraints on degradation of upper slope
	P2/5	2920E	60		
	P2/6	2920F	75		
	P2/7	2920G	82.5	fine sandy/silt loam	
	P2/8	2920H	105		
	P2/9	2920I	115		Thin hillwash accumulations – may indicate some degree of balance and resilience in the landscape, or individual events removed most of the eroded soils to the sea
	P2/10	2920J	125		
	P2/11	2920K	140	weathered Globigerina bedrock	
Ġgantija Temple Test Pit 1, Gozo					
Profile 3	P3/1	2913A	10	greyish brown silt loam with common limestone fragments (<5 cm); Ap and terrace soil	-
	P3/2	2913B	18		later prehistoric and historic agricultural activity
	P3/3	2913C	25		
	P3/4	2913D	34	greyish brown silt loam with abundant limestone rubble and abundant Neolithic artefacts (pot, bone, lithics)	
	P3/5	2913E	45		Base of agricultural soil
	P3/6	2913F	54		
	P3/7	2913G	68	brown silt loam with abundant Neolithic artefacts; <i>in situ</i> Ah of palaeosol	'field' profile implies some chronology with depth; beginnings of soil change associated with use and degradation of this landscape prior to construction of temple?
	P3/8	2913H	78		
	P3/9	2913I	85	mid-brown silt loam with abundant Neolithic artefacts; buried lower A-B horizon of palaeosol	Base of buried soil; constrain onset of soil accumulation
	P3/10	2913J	92		

Table A2.1 (cont.).

	Field no.	SUTL no.	Depth /cm	Field description/ context	Archaeological significance
Skorba Neolithic site (Malta), Trench A, East section profiles 4 (East), 6 and 7 (south) taken on western edge of Skorba temple/settlement; like at Ġgantija, profiles encompass a buried soil associated with the landscape prior to construction of temple; here, sealed by three curvilinear stone walls					
Profile 4	P4/1	2924A	22	modern topsoil and fill of wall robber trench	-
	P4/2	2924B	32		-
	P4/3	2924C	41	dark brown sandy silt loam with occasional limestone rubble (<5 cm)	context [2]; fill of robber trench; re-deposited materials, carry residuals from earlier depositional cycle
	P4/4	2924D	51		
	P4/5	2924E	63	mix of dark brown sandy silt loam and limestone rubble (<15 cm)	context [11]; clear signal-depth progression through contexts 11, 20, 24
	P4/6	2924F	75		
	P4/7	2924G	86	dark greyish brown sandy silt loam; ?aggraded soil?	context [20]; aggraded soil?; later prehistoric and historic agricultural activity (as at Ġgantija?)
	P4/8	2924H	96		
	P4/9	2924I	106	dark brown sandy silt loam; disturbed, possible A horizon of palaeosol	context [24]; possible A horizon to buried soil; beginnings of soil change associated with use and degradation of this landscape prior to construction of temple?
	P4/10	2924J	113		
	P4/11	2924K	121	dark brown sandy silt loam; <i>in situ</i> B horizon of palaeosol	context [28]; in situ B horizon to buried soil
	P4/12	2924L	131		potentially disturbed in prehistory; note inflection in luminescence intensities at c. 138 cm depth
	P4/13	2924M	138		
	P4/14	2924N	147		
	P4/15	2924O	148		
Marsa, Valletta, Malta a Punic-Roman area of terraces and irrigation features; little in way of soil preservation due to commercial development at site					
Profile 5	P5/1	2929A	283	brown, calcitic, fine sandy/silt loam; ?pre-terrace soil/?palaeosol	TPQ for wall; sixteenth century AD soil accumulation and later terrace build-up?
	P5/2	2929B	287		
	P5/3	2929C	292		
	P5/4	2929D	298		
Skorba Neolithic site (Malta), Trench A, South section					
Profile 6	P6/1	2928A	65	dark brown fine sandy loam	context [23]
	P6/2	2928B	80	dark brown fine sandy loam; ?aggraded soil?	beneath context [26] – a possible Neolithic floor 75–78 cm; there is no clear progression in luminescence signals across the possible Neolithic floor/surface (in the position of this profile); this may indicate that this surface was not exposed for any length of time
	P6/3	2928C	90		
	P6/4	2928D	100	dark brown fine sandy loam with 20–25% small limestone rubble <5 cm); ?disturbed upper part of a palaeosol?	disturbed upper part of buried soil; reset during laying of floor / construction of Skorba complex?
	P6/5	2928E	115	dark brown fine sandy loam; <i>in situ</i> palaeosol	in situ buried soil; constrain onset of soil accumulation
	P6/6	2928F	120		
Skorba Neolithic site (Malta), Trump Trench cut in 1961					
Profile 7	P7/1	2931A	103	modern topsoil and fill of wall robber trench	within backfill to Trump’s 1961 excavation; compare and contrast signal intensities with profiles 4 and 6
	P7/2	2931B	113		
	P7/3	2931C	123		
	P7/5	2931D	146	dark greyish brown sandy silt loam; ?aggraded soil?	should be equivalent to context [20] – samples P4/7 – 4/8

Table A2.2. Sample descriptions, contexts and archaeological significance of sediment samples SUTL2914–2930 (*†*depths estimated relative to the overlying landforms for cosmic attenuation estimation).

Sample ID	Profile	SUTL no.	Depth /cm	Description	Archaeological significance
OSL1	1	2917	175–180	=P1/1	Constrain final period soil was exposed, phase 2
OSL2	1	2918	265–270	=P1/6	Constrain final period soil was exposed, phase 1
OSL3	1	2919	320–330	= P1/10	Constrain onset of soil accumulation, phase 1
OSL4	2	2921	15–20	=P2/2	Provide a temporal constraint on degradation of upper slope
OSL5	2	2922	62–66	=P2/5	Provide temporal constraints on periods of colluviation
OSL6	2	2923	103–106	=P2/8	
OSL7	3	2914	78	=P3/8; buried soil 'A' horizon	Constrain final period soil was exposed
OSL8	3	2915	92	=P3/10; buried soil 'B' horizon	Constrain onset of soil accumulation
OSL9	5	2930	295–298	=P5/3 – 5/4	Constrain onset of soil accumulation, and date standing wall overlaying soil
OSL10	4	2925	118	=P4/11; [28]; rich-brown silty loam; 5% clay; 15–20% sand	Constrain final period soil was exposed
OSL11	4	2926	128	=P4/13	Provide temporal constraint on age of buried palaeo-surface
OSL12	4	2927	145	=P4/15	Constrain onset of soil accumulation

re-set at deposition; note, the step-like shifts in signal intensities at 46 cm and 115 cm. The most promising targets for dating are the horizons immediately beneath these units. Moreover, the ratio of net signal intensities between the upper (those not affected by recent soil turnover) and lower units, implies that the temporal range represented by these units may be relatively short. Three tube samples were taken for OSL dating at 15, 62 and 103 cm down-profile. The latter sample loci were also sampled for micromorphological analysis. Initial field impressions were not that clear, but the profile exhibited aggradation over time with at least two clear breaks, suggesting palaeo-surfaces of some kind at c. 46 cm and 115 cm, potentially indicative of

changes in erosion processes from alternating fast/slow to a much slower aggradational dynamic.

Profile 3: Test Pit 1 which was excavated in 2014 on the western edge of the platform south of Ġgantija temple was re-excavated to reveal the complete profile through the agricultural soil build-up over the *in situ* buried soil. This is shown in Figure A2.4. A series of 10 small bulk samples were taken at approximately 10 cm intervals down-profile for luminescence profiling. Initial field impressions were that the agricultural soil had accumulated gradually over time, with a clear stratigraphic break at ~70 cm with the buried soil below, but with the buried soil exhibiting a longer and more stable time-depth. The luminescence profiles



Figure A2.1. Marsalforn valley, Gozo.



Figure A2.2. *Marsalforn valley, Gozo.*



Figure A2.3. *Ramla valley, Gozo.*



Figure A2.4. *Ġgantija Test Pit 1, Gozo.*



Figure A2.5. (above) Skorba Neolithic site; trench A, East section; (left) trench A, South section, arrow shows position of Figure A2.6.



Figure A2.6. Skorba, Trench A, South section.

(Fig. A2.11) show a significant increase in net signal below this horizon increasing with depth. Two tube samples for OSL dating were taken from the base of the agricultural soil (at 68 cm down-profile) and the base of the buried soil (at 92 cm down-profile).

A2.5.3. Skorba

The test excavations on the western edge of the Skorba temple/settlement revealed a 1.5 m deep sequence, within which three curvilinear stone walls of the Neolithic period effectively sealed *c.* 70 cm of soil accumulation. From field observation, it is suggested that the lower *c.* 50 cm of this soil was in fact a buried soil, albeit with the upper *c.* 20 cm probably having been disturbed (in the past). This soil exhibits a very fine sandy/silt dominated texture, which is very different from the soils present in the immediately surrounding area (in BH 618–625) which are much more dark brown, clay-rich, fine sandy/silty clay loams. Figures A2.5 and A2.6 show photographs of this site.

OSL profiling and sampling was undertaken at two profiles in the 2016 Trench A test excavation, from the east and south section faces. From the east section, 15 small bulk samples were taken at about 10 cm intervals from *c.* 22–148 cm down-profile (Profile 4). In the south section, 6 small bulk samples were taken between 65 and 120 cm down-profile, again to target the buried soil and soil accumulation above and the possible Neolithic floor/surface between 75 and 78 cm down-profile (Profile 6). The luminescence-depth profiles (Fig. A2.12) were extremely informative (profile 4):

1. unit [2] contains re-deposited materials, that carry luminescence residuals from an earlier depositional cycle;
2. units [11], [20] and [24] show a progression in luminescence signals with depth, consistent with a normal age-depth progression and a gradual accumulation of sediment; moreover, the range in signal intensities through these units is consistent with an age progression over a temporal range of a multiple of 1.5–2;
3. the upper *c.* 20 cm of the buried soil was probably disturbed in prehistoric times; note, the inflexion in luminescence intensities at *c.* 138 cm, indicating modification of this unit at the time this soil represented a former land-surface (and thus, that it is material at this depth, which should provide a constraint on the age of this palaeo-surface);
4. there is a clear temporal break between deposition of the soil, and units [24], [20] and [11]; this temporal break represents a short interval, equivalent to a temporal range in the order of 1.2–1.5; (profile 6)

5. there is no clear progression in luminescence signals across the possible Neolithic floor/surface (in the position of this profile); this may indicate that this surface was not exposed for any length of time (further characterization of these units in the laboratory will test this hypothesis); and
6. again, the upper part of the buried soil shows signs of disturbance in the past; note, by now the obvious inflexion in luminescence intensities occurs at *c.* 115 cm.

