

URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN BRONZE AGE AND IRON AGE MALTA

Giuliana Bonanno - Sapienza University of Rome

From the Bronze Age, the Maltese archipelago followed a particular and unique urban development throughout its history. Here is the attempt to underline this particularity, through a deepening into the settlement topography and land-use strategies of some of the most important Late Bronze and Iron Age's sites of Malta and Gozo, also by tracing the changes occurred after the arriving of Levantine newcomers in the 8th century BC. This paper will focus on the specific urban strategies adopted by some of the most representative sites of the Bronze and Iron Age. It follows a brief outline about the location of the necropolis, intended as an essential marker to discover the presence of the Phoenician settlements. Altogether, these data shed a light on the comprehension of the Maltese ancient urban landscape, which appears as an interdependent system that involved, in the Late Bronze Age, a strong connection between many inland villages, their fertile lands and few landing bays. This system became more complex during the Iron Age, with the appearance of big urban centers exploiting the rural landscape and connected to important trading harbors.

Keywords: Protohistory; Malta; urban landscape; Punic Archaeology; settlements

1. INTRODUCTION: URBAN LANDSCAPE AND URBANISM MODEL

1.1. *Late and Final Bronze Age - Borġ in-Nadur (13th-9th century BC) and Bahrija (10th-8th century BC) phases*

In the Late Bronze Age Malta appeared dotted with a variety of inland villages located on naturally defended places (fig. 1).¹ These settlements counted with fertile terrains nearby and they were situated in strategic points in connection both with the harbors and the surrounding hinterland.

The villages were often defended by rounded city walls (fig. 2). The emergence of defended settlements seems to be related to socioeconomic reasons, such as the need to control storage and to reinforce strength appearance, rather than to a real necessity of defense:² in this period, there are no signs of threat from overseas nor inside the islands.³

This model fits with the wider urban layout of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, as in Sicily, Southern Italy and Sardinia.

The density of pottery sherds clusters scattered throughout Malta and Gozo, however, has shown that the distribution of settlements expanded considerably in the Maltese islands, including undefended areas, thus suggesting a demographic expansion. Just in Gozo Island the *Cambridge Gozo survey* in 1987-1995 recorded 29 domestic sites dating to the Late Bronze Age.⁴

¹ The Borġ in-Nadur phase starts in Malta as early as the 16th century BC. In this chapter only the final centuries of the period (13th-9th century BC) are considered, corresponding to the Sicilian Late Bronze Age (Trump 1961, 253-262; Tanasi - Vella eds. 2015, tab. 1.1).

² Armstrong *et al.* 2020, 257.

³ Trump 2002, 263.

⁴ Stoddart *et al.* 2020, 242.

Settlements in the hinterland were mostly of three different types:⁵ open villages on hilltops or plateaus, villages on slopes, and cave sites, such as Ghajn Abdul and Għar Mirdum.

The great number of rock-cut bell-shaped pits used as silos, spread all over the islands, testifies of an intense agricultural activity, as also the many terraced fields do, although they are very difficult to date. It is likely that the Borġ in-Nadur villages depended primarily on the cultivation of fields and agricultural products.

It should be also noted that, taking count of the evidence of settlements mostly located inland, we cannot exclude the presence of important coastal outposts during the Late Bronze Age. The reason for the scarcity of ancient remains around the harbors lies in the continuous occupation of these areas from millennia to the present days.

During the Final Bronze Age, in the Bahrija phase (10th-8th century BC), the archaeological evidence suggests a decrease in the number of villages, although the process of nucleation and urbanization that had begun as early as the Middle Bronze Age did not come to a stop, as can be seen from the formation of urban centers in the Iron Age.

1.2. Iron Age - Phoenician Period (8th-6th century BC)

Considering the scarce remains of Phoenician and Punic structures, the urban development in Iron Age Malta is suggested through a variety of evidence, such tomb's distribution, the ancient road plans and the distribution of clusters of pottery sherds. According to these data, the main urban zones of Malta during this period were Mdina/Rabat, Għar Barka, Qalillija and the Buskett Gardens areas.⁶

It is very likely that Phoenicians decided to occupy already existent Late Bronze Age settlements, while others dating to the same period were abandoned. Unfortunately, the reasons for this and the nature of relations with the indigenous people are unclear.⁷

In this perspective, one could imagine an urbanistic model consisting of a single large settlement, Mdina/Rabat, connected with a variety of smaller villages around the countryside and with ports.