Three OSL tube samples were taken at 118, 128 and 145 cm down-profile from the east section, to target the chronology of the buried soil and old land surface. In both cases, the buried soil/soil accumulation/floor zone was also sampled for micromorphological analysis as well as physical characterization and geo-chemical analysis.

A2.5.4. Tal-Istabal, Qormi

Dr Tony Pace and Nathaniel Cutajar accompanied us to a commercial development site in Qormi on the northwestern side of a former marine embayment where a large Punic-Roman area of terraces and irrigation features had been recently excavated. Although there was little in the way of soil survival on this site due to total excavation, one zone of better preservation was located on the western edge of the site (N 36 03.423/E 014 17.047). Here beneath *c.* 2.7 m of surviving Globigerina Limestone terrace wall construction was *c.* 30–40 cm of agricultural/buried soil survival (Figs. A2.7 & A2.8). This was sampled for micromorphological analysis as well as physical characterization and geo-chemical analysis, and OSL profiling (Profile 5), with laser scans made of large sections of the terrace walls, and cut irrigation and burial features (by J. Bennett). The luminescence profile (Fig. A2.13) shows an increasing net signal with depth. A single tube sample was taken for OSL dating from the base of this profile.

A2.6. Laboratory calibrated screening measurements

The laboratory screening data are shown in Figures A2.14 to A2.20, with the data tabulated in the Supplement A Tables SA.2–SA.5. In most cases, the IRSI sensitivity is significantly lower than the OSL sensitivity. IRSI and OSL apparent doses follow similar stratigraphic trends, with a general increase in apparent dose with increasing depth for all profiles, for the sections at Marsalforn, Ġgantija (Gozo) and Skorba (Malta) the two estimates are in good agreement with agreement to within a factor of two to three for the other sections.



Figure A2.7. *Tal-Istabal, Qormi, Malta.*

For Profile 1 (Fig. A2.14) there is a gradual increase in apparent dose with depth, for both IRSL and OSL which are in good agreement, with P1/4 showing higher apparent doses than the neighbouring samples, and a slight inversion of the profile with smaller apparent doses for the bottom two samples. OSL sensitivity is approximately two orders of magnitude greater than IRSL sensitivity, with both sensitivities showing a slight increase down the top half of the profile, a slight decrease down the bottom half, and a higher sensitivity for the sample below the soil layer. This broadly explains the variation of intensities observed in the field profiles (Fig. A2.9), and supports the conclusion that this profile represents a gradual accumulation of sediment.

For Profile 2 (Fig. A2.15) the sensitivities of both OSL and IRSL are similar and generally unchanged down the profile. The apparent dose in the IRSL measurements is approximately twice that of the OSL, with values for both scattered without any obvious trend down profile. For the lower part of the profile, this pattern reflects the field profile measurements (Fig. A2.10) which showed approximately constant intensities for most of the profile. However, the larger intensities for the uppermost three samples in the field measurements are not explained by the laboratory



Figure A2.8. *Tal-Istabal, Qormi, Malta.*

measurements. The approximately constant apparent doses and intensities suggest that the material in this profile accumulated rapidly.

For Profile 3 (Fig. A2.16) the apparent dose measured by OSL and IRSL is in general agreement, with no apparent trend down profile for the top 60 cm and a rapid increase with depth below that. The OSL sensitivities are two to three orders of magnitude greater than the IRSL sensitivities, with neither showing any significant trend down profile. This broadly reflects the field profiles (Fig. A2.11), which showed approximately constant and relatively low net intensities for the top 60 cm increasing significantly below that. Both field and laboratory measurements suggest a slow accumulation of material in the lower part of the profile, with a rapid accumulation for the top 60 cm.

For Profiles 4 and 6 (Figs. A2.17 & A2.19) the apparent dose increases gradually with depth down profile, with the OSL measurements generally slightly greater than the IRSL for profile 4. The OSL sensitivities are two to three orders of magnitude greater than the IRSL, without any obvious trend down profile with the exception of a significant reduction in sensitivity for P6/6. This reflects the observed gradual increase in net intensities down profile observed in the field profiles (Fig. A2.12), supporting the suggestion that




Figure A2.9. Photograph, showing locations of profile sample (red circles) and OSL tubes (yellow circles), and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profile 1.




Figure A2.10. Photograph, and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profile 3.




Figure A2.11. Photograph, and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profile 2.




Figure A2.12. Photograph, and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profiles 4 and 6.

this represents a gradual accumulation of material over an extended period of time. The bottom sample of Profile 7 (Fig. A2.20) has similar apparent doses and sensitivities to the samples in profiles 4 and 6 that are identified as the same context, the upper samples within the backfill of the 1961 trench show a lower apparent dose and an inverted profile.

For Profile 5 (Fig. A2.18) the apparent dose measured by IRSL is 2–3 times that measured by OSL, with both increasing marginally down profile. The sensitivities for the two methods are similar, with differences less than an order of magnitude. This reflects the field profiles (Fig. A2.13) which showed a small increase in net intensities down profile.




Figure A2.13. Photograph, and luminescence-depth profile, for the sediment stratigraphy sampled in profile 5.

A2.6.1. Dose rates

HRGS results are shown in Table A2.3, both as activity concentrations (i.e. disintegrations per second per kilogram) and as equivalent parent element concentrations (in per cent and ppm), based in the case of U and Th on combining nuclide specific data assuming decay series equilibrium.

Infinite matrix alpha, beta and gamma dose rates from HRGS are listed for all samples in Table A2.4, together with infinite matrix beta dose rates from TSBC and field gamma dose rates from FGS. Beta dose rates from HRGS are typically lower than those determined from TSBC by approximately 20 per cent. Wet gamma dose rates were measured in situ by FGS for each of the dating positions, and are typically lower than the HGRS gamma dose rates after water content corrections.

The water content measurements are given in Table A2.5, together with the assumed values for the average water content during burial. Field (ranging from 3–26 per cent of dry weight) and saturated (18–38 per cent of dry weight) water contents were determined from all samples in the laboratory, with working values for each site adopted for effective dose rate evaluation. Effective dose rates to the HF-etched

90–150 μm quartz grains are given in Table A2.5 (the mean of the TSBC and HRGS data, accounting for water content and grain size), together with the estimate of the gamma dose rate (the mean of the FGS and HRGS data, accounting for water content).

A2.6.2. Quartz single aliquot equivalent dose determinations

For equivalent dose determination, data from single aliquot regenerative dose measurements were analysed using the Risø TL/OSL Viewer programme to export integrated summary files that were analysed in MS Excel and SigmaPlot. The quality parameters for these analyses (sensitivity and sensitivity change, recycling ratio and response to zero dose) are given in Table A2.6. This shows considerable variation in sensitivity between samples, a small increase (5–15 per cent) in sensitivity for all samples, with all samples showing recycling ratios consistent with unity (with the exception of SUTL2923) and very low signals from the zero cycle and IRSL.

Composite dose response curves were constructed from selected discs and when possible, for each of the eight preheating groups from each sample, and used to estimate equivalent dose values for each individual

Appendix 2

Table A2.3. Activity and equivalent concentrations of K, U and Th determined by HRGS (^aShap granite reference, working values determined by David Sanderson in 1986, based on HRGS relative to CANMET and NBL standards; ^bActivity and equivalent concentrations for U, Th and K determined by HRGS (Conversion factors based on NEA (2000) decay constants): 40K: 309.3 Bq kg⁻¹%K⁻¹, 238U: 12.35 Bq kg⁻¹ppmU⁻¹, 232Th: 4.057 Bq kg⁻¹ppm Th).

SUTL no.	Activity Concentration ^a / Bq kg ⁻¹			Equivalent Concentration ^b		
	K	U	Th	K / %	U / ppm	Th / ppm
2914	264 ± 13	26.4 ± 1.6	26.6 ± 1.8	0.85 ± 0.04	2.14 ± 0.13	6.56 ± 0.45
(bulk)	260 ± 9	31.4 ± 1.2	25.2 ± 0.9	0.84 ± 0.03	2.54 ± 0.10	6.20 ± 0.22
2915	245 ± 9	19.9 ± 1.1	20.1 ± 0.9	0.79 ± 0.03	1.61 ± 0.09	4.95 ± 0.21
2917	294 ± 10	41.0 ± 1.5	24.2 ± 0.9	0.95 ± 0.03	3.32 ± 0.12	5.96 ± 0.22
(bulk)	225 ± 9	49.5 ± 1.6	22.0 ± 0.9	0.73 ± 0.03	4.01 ± 0.13	5.43 ± 0.22
2918	313 ± 9	42.1 ± 1.5	27.0 ± 0.9	1.01 ± 0.03	3.41 ± 0.12	6.65 ± 0.22
(bulk)	289 ± 9	61.3 ± 1.9	25.5 ± 0.9	0.93 ± 0.03	4.97 ± 0.15	6.28 ± 0.23
2919	240 ± 8	66.4 ± 1.9	20.8 ± 0.9	0.78 ± 0.03	5.37 ± 0.16	5.13 ± 0.22
(bulk)	268 ± 9	77.8 ± 2.2	25.0 ± 0.9	0.87 ± 0.03	6.30 ± 0.18	6.17 ± 0.23
2921	173 ± 7	31.4 ± 1.3	17.8 ± 0.8	0.56 ± 0.02	2.55 ± 0.10	4.38 ± 0.20
2922	164 ± 8	34.1 ± 1.3	17.4 ± 0.9	0.53 ± 0.02	2.76 ± 0.11	4.28 ± 0.21
2923	140 ± 9	42.0 ± 1.5	17.3 ± 0.9	0.45 ± 0.03	3.41 ± 0.12	4.25 ± 0.22
(bulk)	228 ± 10	41.5 ± 1.6	18.8 ± 0.9	0.74 ± 0.03	3.36 ± 0.13	4.63 ± 0.22
2925	304 ± 9	26.5 ± 1.2	23.0 ± 0.9	0.98 ± 0.03	2.14 ± 0.10	5.66 ± 0.21
2926	342 ± 9	27.7 ± 1.2	25.6 ± 0.9	1.11 ± 0.03	2.24 ± 0.09	6.31 ± 0.21
2927	338 ± 9	28.9 ± 1.2	26.0 ± 0.9	1.09 ± 0.03	2.34 ± 0.10	6.41 ± 0.22
(bulk)	360 ± 11	33.4 ± 1.3	26.8 ± 0.9	1.16 ± 0.04	2.71 ± 0.10	6.60 ± 0.22
2930	92 ± 8	84.4 ± 2.3	14.3 ± 0.8	0.30 ± 0.03	6.84 ± 0.18	3.53 ± 0.21

Table A2.4. Infinite matrix dose rates determined by HRGS and TSBC (^abased on dose rate conversion factors in Aikten (1983), Sanderson (1987) and Cresswell et al. (2018); ^baverage of tube and bulk samples, where available).

SUTL no.	HRGS, dry ^a / mGy a ⁻¹			TSBC, dry / mGy a ⁻¹	FGS, wet / mGy a ⁻¹
	Alpha	Beta	Gamma ^b		
2914	10.8 ± 0.5	1.21 ± 0.04	0.80 ± 0.03	1.44 ± 0.09	0.31 ± 0.03
2915	8.1 ± 0.3	1.04 ± 0.03	0.63 ± 0.02	1.50 ± 0.09	0.25 ± 0.02
2917	13.6 ± 0.4	1.44 ± 0.03	0.91 ± 0.02	1.75 ± 0.10	0.57 ± 0.05
2918	14.4 ± 0.4	1.53 ± 0.03	1.05 ± 0.03	1.80 ± 0.10	0.48 ± 0.03
2919	16.7 ± 0.5	1.58 ± 0.03	1.16 ± 0.03	1.74 ± 0.10	0.51 ± 0.04
2921	10.3 ± 0.3	0.96 ± 0.03	0.65 ± 0.02	1.12 ± 0.08	0.32 ± 0.02
2922	10.8 ± 0.3	0.96 ± 0.03	0.66 ± 0.02	1.27 ± 0.09	0.39 ± 0.03
2923	12.6 ± 0.4	0.99 ± 0.03	0.76 ± 0.03	1.32 ± 0.09	0.37 ± 0.02
2925	10.1 ± 0.3	1.29 ± 0.03	0.77 ± 0.02	1.71 ± 0.10	0.35 ± 0.02
2926	10.9 ± 0.3	1.43 ± 0.03	0.85 ± 0.02	1.82 ± 0.10	0.36 ± 0.03
2927	11.2 ± 0.3	1.43 ± 0.03	0.90 ± 0.03	1.78 ± 0.10	0.30 ± 0.02
2930	21.6 ± 0.5	1.35 ± 0.03	1.04 ± 0.02	1.35 ± 0.09	0.40 ± 0.01

disc and their combined sets. Dose response curves (shown in Supplement B Figures SB.1–SB.12) for each of the preheating temperature groups and the combined data were determined using a fit to a saturating exponential function. There was no evidence of significant differences in normalized OSL ratios (both in natural and regenerated dose points) between

subsets of discs pre-heated at temperatures from 200° to 270° C. Accordingly composite dose response curves from selected discs for each sample were constructed and used to estimate equivalent dose values for each individual discs and their combined sets.

Three average values were calculated from the dose estimates from individual aliquots for each

Table A2.5. Effective beta and gamma dose rates following water correction (^a Effective beta dose rate combining water content corrections with inverse grain size attenuation factors obtained by weighting the 90–150 μm attenuation factors of Mejdahl (1979) for K, U, and Th by the relative beta dose contributions for each source determined by Gamma Spectrometry; ^d includes a cosmic dose contribution).

SUTL no.	Water contents / %			Effective Dose Rate ^a / mGy a ⁻¹		
	Field	Sat	Assumed	Beta ^b	Gamma	Total ^{b,d}
2914	26	34	30 $\pm$ 5	0.89 $\pm$ 0.08	0.46 $\pm$ 0.05	1.51 $\pm$ 0.09
2915	16	38	30 $\pm$ 5	0.86 $\pm$ 0.07	0.36 $\pm$ 0.03	1.39 $\pm$ 0.08
2917	6	18	15 $\pm$ 5	1.24 $\pm$ 0.10	0.68 $\pm$ 0.07	2.09 $\pm$ 0.12
2918	6	20	15 $\pm$ 5	1.29 $\pm$ 0.11	0.69 $\pm$ 0.06	2.15 $\pm$ 0.12
2919	9	23	15 $\pm$ 5	1.28 $\pm$ 0.11	0.75 $\pm$ 0.07	2.20 $\pm$ 0.13
2921	3	21	10 $\pm$ 5	0.85 $\pm$ 0.08	0.45 $\pm$ 0.04	1.47 $\pm$ 0.09
2922	4	19	10 $\pm$ 5	0.91 $\pm$ 0.09	0.49 $\pm$ 0.05	1.57 $\pm$ 0.10
2923	4	27	10 $\pm$ 5	0.94 $\pm$ 0.09	0.53 $\pm$ 0.05	1.64 $\pm$ 0.10
2925	15	24	20 $\pm$ 5	1.11 $\pm$ 0.10	0.49 $\pm$ 0.04	1.78 $\pm$ 0.10
2926	16	24	20 $\pm$ 5	1.21 $\pm$ 0.10	0.53 $\pm$ 0.05	1.90 $\pm$ 0.11
2927	15	34	20 $\pm$ 5	1.19 $\pm$ 0.10	0.52 $\pm$ 0.04	1.88 $\pm$ 0.11
2930	14	20	17 $\pm$ 3	1.00 $\pm$ 0.08	0.64 $\pm$ 0.03	1.81 $\pm$ 0.09

Table A2.6. SAR quality parameters.

SUTL No.	Sensitivity (c Gy ⁻¹)	Sensitivity change (% per cycle)	Recycling ratio	Zero cycle	IRSL (%)
2914	5900 $\pm$ 750	15 $\pm$ 3	1.01 $\pm$ 0.01	0.04 $\pm$ 0.01	0.22 $\pm$ 0.18
2915	5240 $\pm$ 530	13 $\pm$ 2	1.05 $\pm$ 0.01	0.04 $\pm$ 0.01	0.00 $\pm$ 0.03
2917	188 $\pm$ 142	4.5 $\pm$ 4.1	0.90 $\pm$ 0.05 [†]	0.07 $\pm$ 0.02 [†]	0.02 $\pm$ 0.44
2918	1750 $\pm$ 250	5.0 $\pm$ 1.1	1.01 $\pm$ 0.05	0.09 $\pm$ 0.05	0.06 $\pm$ 0.21
2919	900 $\pm$ 175	9.2 $\pm$ 2.2	0.96 $\pm$ 0.06	0.06 $\pm$ 0.06	0.40 $\pm$ 0.57
2921	2540 $\pm$ 1050	8.8 $\pm$ 4.8	1.02 $\pm$ 0.05	0.10 $\pm$ 0.07	0.45 $\pm$ 0.23
2922	1700 $\pm$ 380	9.6 $\pm$ 3.1	1.06 $\pm$ 0.12	0.08 $\pm$ 0.04	0.42 $\pm$ 0.35
2923	470 $\pm$ 170	15 $\pm$ 8	1.25 $\pm$ 0.06 [†]	0.00 $\pm$ 0.09	0.84 $\pm$ 1.70
2925	11600 $\pm$ 2500	8.1 $\pm$ 2.2	0.99 $\pm$ 0.01	0.04 $\pm$ 0.01	-0.02 $\pm$ 0.04
2926	7980 $\pm$ 940	14 $\pm$ 2	0.99 $\pm$ 0.01	0.03 $\pm$ 0.01	-0.02 $\pm$ 0.03
2927	12900 $\pm$ 1300	12 $\pm$ 2	1.02 $\pm$ 0.01	0.03 $\pm$ 0.01	-0.01 $\pm$ 0.06
2930	4420 $\pm$ 650	24 $\pm$ 4	0.95 $\pm$ 0.01	0.03 $\pm$ 0.01	0.12 $\pm$ 0.07

[†] Weighted mean used to reduce influence of low precision aliquots

sample, the mean, a weighted mean and the robust mean. These are given in Table 3.7. Probability density functions (pdfs) and abanico plots were generated to describe the dose distributions. The pdfs are shown in Figures A2.21–A2.25, grouping the samples from each site, with the abanico plots in Supplement C Figures SC.1–SC.12.

For the Ġgantija samples (SUTL2914–2915), Figure A2.21, it can be seen that the pdfs for both samples form approximately Gaussian peaks centred on the mean value, with evidence of a tail to higher doses. There is no significant difference between the different averages, and so the mean was taken as the preferred estimate for the stored dose.

Similarly, for the Skorba samples (SUTL2925–2927) (Fig. A2.24), two of the pdfs have approximately Gaussian shapes whereas SUTL2926 is bimodal. The three different averages are, again, very similar and the slightly higher precision weighted mean has been used as the preferred estimate for the stored dose.

For the samples from Marsalforn (SUTL2917–2919) and Ramla (SUTL2921–2923) (Figs. A2.22 & A2.23), the pdfs are generally complex with very broad distributions and multiple peaks. SUTL2918 and 2923 show approximately Gaussian shapes, with tails to high dose rates. In both cases the weighted mean approximates to the position of the peak with better precision, and has been used as the preferred estimate




Figure A2.14. Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL (blue) and IRSL (red) profile measurements for SUTL2916 (P1).




Figure A2.15. Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL (blue) and IRSL (red) profile measurements for SUTL2920 (P2).




Figure A2.16. Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL (blue) and IRSL (red) profile measurements for SUTL2913 (P3).




Figure A2.17. Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL (blue) and IRSL (red) profile measurements for SUTL2924 (P4).




Figure A2.18. Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL (blue) and IRSL (red) profile measurements for SUTL2929 (P5).




Figure A2.20. Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL (blue) and IRSL (red) profile measurements for SUTL2931 (P7).