Based on these elements, C. Sagona suggested that in the Punic period the island was divided into two zones, one in the North, with Mdina/Rabat as its center, and one in the South, around the bay of Marsaxlokk. These two zones reflected two different economies and systems of land exploitation: in the northern part the main activity was oil production, while in the south the textile industry and dyeing of weaving products prevailed.⁸

In the following pages are presented some case studies illustrating the main urban characteristics of Late Bronze and Iron Age settlements.

⁵ This sites' typology has been suggested by D. Trump (2002, 250-253).

⁶ Sagona 2014, 357.

⁷ Sagona (2015, 171-177) hypothesises an enduring presence of the Late Bronze Age local population after the arrivals of the Levantines, considering not possible the occurrence of a cultural hiatus. For some scholars the seeming disappearance of Borġ in-Nadur culture could be seen as a sign of hybridity and cultural interaction with the Phoenicians' culture since early times.

⁸ Sagona 2002, 680, fig. 11.

2. THE SETTLEMENTS

2.1. *Borġ in-Nadur*

Located on the south-western part of Malta, Borġ in-Nadur represents one of the best sites to outline the urban development of the island in the Late Bronze Age: lying on a hilltop, it was surrounded by a great dry-stone wall (4.5 m high) with a semicircular bastion defending the village, of which two huts were discovered⁹ (fig. 2). Its strategic location in connection with the bay of Marsaxlokk has been the object of a study by R. Grima,¹⁰ that showed how the fortune of the site relied on its topographical connectivity with different parts of the interior.

The site comprised 2 sectors: the templar area dating to the Tarxien Temple Period (3000 - 2500 BC), refurbished in the Bronze Age, and the Bronze Age settlement nearby.¹¹ The settlement's development is strictly related to the reuse of the temple in the Late Bronze age.

Each hut (Hut 1: 7.5 m²; Hut 2: 3.5 m²) preserved stone wall foundations, had an oval shape, and contained a quern and a heart. It has been estimated that the village was inhabited by hundreds of people and that it was 2.8 ha wide.¹²

On the rocky foreshore below the village, a pair of ruts and silo pits¹³ were discovered,¹⁴ positioned in front of the sea and not inside the walls and connected to the village through Cart Ruts. This location may suggest a use of the silos as clothes' dyeing vats rather than as water or food storage.¹⁵

2.2. *In-Nuffara*

Occupied continuously for only 100 years, from 1100 to 1000 BC, the site is in Gozo's interior, not far from Victoria, on an Upper Coralline limestone hilltop, therefore naturally defended¹⁶ and with a view on the surrounding hinterland (fig. 3). Due to the erosion of the soil, very little traces of the settlement have remained. Indeed, no structures have survived, except for 15 rock-cut pits.¹⁷ It is difficult to reconstruct the extent of the settlement; however, the distribution of the pits can help to understand the structure of the site: they are spread over the entire surface, suggesting that at one time the village extended over the

⁹ The excavations of the site were carried out by Caruana in 1881 and 1923, later by Murray in the Temple complex and Trump in the residential area in 1959 (Vella - Zammit - Bugeja 2011, 45-60).

¹⁰ Grima - Mallia 2011.

¹¹ Tanasi 2008, 14; Grima - Mallia 2011.

¹² Trump 2002, 254.

¹³ The presence of rock-cut silo pits is a recurrent pattern in the settlements of the Bronze Age culture of Malta. Their interpretation is twofold: they could be used as storage pits for grain or water cisterns, or as dyeing vats (Sagona 1999, 53; Tanasi 2008, 17), thus assuming an intense productive activity of the Bronze Age's Maltese sites. However, the frequency of these artifacts in almost every Bronze Age's settlement in Malta and Gozo, makes us suppose a use as storage silos, at least for those strictly related to residential areas, while it is possible that the ones far from the village had a more industrial purpose.

¹⁴ Trump 2002, 288.

¹⁵ Tanasi 2008, 18.

¹⁶ The site was excavated by Evans in 1960 and 1971, then by a team directed by Simon Stoddart and Rowan McLaughlin in 2015. See Armstrong *et al.* 2020.

¹⁷ Two of them, excavated in 2015, contained huge storage vessels (Armstrong *et al.* 2020, 255).

entire plateau.¹⁸ Moreover, the presence of these storage devices, combined with the defensive nature of the settlement, tell of a particular organization required for the economic complexity achieved by this Maltese Bronze Age community.

It is unknown if each pit was related to a single household or if it was used for collective community storage:¹⁹ that would mean a clear difference in the complexity and organization of the village's community. The site had a short life because it was abandoned in the 10th century BC.