Figure A2.19. Apparent dose and sensitivity for laboratory OSL (blue) and IRSL (red) profile measurements for SUTL2928 (P6).

for the stored dose. SUTL2917 shows a very broad peak, with no readily defined preferred stored dose, and the weighted mean has been used since this is generally the preferred value in this project. SUTL2919 shows a lower peak at ~5 Gy which corresponds to a single aliquot, and the mean has been used as the preferred value as this best represents the remaining aliquots. SUTL2921 and 2922 both show multiple peaks, each supported by more than one aliquot. In both cases the weighted mean approximates to the lowest dose peak, and has been preferred.

The sample from Tal-Istabal, Qormi (SUTL2930) (Fig. A2.25), shows a large dominant peak, with two smaller peaks at higher doses. Both the weighted and robust means approximate to the position of this peak, and the slightly higher precision weighted mean has been preferred.

A2.6.3. Age determinations

The total dose rate is determined from the sum of the equivalent beta and gamma dose rates, and the cosmic dose rate. Age estimates are determined by dividing the equivalent stored dose by the dose rate (Table A2.8).

The dose rates for the laboratory profile samples can be estimated by interpolating and extrapolating from the dose rates measured from the OSL samples. This allows an apparent age for the profile samples to be estimated from the apparent doses estimated from the laboratory profile analyses. These are shown in Supplement D Figures SD.1–SD.6.

Table A2.7. Comments on equivalent dose distributions of SUTL2914 to SUTL2930; preferred estimates in bold (errors stated: $\pm$ weighted standard deviation or weighted error).

SUTL no.	n	Comments on apparent age distribution / individual samples	Mean	Weighted Mean	Robust Mean
2914	8		4.77 $\pm$ 0.25	4.61 $\pm$ 0.13	4.70 $\pm$ 0.23
2915	16		15.0 $\pm$ 0.4	14.7 $\pm$ 0.2	15.0 $\pm$ 0.4
2917	12	Generally very poor statistics throughout. Dispersed apparent ages	10.8 $\pm$ 4.9	5.8 $\pm$ 1.9	7.3 $\pm$ 2.1
2918	16	One significant outlier (67 $\pm$ 48 Gy) excluded from means	9.5 $\pm$ 1.0	7.7 $\pm$ 0.3	9.2 $\pm$ 0.9
2919	8	One aliquot with Ed = 4.9 $\pm$ 0.3 Gy. Remaining aliquots 6.7–10.4 Gy	7.7 $\pm$ 0.6	6.3 $\pm$ 0.2	7.8 $\pm$ 0.6
2921	8	Large dispersion of Ed values	1.3 $\pm$ 0.7	0.20 $\pm$ 0.02	0.83 $\pm$ 0.34
2922	8		0.48 $\pm$ 0.09	0.26 $\pm$ 0.01	0.52 $\pm$ 0.11
2923	8	Large dispersion of Ed values	0.12 $\pm$ 0.50	0.17 $\pm$ 0.05	0.39 $\pm$ 0.32
2925	16		17.6 $\pm$ 0.4	17.4 $\pm$ 0.2	17.5 $\pm$ 0.5
2926	16	12 aliquots with Ed 17.0–19.6 Gy. 4 aliquots with Ed 21.0–23.0 Gy.	19.6 $\pm$ 0.5	19.2 $\pm$ 0.2	19.6 $\pm$ 0.6
2927	16		20.8 $\pm$ 0.6	20.3 $\pm$ 0.6	20.5 $\pm$ 0.5
2930	12		0.81 $\pm$ 0.08	0.72 $\pm$ 0.02	0.74 $\pm$ 0.04

Table A2.8. Quartz OSL sediment ages.

SUTL no.	Dose (Gy)	Dose Rate (mGy a ⁻¹)	Years / ka	Calendar years
2914	4.77 $\pm$ 0.25	1.51 $\pm$ 0.09	3.16 $\pm$ 0.25	1140 $\pm$ 250 BC
2915	15.0 $\pm$ 0.4	1.39 $\pm$ 0.08	10.79 $\pm$ 0.68	8770 $\pm$ 680 BC
2917	5.8 $\pm$ 1.9	2.09 $\pm$ 0.12	2.78 $\pm$ 0.92	760 $\pm$ 920 BC
2918	7.7 $\pm$ 0.3	2.15 $\pm$ 0.12	3.58 $\pm$ 0.24	1560 $\pm$ 240 BC
2919	7.7 $\pm$ 0.6	2.20 $\pm$ 0.13	3.50 $\pm$ 0.34	1480 $\pm$ 340 BC
2921	0.20 $\pm$ 0.02	1.47 $\pm$ 0.09	0.14 $\pm$ 0.02	AD 1880 $\pm$ 16
2922	0.26 $\pm$ 0.01	1.57 $\pm$ 0.10	0.17 $\pm$ 0.01	AD 1850 $\pm$ 12
2923	0.17 $\pm$ 0.05	1.64 $\pm$ 0.10	0.10 $\pm$ 0.03	AD 1910 $\pm$ 30
2925	17.4 $\pm$ 0.2	1.78 $\pm$ 0.10	9.78 $\pm$ 0.56	7760 $\pm$ 560 BC
2926	19.2 $\pm$ 0.2	1.90 $\pm$ 0.11	10.11 $\pm$ 0.59	8090 $\pm$ 590 BC
2927	20.3 $\pm$ 0.6	1.88 $\pm$ 0.11	10.80 $\pm$ 0.71	8780 $\pm$ 710 BC
2930	0.72 $\pm$ 0.02	1.81 $\pm$ 0.09	0.40 $\pm$ 0.02	AD 1620 $\pm$ 23

A2.7. Discussion

The dates determined from the OSL measurements and their contexts are summarized in Tables A2.8 and A2.9.

A2.7.1. Ġgantija Temple (SUTL2914 and 2915)

The samples were taken from a reopened test pit, initially excavated in 2014, on the western edge of the platform south of Ġgantija temple, which showed agricultural soil build-up over an *in situ* buried soil. Profiling shows low apparent dose (approximately 1 Gy or less, in most cases corresponding to an apparent age of a few centuries) for the agricultural soil, with a significant increase in dose with depth for the buried soil. The

samples for OSL dating were taken from immediately below the base of the agricultural soil and the base of the buried soil. For SUTL2914 immediately below the agricultural soil the estimated stored doses and corresponding ages are consistent, and confirms that the agricultural soil is modern, and that the buried soil is prehistoric (older than 1000 BC). The date determined for the onset of the soil accumulation from SUTL2915 (8770 $\pm$ 680 BC) is older than the apparent age from the corresponding profile sample (~5000 BC) and both age estimates significantly pre-date Neolithic human activity on the islands, and the initial construction of the Ġgantija temples (3600 BC). The date for the final exposure of the soil (1140 $\pm$ 250 BC) is in the Bronze Age,

Table A2.9. Locations, dates and archaeological significance of sediment samples SUTL2914–2930 (Dates in italics are poorly constrained due to low precision and large dispersion of equivalent doses determined by OSL analysis).

Sample ID	SUTL no.	Depth /cm	Date	Archaeological significance
Marsalforn valley				
OSL1	2917	175–180	760±920 BC	Constrains the final period that the upper incipient soil in hillwash was exposed, phase 2
OSL2	2918	265–270	1560±240 BC	Constrains the final period that the lower incipient soil in hillwash was exposed, phase 1
OSL3	2919	320–330	1480±340 BC	Constrains the onset of hillwash accumulation, phase 1
Ramla valley				
OSL4	2921	15–20	AD 1880±16	Provides a temporal constraint on degradation of upper slope
OSL5	2922	62–66	AD 1850±12	Provide temporal constraints on periods of colluviation
OSL6	2923	103–106	AD 1910±30	
Ġgantija Temple				
OSL7	2914	78	1140±250 BC	Constrains the final period that the buried soil was exposed
OSL8	2915	92	8770±680 BC	Constrains onset of soil formation
Tal-Istabal, Qormi				
OSL9	2930	295–298	AD 1620±23	Constrains the burial of soil
Skorba Neolithic site				
OSL10	2925	118	7760±560 BC	Constrains the final period that the buried soil was exposed
OSL11	2926	128	8090±590 BC	Constrains the age of the buried land surface
OSL12	2927	145	8780±710 BC	Constrains onset of soil formation

significantly later than the last stages of construction at the temples (2500 BC). However, there is evidence of Bronze Age activity at other Neolithic sites in the islands.

A2.7.2. Ramla and Marsalforn Valleys (SUTL2917–2923)

The Ramla valley, and the tributary Marsalforn valley, form the southern boundary of the Xagħra plateau, on which the Neolithic temple site of Ġgantija is located. It is known that the plateau is largely denuded of Holocene soils, which are concentrated in the valleys. The OSL investigations in these valleys were undertaken with the aim of generating a chronology for the sequences of buried palaeosols, hillwash and alluvial deposits preserved there. The OSL dates for these materials are generally poorly constrained due to poor signal and dispersed stored doses, suggesting considerable re-working of material.

For Marsalforn Valley, the upper-most sample (SUTL2917) could not be dated, with the ages for the lower two samples consistent with being the same age (SUTL2918 1560±240 BC, SUTL2919 1480±340 BC). These are also consistent with the apparent ages from the profile measurements, which suggest a gradual increase in age from approximately 2–3.5 ka over the 180 to 290 cm depth range, with a slight inversion to younger ages below that. The impressions from the

field and laboratory profiles that this section represents gradual accumulation of material is not contradicted by the OSL dates for the upper samples given the poor precision of SUTL2917 and the general agreement between OSL ages and profile apparent ages for the lower samples, giving an accumulation rate for the upper part of the section of approximately 1 m ka⁻¹. However, the data suggest that the lower part of the section (290–320 cm depth) accumulated rapidly, with the inverted apparent age profile suggesting better zeroed material being deposited first.

The Ramla Valley dating samples (SUTL2921–2923) are all modern, with OSL dates in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries AD, based on the youngest component in the dose distributions, although it is noted that these distributions also contain older components and that the apparent ages from the profile samples are significantly older (0.5–2.0 ka, with the best constrained apparent ages at 0.5–1.0 ka). This supports the inference from the field and laboratory profiling that this material was deposited over a short period of time.

A2.7.3. Skorba Neolithic site (SUTL2925–2927)

Excavations on the western edge of the Skorba temple/settlement revealed three curvilinear stone walls of the Neolithic period effectively sealing an accumulated soil. The profile samples indicate a gradual increase in




Figure A2.21. Probability Distribution Functions for the stored dose on samples SUTL2914 and 2915.




Figure A2.22. Probability Distribution Functions for the stored dose on samples SUTL2917–2919. Note, SUTL2918 includes a single aliquot with a stored dose of 67 ± 48 Gy.




Figure A2.23. Probability Distribution Functions for the stored dose on samples SUTL2921–2923. Note, SUTL2921 includes a single aliquot with a stored dose of 5.8 ± 0.9 Gy.




Figure A2.24. Probability Distribution Functions for the stored dose on samples SUTL2925–2927.




Figure A2.25. *Probability Distribution Function for the stored dose on sample SUTL2930.*

stored dose with depth, with no clear change in stored dose below the Neolithic structure. The profile apparent age estimates show generally very good agreement between equivalent contexts in profiles 4 and 6, with a couple of exceptions. The uppermost profile sample shows an apparent age of approximately 2.0 ka, with the remaining samples showing a gradual increase in apparent age from approximately 5.0 to 7.0 ka down the sections. These are lower than the ages obtained for the OSL dating samples, with a very similar pattern to the bottom sample of profile 3 at the Ġgantija site. The OSL dating samples were selected to constrain the period of accumulation of this soil. The onset of soil accumulation (8780 ± 710 BC) is consistent with the onset of soil accumulation at the Ġgantija site (SUTL2915 8770 ± 680 BC). The upper two samples produce consistent OSL dates (7760 ± 560 BC and 8090 ± 590 BC) which are significantly older than the earliest known human activity in the vicinity (5000 BC) (Trump 1966). These samples are located below the context that had been suggested corresponded to the context at the base of the Trump (1966) excavation.

A2.7.4. *Tal-Istabal, Qormi (SUTL2930)*

Within excavations of a large Punic-Roman area of terraces and irrigation features c. 30–40 cm of agricultural/

buried soil was sampled beneath a surviving wall. The laboratory and field profile measurements indicated a slight increase in stored dose with depth below the wall, which is reflected in the apparent age estimates, which carry large uncertainties. The OSL date ($AD\ 1620 \pm 23$) significantly post-dates the Roman period, lower than the apparent ages from the profiling for the upper three samples ($AD\ 1200 \pm 250$), which would still result in a post-Roman date. These young ages for material from beneath a surviving Punic-Roman age wall are unexpected.

A2.8. Conclusions

Despite the local limestone geology not supplying abundant quantities of silicates to the soils and sediments at these sites, micromorphological studies had already shown the presence of small quantities of silicate minerals. Both field and laboratory profiling measurements had indicated that these minerals carry measurable luminescence signals, with the OSL signals associated with quartz the most promising for dating. Although the quartz yields from the samples collected for OSL dating were limited the signals from the quartz grains extracted were generally bright, in most cases providing sufficient signal to quantify the

ages of the sampled sediments and soils. It is known that dust from the Sahara has been transported across the Mediterranean, and beyond, for approximately five million years and that this has contributed to the soils on Malta and Gozo. The large signals observed from the quartz grains studied here are similar to those observed from Saharan sand, supporting that source for the silicates measured. This work has demonstrated that even in locations where the local geology is deficient in quartz OSL measurements can be conducted using aeolian quartz from more distant sources. In locations where this primary aeolian mineral input is preserved this should retain a palaeoclimatic signal combining aridity history in the Saharan source regions and wind patterns that move these minerals across the Mediterranean region.

For most of the samples collected from hillwash and alluvial deposits in valleys the equivalent doses showed variations of a factor of two to three between aliquots, reflecting inhomogeneous or partial bleaching

of the quartz grains in these samples. This suggests that the erosion and sediment transport processes resulting in these deposits did not expose the minerals to sufficient light to remove all the residual signals from burial in earlier sediments. This could be the result of bulk movement of sediment or the rapid erosion, movement and re-burial of the minerals. Although reliable dates were not always quantifiable, the data do provide information about the processes of formation for these deposits.

For the soils directly associated with the temple sites the equivalent dose values did not show significant dispersion, suggesting that the quartz grains had been well zeroed prior to burial and that there has not been substantial disturbance since then. This allowed ages to be determined even from the small number of aliquots available. This has demonstrated that OSL dating provides valuable information, and should be applied in any further studies of these and similar monuments.

Appendix 2 – Supplement A

Table SA.1. Field profiling data, as obtained using portable OSL equipment, for the sediment stratigraphies examined on Gozo and Malta.

Sample no.	IRSL net signal intensities	IRSL depletion ratio	OSL net signal intensities	OSL depletion ratio	IRSL/OSL ratio
P1/1	2178 ± 66	1.26 ± 0.06	35102 ± 194	2.37 ± 0.03	0.0620 ± 0.0019
P1/2	14293 ± 129	1.51 ± 0.03	103206 ± 325	2.12 ± 0.01	0.1385 ± 0.0013
P1/3	4997 ± 86	1.39 ± 0.04	59909 ± 250	1.98 ± 0.02	0.0834 ± 0.0015
P1/4	5290 ± 86	1.54 ± 0.05	73218 ± 275	2.02 ± 0.02	0.0722 ± 0.0012
P1/5	5817 ± 89	1.40 ± 0.04	66796 ± 263	1.91 ± 0.02	0.0871 ± 0.0014
P1/6	4077 ± 80	1.25 ± 0.04	54936 ± 240	2.34 ± 0.02	0.0742 ± 0.0015
P1/7	3935 ± 80	1.34 ± 0.05	46536 ± 222	2.06 ± 0.02	0.0846 ± 0.0018
P1/8	2804 ± 74	1.40 ± 0.06	53609 ± 238	2.43 ± 0.02	0.0523 ± 0.0014
P1/9	3692 ± 77	1.43 ± 0.05	50362 ± 230	2.48 ± 0.02	0.0733 ± 0.0016
P1/10	19162 ± 148	1.73 ± 0.03	81874 ± 291	2.54 ± 0.02	0.2340 ± 0.0020
P2/1	4792 ± 81	1.46 ± 0.05	90499 ± 304	2.79 ± 0.02	0.0530 ± 0.0009
P2/2	2261 ± 66	1.30 ± 0.06	38257 ± 201	2.09 ± 0.02	0.0591 ± 0.0017
P2/3	3511 ± 76	1.54 ± 0.06	21854 ± 155	1.73 ± 0.02	0.1607 ± 0.0036
P2/4	454 ± 49	1.16 ± 0.12	11777 ± 118	1.56 ± 0.03	0.0385 ± 0.0042
P2/5	818 ± 54	1.55 ± 0.12	13389 ± 124	1.66 ± 0.03	0.0611 ± 0.0041
P2/6	1161 ± 55	1.46 ± 0.10	17459 ± 140	2.07 ± 0.03	0.0665 ± 0.0032
P2/7	980 ± 54	1.44 ± 0.11	16591 ± 137	1.43 ± 0.02	0.0591 ± 0.0033
P2/8	1151 ± 55	1.14 ± 0.08	18251 ± 142	1.93 ± 0.03	0.0631 ± 0.0030
P2/9	836 ± 51	1.21 ± 0.10	7448 ± 96	1.64 ± 0.04	0.1122 ± 0.0070
P2/10	659 ± 49	1.16 ± 0.11	11238 ± 115	1.41 ± 0.03	0.0586 ± 0.0044
P2/11	11480 ± 115	1.57 ± 0.03	49486 ± 228	2.09 ± 0.02	0.2320 ± 0.0026
P3/1	359 ± 45	1.76 ± 0.21	12511 ± 119	2.99 ± 0.06	0.0287 ± 0.0036
P3/2	-	-	6605 ± 93	3.28 ± 0.10	
P3/3	-	-	5468 ± 90	3.48 ± 0.12	
P3/4	-	-	7899 ± 98	2.49 ± 0.07	
P3/5	275 ± 42	1.43 ± 0.20	10350 ± 110	3.94 ± 0.10	0.0266 ± 0.0040
P3/6	207 ± 43	1.03 ± 0.14	12783 ± 120	3.07 ± 0.07	0.0162 ± 0.0034
P3/7	245 ± 44	2.89 ± 0.40	12328 ± 119	2.42 ± 0.05	0.0199 ± 0.0036
P3/8	-	-	22897 ± 164	2.50 ± 0.04	
P3/9	1912 ± 62	1.66 ± 0.09	74749 ± 277	2.41 ± 0.02	0.0256 ± 0.0008
P3/10	1967 ± 62	1.44 ± 0.07	80253 ± 287	2.47 ± 0.02	0.0245 ± 0.0008

Table SA.1 (cont.).