2.3. *Il Qlejgha tal-Baħrija*

The village of Baħrija extended over 7.5 ha, in a sloping and not leveled limestone plateau on the western coast of Malta. To the east, the settlement was connected to the Baħrija valley, one of the most fertile lands in the island due to the presence of a perennial water spring.²⁰ Unfortunately, no structures attributable to this Final Late Bronze Age settlement were recovered, except for the imprints of reeds, interpreted as possible remains of a hut²¹ and many fragments of Baħrija and Borġ in-Nadur pottery,²² together with spindle whorls, mortars and two hearths, clearly associated with an occupation of dwelling type.

M.E. Zammit also recorded early Borġ in-Nadur pottery sherds, thus suggesting an occupation of the site before the Baħrija phase.²³

2.4. *Mdina/Rabat*

Located on the highest point of the island of Malta, in a natural defended position, the city was surrounded by a rural landscape comprehending two freshwater springs, and it was linked by radial roads to other smaller centers and to the main harbors of the island. The distance from the Marsaxlokk Bay, for instance, is only 7 km. During Punic times (5th-3rd centuries BC), the city extended over 40 ha. The site was defined by an ancient ditch on the west, while the eastern part by the steep slopes of the plateau itself.

The ancient Phoenician city was founded in the early 8th century BC. Recent archaeological investigations revealed some Phoenician strata including at least three architectural phases of rectangular structures, proving the presence of a settlement dating to the 8th-6th century BC, under the Mesquita square and Xara Palace.²⁴

¹⁸ Armstrong *et al.* 2020, 256.

¹⁹ Armstrong *et al.* 2020, 256.

²⁰ Cardona 2020, 3-5. Excavations began in 1909, directed by Eric Peet. Then they continued in 1965 under the direction of David Trump. In 2006, Maria Elena Zammit conducted a field walking survey, that make it possible to understand the dimension and shape of the site as a whole.

²¹ This evidence was discovered by Eric Peet in 1909 in the trench A, opened in the central part of the site (Peet 1910, 154).

²² This material has been recently object of study and revision by Tanasi - Cardona eds. 2020.

²³ Zammit 2006.

²⁴ These structures had rubble foundations and mortar floors and included hearths in close association with Bronze Age material. This may indicate the Phoenician strategy of making use of existing indigenous economic and social networks (Bonanno 2005, 47; Sagona 2014, 357). It is very likely, thus, that Mdina had a proto-urban past developed during the Borġ in-Nadur period.

However, other scholars suggest a different scenario: Mdina/Rabat could be the settlement of an already existing Maltese population, while the main Phoenician center was located on a bay on the coast. The two centers being strictly connected, has led to consider Mdina/Rabat to be Phoenician itself.²⁵

Some hypothesizes that the rectangular structures of the Phoenician strata uncovered under Mesquita Square stood inside an ancient precinct: it was located on the highest point of the city and defined an open space with public buildings inside, while the residential buildings could be located on the lower part of the city.²⁶

Nowadays these are the only evidence of the Phoenician-Punic period, meanwhile only Roman structures, some bell-shaped pits, and a shaft of the prehistoric period are the other discovered remains of the city.²⁷

2.5. *Victoria, Gozo*

According to Pseudo Skylax,²⁸ there was only one city in Gozo during the Punic period, located under the modern city and the citadel of Victoria/Rabat. The position of the city in one of the highest points of the island, not far from the coastline and the harbors of Xlendi and Mġarr, seems to recall the urbanist model of most of the main Phoenician settlements in the Maltese islands.

Regarding the chronology of the site, A. Bonanno²⁹ suggested that the city took its time to develop into a proper urban center, based on the scarcity of Phoenician tombs in Victoria dating to the early period (8th-7th centuries BC).

Here there are no Phoenician or Punic period remains, except for some materials recovered from small soundings on the citadel, the highest point of the city.

Therefore, to understand the urban development of Gozo in the Iron Age it is necessary to consult other sources. In this sense, the text known as *Melitensia Quinta*, although written in the 3rd century BC, gave us some interesting data.³⁰ In the text there is a mention of the “guard of the stone-quarry”, as if it was an important person. It is very likely that quarrying was one of the main activities on the island. A. Bonanno³¹ suggests that Gozo’s Cart Ruts³² had to be associated with the quarrying industry and served to carry the blocks from the quarry to the main street.

²⁵ Docter *et al.* 2012, 140.

²⁶ Sagona 2015, 221-228.

²⁷ On the remains from the Roman period see Zammit 1922; on the Prehistoric ones and the bell-shaped pits see Cutajar 2001.

²⁸ Saliba 2002, 7.

²⁹ Bonanno 2005, 41-43.

³⁰ The small limestone tablet was discovered in 1855 and first published by the orientalist Michelangelo Lanci (1855). It is inscribed in Phoenician and talks about the rebuilding of three Punic sanctuaries by “the people of Gozo”. See, among others, Bonanno 2017, 243-254.

³¹ Bonanno 1990, 35-39; 2005, 17.

³² The Cart Ruts are a unique characteristic of ancient Malta. They are diffused all over the Maltese islands and consist of parallel long grooves incised on the bedrock, usually interpreted as roads. The academic debate disagrees on their chronology and use, still shrouded in mystery. For further study see Bonanno 1990; Sagona 2004; Tanasi 2008.

In Gozo there are at least four long Cart Ruts: Ta' Lambert, Ras il-Qala, Ta' Cenc, Dwejra. Therefore, during the Punic Period Gozo was surely living an intense urbanism development (of which no traces are left), having Victoria as the urban center, connected with roads and Cart Ruts with the harbors and with the interior, the latter being dotted with rustic houses related to an intense agricultural activity.

3. LOCATION OF THE NECROPOLIS

Considering the scarce remains of Phoenician settlements in the Maltese islands, tombs and their location can be considered good indicators to understand the Iron Age urban development: basing on tombs distribution, it appears that the Phoenician territorial expansion into the interior had begun very early (fig. 4). All the earliest Phoenician's rock-cut tombs (Ghajn Quajjet, Qualillija, Buskett Gardens) are located in the interior, a few kilometers away from Mdina. This is an indicator of the very early occupation of the site of Mdina from the beginning of the Phoenicians' arrival.³³ It is likely, therefore, that Mdina/Rabat was the oldest and main urban center in Iron Age Malta.

Among the Phoenician funerary tradition, necropolises usually stood apart from the settlements, next to waterways such as coastlines or rivers. In Malta, however, Phoenician rock-cut tombs were located along the main roads of the islands that connected the sea with the interior. One might suggest that this feature is to be connected with the equally unique urban development of the island during this period, which as we have seen is different from the usual settlement pattern of the Phoenician colonies of the West. Moreover, the exact locations of these graves helped some scholars to track the course of the ancient roads, and it turned out an urbanistic framework with more than one or two points of access from the sea and at least four main roads.³⁴

To bring some examples, a roadway from Rabat to Ghajin Tuffieha, in the North part of the island, and another to the South, from Cospicua to Marsaxlokk, are suggested by tombs' distribution,³⁵ and they connected the inland settlements to the coastal bays. In the island of Gozo only 20 tombs have been recorded, 12 of which are in Victoria.³⁶

Tombs provide precious information not only for their locations but also through their contents. The discovery of wine vessels and hybrid pottery³⁷ in some of the earliest Phoenicians tombs suggested some considerations about the transformation of the landscape, the land use and the relationships between newcomers and local people. Introduction of viticulture by Levantines, testified also by the many rock-cut pans used for grape crushing and production of wine,³⁸ may have also influenced, for example, some settlement strategies: the occupation of some Late Bronze Age sites in the interior and the abandonment of others, perhaps also caused by widespread processes of centralization of people in one big settlement.

³³ Bonanno 2005, 34-35. For the contents and shape of the tomb of Ghajn Quajjet see, Baldacchino - Dunbabin 1953.

³⁴ Sagona 2015, 198-201.

³⁵ Sagona 2002, 269-271.

³⁶ Sagona 2014, 359.

³⁷ Which is to say, in this case, locally crafted Phoenician pottery.

³⁸ Jaccarini - Cauchi 1999, 10-14; Bonanno 2008, 10-16.

4. DISCUSSION: HINTERLAND, RURAL CONTEXTS AND LAND USE

To report some quantitative data, 23 villages dating to the Late Bronze Age have been recorded in Malta, while 6 in Gozo. For the Phoenician and Punic Period there were 1 urban settlement (Mdina/Rabat), 19 rural settlements and 642 burials in Malta, while 1 urban settlement (Victoria), 3 rural settlements and 25 burials in Gozo, according to findings' distribution.³⁹

Many of the rural settlements in Malta were distributed around the area of Mdina/Rabat.