Sample no.	IRSL net signal intensities	IRSL depletion ratio	OSL net signal intensities	OSL depletion ratio	IRSL/OSL ratio
P4/15	5995 ± 88	1.63 ± 0.05	240349 ± 493	2.46 ± 0.01	0.0249 ± 0.0004
P4/14	5177 ± 87	1.51 ± 0.05	226018 ± 478	2.54 ± 0.01	0.0229 ± 0.0004
P4/13	5712 ± 90	1.41 ± 0.04	211440 ± 462	3.09 ± 0.02	0.0270 ± 0.0004
P4/12	5291 ± 87	1.37 ± 0.04	225233 ± 477	2.50 ± 0.01	0.0235 ± 0.0004
P4/11	5240 ± 88	1.50 ± 0.04	213038 ± 465	2.48 ± 0.01	0.0246 ± 0.0004
P4/10	4344 ± 82	1.42 ± 0.05	184363 ± 432	2.48 ± 0.01	0.0236 ± 0.0004
P4/9	3525 ± 77	1.49 ± 0.06	168705 ± 414	2.43 ± 0.01	0.0209 ± 0.0005
P4/8	2397 ± 73	1.53 ± 0.07	123329 ± 355	2.49 ± 0.02	0.0194 ± 0.0006
P4/7	2331 ± 73	1.52 ± 0.07	114334 ± 342	2.69 ± 0.02	0.0204 ± 0.0006
P4/6	2312 ± 70	1.41 ± 0.06	119908 ± 350	2.56 ± 0.02	0.0193 ± 0.0006
P4/5	1670 ± 70	1.67 ± 0.08	111527 ± 339	2.45 ± 0.02	0.0150 ± 0.0006
P4/4	2896 ± 80	1.47 ± 0.06	138249 ± 376	2.84 ± 0.02	0.0209 ± 0.0006
P4/3	1227 ± 64	1.43 ± 0.08	130444 ± 365	2.61 ± 0.02	0.0094 ± 0.0005
P4/2	1443 ± 65	1.41 ± 0.08	72598 ± 274	2.53 ± 0.02	0.0199 ± 0.0009
P4/1	796 ± 60	1.71 ± 0.12	51567 ± 233	2.84 ± 0.03	0.0154 ± 0.0012
P5/1	422 ± 62	1.20 ± 0.12	12643 ± 125	3.23 ± 0.07	0.0334 ± 0.0049
P5/2	535 ± 60	1.55 ± 0.15	9533 ± 113	3.04 ± 0.08	0.0561 ± 0.0064
P5/3	730 ± 62	1.99 ± 0.18	14463 ± 134	2.69 ± 0.05	0.0505 ± 0.0043
P5/4	502 ± 62	1.64 ± 0.15	15182 ± 135		0.0331 ± 0.0041
P6/1	-	-	133503 ± 377	2.34 ± 0.01	
P6/2	3808 ± 71	1.36 ± 0.05	139097 ± 375	2.25 ± 0.01	0.0274 ± 0.0005
P6/3	-	-	125277 ± 365	2.38 ± 0.01	
P6/4	3547 ± 71	1.29 ± 0.05	125270 ± 357	2.38 ± 0.01	0.0283 ± 0.0006
P6/5	2451 ± 64	1.41 ± 0.06	99668 ± 319	2.19 ± 0.02	0.0246 ± 0.0006
P6/6	4579 ± 79	1.41 ± 0.04	186586 ± 434	2.39 ± 0.01	0.0245 ± 0.0004

Table SA.2. OSL screening measurements on paired aliquots of 90–250 µm 40% HF-etched 'quartz'.

SUTL no.	Field ID	Stored dose / Gy		Sensitivity / photon counts Gy ⁻¹		/ Gy	/ photon counts Gy ⁻¹
		Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Mean	
2916A	P1/1	5.82 ± 0.24	2.00 ± 0.18	1506 ± 39	389 ± 20	3.91 ± 1.91	948 ± 559
2916B	P1/2	5.62 ± 0.25	28.35 ± 1.39	1222 ± 35	1017 ± 32	16.98 ± 11.37	1120 ± 103
2916C	P1/3	3.76 ± 0.47	6.49 ± 0.15	201 ± 14	4550 ± 67	5.13 ± 1.37	2376 ± 2174
2916D	P1/4	6.95 ± 0.25	11.30 ± 0.24	1516 ± 39	5046 ± 71	9.12 ± 2.17	3281 ± 1764
2916E	P1/5	4.57 ± 0.48	6.65 ± 0.13	220 ± 15	5627 ± 75	5.61 ± 1.04	2924 ± 2703
2916F	P1/6	5.58 ± 0.17	9.23 ± 0.21	2764 ± 53	4319 ± 66	7.40 ± 1.83	3541 ± 777
2916G	P1/7	7.83 ± 0.31	8.02 ± 0.26	1354 ± 37	2099 ± 46	7.92 ± 0.24	1726 ± 373
2916H	P1/8	12.02 ± 0.71	6.89 ± 0.31	843 ± 29	1240 ± 35	9.45 ± 2.57	1041 ± 199
2916I	P1/9	5.93 ± 0.11	6.48 ± 0.08	7038 ± 84	15101 ± 123	6.20 ± 0.27	11070 ± 4031
2916J	P1/10	6.35 ± 0.21	5.03 ± 0.09	2390 ± 49	7691 ± 88	5.69 ± 0.66	5040 ± 2650
2920A	P2/1	2.05 ± 0.24		259 ± 16		2.05 ± 0.24	259 ± 16
2920B	P2/2	1.93 ± 0.47		68 ± 8		1.93 ± 0.47	68 ± 8
2920C	P2/3	1.47 ± 0.10		727 ± 27		1.47 ± 0.10	727 ± 27
2920D	P2/4	4.66 ± 1.00	2.35 ± 0.45	85 ± 9	148 ± 12	3.51 ± 1.63	116 ± 45
2920E	P2/5	0.63 ± 0.07		579 ± 24		0.63 ± 0.07	579 ± 24

Table SA.2 (cont.).

SUTL no.	Field ID	Stored dose / Gy		Sensitivity / photon counts Gy ⁻¹		/ Gy	/ photon counts Gy ⁻¹
		Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Mean	
2920F	P2/6	0.68 ± 0.09	4.40 ± 1.11	381 ± 20	59 ± 8	2.54 ± 2.63	220 ± 228
2920G	P2/7	0.81 ± 0.06		1000 ± 32		0.81 ± 0.06	1000 ± 32
2920H	P2/8	3.20 ± 0.64		83 ± 9		3.20 ± 0.64	83 ± 9
2920I	P2/9	3.29 ± 0.61		87 ± 9		3.29 ± 0.61	87 ± 9
2920J	P2/10	2.07 ± 0.40		111 ± 11		2.07 ± 0.40	111 ± 11
2920K	P2/11	1.41 ± 0.22		232 ± 15		1.41 ± 0.22	232 ± 15
2913A	P3/1	0.33 ± 0.01	0.200 ± 0.003	6948 ± 83	40747 ± 202	0.27 ± 0.07	23848 ± 16900
2913B	P3/2	0.167 ± 0.004	0.27 ± 0.01	20089 ± 142	4222 ± 65	0.22 ± 0.05	12156 ± 7933
2913C	P3/3	0.25 ± 0.01	0.28 ± 0.01	4437 ± 67	3944 ± 63	0.27 ± 0.02	4190 ± 247
2913D	P3/4	0.43 ± 0.01	3.59 ± 0.04	24997 ± 158	17770 ± 133	2.01 ± 1.58	21384 ± 3614
2913E	P3/5	0.56 ± 0.02	0.35 ± 0.01	4973 ± 71	6688 ± 82	0.46 ± 0.10	5831 ± 857
2913F	P3/6	0.48 ± 0.01	0.67 ± 0.01	30097 ± 173	8899 ± 94	0.58 ± 0.09	19498 ± 10599
2913G	P3/7	2.94 ± 0.09	1.36 ± 0.02	2885 ± 54	23541 ± 153	2.15 ± 0.79	13213 ± 10328
2913H	P3/8	5.38 ± 0.06	6.13 ± 0.08	17333 ± 132	13410 ± 116	5.76 ± 0.38	15372 ± 1961
2913I	P3/9	10.12 ± 0.08	10.31 ± 0.07	37034 ± 192	43696 ± 209	10.22 ± 0.09	40365 ± 3331
2913J	P3/10	8.53 ± 0.17	9.79 ± 0.24	5952 ± 77	3745 ± 61	9.16 ± 0.63	4849 ± 1103
2929A	P5/1	1.70 ± 0.26	1.48 ± 0.18	236 ± 15	285 ± 17	1.59 ± 0.16	261 ± 35
2929B	P5/2	1.73 ± 0.27	1.19 ± 0.11	181 ± 13	489 ± 22	1.46 ± 0.38	335 ± 218
2929C	P5/3	0.80 ± 0.10	2.09 ± 0.38	369 ± 19	121 ± 11	1.44 ± 0.92	245 ± 176
2929D	P5/4	3.40 ± 0.72	1.82 ± 0.32	70 ± 8	108 ± 10	2.61 ± 1.12	89 ± 27
2928A	P6/1	11.39 ± 0.08	12.01 ± 0.10	41658 ± 204	33686 ± 184	11.70 ± 0.31	37672 ± 3986
2928B	P6/2	11.92 ± 0.11	12.55 ± 0.11	25557 ± 160	77647 ± 279	12.23 ± 0.31	51602 ± 26045
2928C	P6/3	11.52 ± 0.09	11.86 ± 0.15	38308 ± 196	13986 ± 118	11.69 ± 0.17	26147 ± 12161
2928D	P6/4	9.82 ± 0.09	10.24 ± 0.09	23824 ± 154	27373 ± 165	10.03 ± 0.21	25598 ± 1774
2928E	P6/5	11.78 ± 0.08	10.81 ± 0.10	42131 ± 205	26739 ± 164	11.30 ± 0.48	34435 ± 7969
2928F	P6/6	8.38 ± 0.58	8.43 ± 0.58	615 ± 25	612 ± 25	8.40 ± 0.48	613 ± 21
2931A	P7/1	9.14 ± 0.07	9.70 ± 0.10	42722 ± 207	20750 ± 144	9.42 ± 0.28	31736 ± 10986
2931B	P7/2	8.38 ± 0.04	7.93 ± 0.04	83074 ± 288	76168 ± 276	8.16 ± 0.23	79621 ± 3453
2931C	P7/3	4.93 ± 0.04	4.22 ± 0.02	34230 ± 185	86158 ± 294	4.58 ± 0.35	60194 ± 25964
2931D	P7/4	11.84 ± 0.06	11.89 ± 0.05	80656 ± 284	101688 ± 319	11.87 ± 0.05	91172 ± 10516

Table SA.3. OSL screening measurements on three aliquots of 90–250 μm 40% HF-etched ‘quartz’ for SUTL2924.

SUTL no.	Field ID	Stored dose / Gy			Sensitivity / photon counts Gy^{-1}			/ Gy	/ photon counts Gy^{-1}
		Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Aliquot 3	Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Aliquot 3	Mean	
2924A	P4/1	3.55 $\pm$ 0.03	3.59 $\pm$ 0.03	3.56 $\pm$ 0.03	27174 $\pm$ 165	40827 $\pm$ 202	36701 $\pm$ 192	3.57 $\pm$ 0.02	34901 $\pm$ 6827
2924B	P4/2	8.13 $\pm$ 0.08	8.38 $\pm$ 0.06	7.90 $\pm$ 0.06	23619 $\pm$ 154	46797 $\pm$ 216	35381 $\pm$ 188	8.14 $\pm$ 0.24	35266 $\pm$ 11589
2924C	P4/3	8.49 $\pm$ 0.04	7.81 $\pm$ 0.05	8.38 $\pm$ 0.05	111907 $\pm$ 335	57758 $\pm$ 240	58463 $\pm$ 242	8.23 $\pm$ 0.34	76042 $\pm$ 27074
2924D	P4/4	10.27 $\pm$ 0.09	10.23 $\pm$ 0.08	9.36 $\pm$ 0.09	25766 $\pm$ 161	39058 $\pm$ 198	22088 $\pm$ 149	9.96 $\pm$ 0.45	28971 $\pm$ 8485
2924E	P4/5	10.09 $\pm$ 0.08	9.74 $\pm$ 0.06	10.24 $\pm$ 0.06	30295 $\pm$ 174	55414 $\pm$ 235	70989 $\pm$ 266	10.02 $\pm$ 0.25	52233 $\pm$ 20347
2924F	P4/6	10.00 $\pm$ 0.06	9.26 $\pm$ 0.06	10.41 $\pm$ 0.06	58387 $\pm$ 242	47008 $\pm$ 217	62521 $\pm$ 250	9.89 $\pm$ 0.57	55972 $\pm$ 7756
2924G	P4/7	15.84 $\pm$ 0.19	5.04 $\pm$ 0.81	4.64 $\pm$ 0.74	15685 $\pm$ 125			8.51 $\pm$ 5.60	15685 $\pm$ 125
2924H	P4/8	11.14 $\pm$ 0.07	10.93 $\pm$ 0.07	11.91 $\pm$ 0.08	55414 $\pm$ 235	54789 $\pm$ 234	49922 $\pm$ 223	11.32 $\pm$ 0.49	53375 $\pm$ 2746
2924I	P4/9	12.42 $\pm$ 0.09	10.99 $\pm$ 0.11	12.56 $\pm$ 0.08	40395 $\pm$ 201	23165 $\pm$ 152	58415 $\pm$ 242	11.99 $\pm$ 0.79	40658 $\pm$ 17625
2924J	P4/10	11.78 $\pm$ 0.09	12.48 $\pm$ 0.09	12.50 $\pm$ 0.08	39231 $\pm$ 198	43100 $\pm$ 208	54282 $\pm$ 233	12.26 $\pm$ 0.36	45538 $\pm$ 7526
2924K	P4/11	12.24 $\pm$ 0.10	12.67 $\pm$ 0.08	12.99 $\pm$ 0.17	29496 $\pm$ 172	54219 $\pm$ 233	12411 $\pm$ 111	12.63 $\pm$ 0.38	32042 $\pm$ 20904
2924L	P4/12	12.72 $\pm$ 0.11	13.16 $\pm$ 0.31	4.72 $\pm$ 0.80	27041 $\pm$ 164	4188 $\pm$ 65		10.20 $\pm$ 4.22	15615 $\pm$ 11426
2924M	P4/13	13.28 $\pm$ 0.09	11.89 $\pm$ 0.06	12.19 $\pm$ 0.10	49639 $\pm$ 223	81273 $\pm$ 285	34906 $\pm$ 187	12.46 $\pm$ 0.69	55273 $\pm$ 23183
2924N	P4/14	13.05 $\pm$ 0.09	12.44 $\pm$ 0.17	12.41 $\pm$ 0.12	40900 $\pm$ 202	11550 $\pm$ 107	23300 $\pm$ 153	12.63 $\pm$ 0.32	25250 $\pm$ 14675
2924O	P4/15	12.02 $\pm$ 0.25	12.15 $\pm$ 0.06	11.25 $\pm$ 0.09	5366 $\pm$ 73	86947 $\pm$ 295	29330 $\pm$ 171	11.80 $\pm$ 0.45	40548 $\pm$ 40790

Table SA.4. IRSL screening measurements on paired aliquots of 90–250 μm 15% HF-etched ‘polymineral’ for SUTL2924.

SUTL no.	Field ID	Stored dose / Gy		Sensitivity / photon counts Gy^{-1}		/ Gy	/ photon counts Gy^{-1}
		Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Mean	
2916A	P1/1	0.87 $\pm$ 0.20	9.07 $\pm$ 2.99	72 $\pm$ 8	26 $\pm$ 5	4.97 $\pm$ 4.10	49 $\pm$ 23
2916B	P1/2	5.87 $\pm$ 1.77	4.64 $\pm$ 1.29	34 $\pm$ 6	32 $\pm$ 6	5.26 $\pm$ 0.62	33 $\pm$ 6
2916C	P1/3	6.53 $\pm$ 1.42	4.07 $\pm$ 0.63	67 $\pm$ 8	147 $\pm$ 12	5.30 $\pm$ 1.23	107 $\pm$ 40
2916D	P1/4	4.72 $\pm$ 0.80	99.38 $\pm$ 28.49	94 $\pm$ 10	23 $\pm$ 5	52.05 $\pm$ 47.33	58 $\pm$ 36
2916E	P1/5	8.15 $\pm$ 2.25	3.71 $\pm$ 1.12	31 $\pm$ 6	27 $\pm$ 5	5.93 $\pm$ 2.22	29 $\pm$ 4
2916F	P1/6	4.58 $\pm$ 1.65	8.08 $\pm$ 0.76	27 $\pm$ 5	416 $\pm$ 20	6.33 $\pm$ 1.75	222 $\pm$ 194
2916G	P1/7	11.14 $\pm$ 3.64	6.01 $\pm$ 0.56	25 $\pm$ 5	376 $\pm$ 19	8.57 $\pm$ 2.56	201 $\pm$ 176
2916H	P1/8	15.68 $\pm$ 3.60	5.21 $\pm$ 1.50	47 $\pm$ 7	27 $\pm$ 5	10.45 $\pm$ 5.23	37 $\pm$ 10
2916I	P1/9	11.16 $\pm$ 1.20	2.51 $\pm$ 0.50	348 $\pm$ 19	80 $\pm$ 9	6.83 $\pm$ 4.33	214 $\pm$ 134
2916J	P1/10	3.12 $\pm$ 1.06	1.79 $\pm$ 0.54	45 $\pm$ 7	44 $\pm$ 7	2.45 $\pm$ 0.66	45 $\pm$ 6
2920A	P2/1	4.32 $\pm$ 0.53	4.61 $\pm$ 0.61	171 $\pm$ 13	150 $\pm$ 12	4.47 $\pm$ 0.20	161 $\pm$ 14
2920B	P2/2	5.78 $\pm$ 0.65	6.92 $\pm$ 0.93	178 $\pm$ 13	133 $\pm$ 12	6.35 $\pm$ 0.80	156 $\pm$ 32
2920C	P2/3	7.26 $\pm$ 0.84	6.21 $\pm$ 0.70	181 $\pm$ 13	182 $\pm$ 13	6.73 $\pm$ 0.75	182 $\pm$ 9
2920D	P2/4	3.80 $\pm$ 0.50	4.66 $\pm$ 0.63	139 $\pm$ 12	127 $\pm$ 11	4.23 $\pm$ 0.60	133 $\pm$ 9
2920E	P2/5	3.58 $\pm$ 0.51	4.61 $\pm$ 0.67	145 $\pm$ 12	137 $\pm$ 12	4.10 $\pm$ 0.73	141 $\pm$ 6
2920F	P2/6	4.54 $\pm$ 0.59	4.15 $\pm$ 0.55	138 $\pm$ 12	134 $\pm$ 12	4.35 $\pm$ 0.28	136 $\pm$ 3
2920G	P2/7	5.04 $\pm$ 0.55		221 $\pm$ 15		5.04 $\pm$ 0.55	221 $\pm$ 15
2920H	P2/8	8.09 $\pm$ 1.12	5.74 $\pm$ 0.76	116 $\pm$ 11	134 $\pm$ 12	6.91 $\pm$ 1.67	125 $\pm$ 13
2920I	P2/9	2.67 $\pm$ 0.28	4.08 $\pm$ 0.34	227 $\pm$ 15	434 $\pm$ 21	3.37 $\pm$ 1.00	331 $\pm$ 146
2920J	P2/10	3.98 $\pm$ 0.48		161 $\pm$ 13		3.98 $\pm$ 0.48	161 $\pm$ 13
2920K	P2/11	6.85 $\pm$ 0.85		140 $\pm$ 12		6.85 $\pm$ 0.85	140 $\pm$ 12
2913A	P3/1	5.68 $\pm$ 1.68	4.96 $\pm$ 1.61	59 $\pm$ 8	43 $\pm$ 7	5.32 $\pm$ 0.36	51 $\pm$ 8
2913B	P3/2	2.49 $\pm$ 0.77	1.69 $\pm$ 0.55	43 $\pm$ 7	45 $\pm$ 7	2.09 $\pm$ 0.40	44 $\pm$ 1

Table SA.4 (cont.).

SUTL no.	Field ID	Stored dose / Gy		Sensitivity / photon counts Gy ⁻¹		/ Gy	/ photon counts Gy ⁻¹
		Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Mean	
2913C	P3/3	2.01 ± 0.66	5.74 ± 2.07	42 ± 6	22 ± 5	3.87 ± 1.86	32 ± 10
2913D	P3/4	1.88 ± 0.79	2.55 ± 0.90	23 ± 5	25 ± 5	2.22 ± 0.33	24 ± 1
2913E	P3/5	1.25 ± 0.45	2.97 ± 0.80	42 ± 6	35 ± 6	2.11 ± 0.86	38 ± 3
2913F	P3/6	1.07 ± 0.42	2.44 ± 0.58	41 ± 6	41 ± 6	1.76 ± 0.69	41 ± 5
2913G	P3/7	3.27 ± 0.99	6.75 ± 2.13	44 ± 7	26 ± 5	5.01 ± 1.74	35 ± 9
2913H	P3/8	4.40 ± 1.87	4.65 ± 1.16	19 ± 4	43 ± 7	4.52 ± 1.29	31 ± 12
2913I	P3/9	7.47 ± 1.36	8.89 ± 1.74	112 ± 11	55 ± 7	8.18 ± 0.71	84 ± 29
2913J	P3/10	12.41 ± 2.12	9.11 ± 1.74	183 ± 14	62 ± 8	10.76 ± 1.65	122 ± 60
2929A	P5/1	3.12 ± 0.38	4.47 ± 0.51	188 ± 14	195 ± 14	3.79 ± 0.95	191 ± 5
2929B	P5/2	4.05 ± 0.54	4.29 ± 0.59	136 ± 12	128 ± 11	4.17 ± 0.17	132 ± 6
2929C	P5/3	4.94 ± 0.70	6.07 ± 0.83	132 ± 12	122 ± 11	5.51 ± 0.80	127 ± 7
2929D	P5/4	4.13 ± 0.51	4.99 ± 0.70	162 ± 13	135 ± 12	4.56 ± 0.61	148 ± 19
2928A	P6/1	9.65 ± 1.19	9.72 ± 0.79	263 ± 16	427 ± 21	9.69 ± 0.87	345 ± 82
2928B	P6/2	8.55 ± 0.86	14.55 ± 0.86	340 ± 18	151 ± 12	11.55 ± 3.00	245 ± 94
2928C	P6/3	19.88 ± 1.56	9.45 ± 1.13	510 ± 23	199 ± 14	14.66 ± 5.21	355 ± 156
2928D	P6/4	17.96 ± 2.82	11.37 ± 3.94	145 ± 12	44 ± 7	14.67 ± 3.30	95 ± 50
2928E	P6/5	12.19 ± 1.35	10.50 ± 0.98	298 ± 17	339 ± 18	11.35 ± 0.85	318 ± 20
2928F	P6/6	2.49 ± 0.58	7.59 ± 1.64	44 ± 8	72 ± 8	5.04 ± 2.55	58 ± 14
2931A	P7/1	8.30 ± 0.91	8.54 ± 0.94	281 ± 17	310 ± 18	8.42 ± 0.77	296 ± 15
2931B	P7/2	9.08 ± 0.39	4.45 ± 0.43	1474 ± 38	356 ± 19	6.76 ± 2.32	915 ± 559
2931C	P7/3	3.27 ± 0.21	1.34 ± 0.18	805 ± 28	285 ± 17	2.31 ± 0.96	545 ± 260
2931D	P7/4	16.61 ± 1.04	13.72 ± 1.81	668 ± 26	159 ± 13	15.17 ± 1.45	413 ± 255

Table SA.5. IRSL screening measurements on three aliquots of 90–250 µm 15% HF-etched 'polymineal' for SUTL2924.

SUTL no.	Field ID	Stored dose / Gy			Sensitivity / photon counts Gy ⁻¹			/ Gy	/ photon counts Gy ⁻¹
		Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Aliquot 3	Aliquot 1	Aliquot 2	Aliquot 3	Mean	
2924A	P4/1	7.69 ± 0.88	1.04 ± 0.11	4.89 ± 0.54	60 ± 8	179 ± 13	66 ± 8	4.54 ± 3.32	102 ± 59
2924B	P4/2	4.69 ± 0.29	4.46 ± 0.36	3.70 ± 0.49	124 ± 11	74 ± 9	42 ± 7	4.28 ± 0.49	80 ± 41
2924C	P4/3	7.00 ± 0.35	2.28 ± 0.47	1.65 ± 0.31	141 ± 12	25 ± 5	29 ± 5	3.64 ± 2.68	65 ± 58
2924D	P4/4	7.76 ± 0.83	6.72 ± 0.60	2.85 ± 0.33	49 ± 7	60 ± 8	47 ± 7	5.78 ± 2.45	52 ± 6
2924E	P4/5	5.20 ± 0.39	4.66 ± 0.48	4.43 ± 0.47	78 ± 9	54 ± 7	54 ± 7	4.76 ± 0.39	62 ± 12
2924F	P4/6	6.38 ± 0.44	5.74 ± 0.67	5.10 ± 0.38	90 ± 10	46 ± 7	82 ± 9	5.74 ± 0.64	73 ± 22
2924G	P4/7	10.84 ± 0.49	9.87 ± 0.55	5.86 ± 0.68	163 ± 13	82 ± 9	163 ± 13	8.86 ± 2.49	136 ± 41
2924H	P4/8	12.01 ± 0.58	4.44 ± 1.02	11.84 ± 0.58	149 ± 12	21 ± 5	139 ± 12	9.43 ± 3.79	103 ± 64
2924I	P4/9	7.85 ± 0.52	10.28 ± 0.61	11.26 ± 0.31	92 ± 10	109 ± 10	379 ± 19	9.80 ± 1.70	193 ± 144
2924J	P4/10	6.16 ± 0.52	8.77 ± 0.42	7.40 ± 0.72	64 ± 8	149 ± 12	54 ± 7	7.44 ± 1.30	89 ± 47
2924K	P4/11	10.86 ± 0.57	12.04 ± 0.74	10.71 ± 0.53	132 ± 11	106 ± 10	140 ± 12	11.20 ± 0.67	126 ± 17
2924L	P4/12	8.98 ± 0.99	4.26 ± 0.40	6.29 ± 0.41	46 ± 7	59 ± 8	46 ± 7	6.51 ± 2.36	50 ± 6
2924M	P4/13	9.90 ± 0.80	7.08 ± 0.88	6.95 ± 0.66	67 ± 8	39 ± 6	58 ± 8	7.97 ± 1.48	55 ± 14
2924N	P4/14	14.74 ± 0.91	5.71 ± 0.54	1.91 ± 0.43	101 ± 10	58 ± 8	21 ± 5	7.45 ± 6.41	60 ± 40
2924O	P4/15	11.86 ± 0.97	4.17 ± 0.27	11.24 ± 0.43	68 ± 8	98 ± 10	204 ± 14	9.09 ± 3.85	123 ± 68

Appendix 2 – Supplement B




Figure SB.1. Dose response curves for SUTL2914, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.2. Dose response curves for SUTL2915, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.3. Dose response curves for SUTL2917, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.4. Dose response curves for SUTL2918, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.5. Dose response curves for SUTL2919, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.6. Dose response curves for SUTL2921, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.7. Dose response curves for SUTL2922, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.8. Dose response curves for SUTL2923, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.9. Dose response curves for SUTL2925, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.10. Dose response curves for SUTL2926, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.11. Dose response curves for SUTL2927, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).




Figure SB.12. Dose response curves for SUTL2930, showing the mean of all groups (left) with the fitted saturating exponential function and mean normalized natural signal, and the exponential functions for the different preheat groups (right).

Appendix 2 – Supplement C




Figure SC.1. Abanico plot for SUTL2914.




Figure SC.2. Abanico plot for SUTL2915.




Figure SC.3. *Abanico plot for SUTL2917.*




Figure SC.4. *Abanico plot for SUTL2918.*




Figure SC.5. *Abanico plot for SUTL2919.*




Figure SC.6. Abanico plot for SUTL2921 (note: data point for -0.032 ± 0.136 Gy excluded).




Figure SC.7. Abanico plot for SUTL2922.




Figure SC.8. Abanico plot for SUTL2923 (note: data point for -3.03 ± 3.53 Gy excluded).




Figure SC.9. *Abanico plot for SUTL2925.*




Figure SC.10. *Abanico plot for SUTL2926.*




Figure SC.11. *Abanico plot for SUTL2927.*




Figure SC.12. *Abanico plot for SUTL2930.*

Appendix 2 – Supplement D




Figure SD.1. Apparent ages for profile 1 (black) with OSL ages (red).




Figure SD.2. Apparent ages for profile 2 (black) with OSL ages (red).




Figure SD.3. Apparent ages for profile 3 (black) with OSL ages (red). Note that dose rates for 0–75 cm are extrapolated.




Figure SD.4. Apparent ages for profiles 4 (black) and 6 (blue) with OSL ages (red). Note that dose rates for 0–120 cm are extrapolated, and for the south section assumed to be the same as the corresponding depth on the east section.




Figure SD.5. Apparent ages for profile 5 (black) with OSL ages (red).




Figure SD.6. Apparent ages for profile 7 (black). The dose rate for the bottom sample was assumed to equal the corresponding context in P4, the apparent age for that context in P4 is shown (red).

Temple landscapes

The ERC-funded *FRAGSUS Project* (*Fragility and sustainability in small island environments: adaptation, cultural change and collapse in prehistory, 2013–18*), led by Caroline Malone (Queens University Belfast) has explored issues of environmental fragility and Neolithic social resilience and sustainability during the Holocene period in the Maltese Islands. This, the first volume of three, presents the palaeo-environmental story of early Maltese landscapes.

The project employed a programme of high-resolution chronological and stratigraphic investigations of the valley systems on Malta and Gozo. Buried deposits extracted through coring and geoarchaeological study yielded rich and chronologically controlled data that allow an important new understanding of environmental change in the islands. The study combined AMS radiocarbon and OSL chronologies with detailed palynological, molluscan and geoarchaeological analyses. These enable environmental reconstruction of prehistoric landscapes and the changing resources exploited by the islanders between the seventh and second millennia BC. The interdisciplinary studies combined with excavated economic and environmental materials from archaeological sites allows *Temple landscapes* to examine the dramatic and damaging impacts made by the first farming communities on the islands' soil and resources. The project reveals the remarkable resilience of the soil-vegetational system of the island landscapes, as well as the adaptations made by Neolithic communities to harness their productivity, in the face of climatic change and inexorable soil erosion. Neolithic people evidently understood how to maintain soil fertility and cope with the inherently unstable changing landscapes of Malta. In contrast, second millennium BC Bronze Age societies failed to adapt effectively to the long-term aridifying trend so clearly highlighted in the soil and vegetation record. This failure led to severe and irreversible erosion and very different and short-lived socio-economic systems across the Maltese islands.

Editors:

Charles French is Professor of Geoarchaeology in the Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge. *Chris O. Hunt* is a Professor in the School of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool.

Reuben Grima is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Conservation and Built Heritage, University of Malta.

Rowan McLaughlin is Senior Researcher in the Department of Scientific Research at the British Museum and honorary research scholar at Queen's University Belfast.

Caroline Malone is a Professor in the School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's University Belfast.

Simon Stoddart is Reader in Prehistory in the Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge.

*Published by the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research,
University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3ER, UK.*

Cover design by Dora Kemp and Ben Plumridge.

ISBN: 978-1-902937-99-1