The interesting results of the survey project directed by Docter⁴⁰ in the rural areas of Malta, showed that the north part of the island was not occupied by Phoenicians before the 5th century BC, while the area of the Roman Villa of St. Pawl Milqui, rich in presence of water, seems to be occupied in a permanent way since earlier times, considering the 6th century rock-cut tomb found in the zone. In the south-west part of the island, the Zurrieq region had to be an important economic Phoenician center, as it is suggested by the still standing structure so called "Punic Tower", although no others archaeological finds are known from the Phoenician and Punic period.

The evidence for the presence of substantial rural complexes well established in the Punic Period (5th-4th centuries BC), suggests that they were already existent in earlier times, thus providing an idea of the importance of the agricultural activities since the earliest Phoenician period (7th-6th centuries BC). In other words, land-use patterns of the Punic period may have followed earlier land-use settlements plans.⁴¹

As concerns the main port areas, it is likely that only the south and south-eastern harbors of the two islands provided sufficient shelters. In fact, it seems that Marsaxlokk, Grand Harbor and Marsamxett bays were preferred to the northern ones. The Manoel island, enclosed inside the Marsamxett bay, would be the perfect place for a traditional Phoenician colony, unfortunately no remains are reported. On Gozo the only beaching facilities are Ramla bay, l-Hamra, Xlendi bay, Marsalforn and Mġarr, the last three being the main port areas, connected to the city of Victoria.

To enrich the Bronze and Iron Age urbanistic framework of the Maltese islands, we should briefly mention the much-debated Cart Ruts, series of parallel long grooves incised on the bedrock, spread all over the islands' territory: sometimes 3 km long, they followed different destinations and are generally interpreted as sort of roads used for the transition of vehicles. D. Trump and D. Tanasi⁴² consider the Cart Ruts linked to an intense productive-economic network and date them to the Bronze Age, while Sagona⁴³ suggests a use for the intense agricultural activities of the more ancient Temple Period (4100-2500 BC).

Lastly, with regards to the settlement strategies, it seems that in the two islands, both in the Late Bronze Age and the Phoenician Period, the pre-existence of a temple (dating from Temple Period or Tarxien Cemetery, 4100-2500 BC) often influenced the establishment of a new settlement. This and other similarities of the urban strategies adopted in the two

³⁹ Said-Zammit 1997a, 2-4; van Dommelen - Gómez Bellard eds. 2008, 15-19.

⁴⁰ Docter *et al.* 2012.

⁴¹ Vella 2007; Sagona 2015, 220-221.

⁴² Tanasi 2008, 21.

⁴³ Sagona 2004, 45-60.

periods, could suggest that natives didn't abandon their culture abruptly and that there was not a hiatus between the Late Bronze and the Iron Age.⁴⁴ Even though the evidence of the overlapping of Bronze Age and Phoenician materials in the archaeological record of Tas Silġ and the Mtarfa pit is no longer considered reliable as seen in recent studies,⁴⁵ a scenario of peaceful coexistence between local inhabitants and the new settlers still seems likely.

5. CONCLUSIONS - THE SETTLEMENTS, THEIR HINTERLAND AND THE COASTAL TRADE HARBOR: AN INTERDEPENDENT SYSTEM

In the Maltese islands, already in the Bronze Age but especially during the Iron Age, the settlements, their hinterland, and the coastal trading ports appeared altogether as an interdependent system.

During the Late Bronze Age, the urban landscape was mostly composed of villages located inland, sometimes fortified, interconnected, and dedicated to farming. Trade activities and relations with foreign countries, especially with Sicily, are well documented for this period. However, trade was not the main activity practiced on the islands.

With the arrival of the Phoenicians in the 8th century BC, this layout was modified with the foundation of a few large urban centers that replaced some of the main villages. However, the Phoenicians kept the same urban planning and land-use strategies adopted in the Late Bronze Age by the local inhabitants. As already suggested by S. Moscati, in Malta the Phoenicians choose to reuse previous settlements, finding it more convenient. The scholar explained this particularity as «not a contradiction to usual criteria but rather an adaptation to special circumstances».⁴⁶

These special circumstances could be based, to mention one, on the insular and isolated nature of the territory: the Maltese islands are small and far from the mainland, implying a relatively closed subsistence economy and a necessary agro-pastoral exploitation of the land. In fact, in contrast to the urbanistic model typical of most Phoenicians colonies throughout the Mediterranean (coastal settlements located in promontories or bays, offshore islands), in Malta the colonies were established inland and had a direct connection with the surrounding hinterland.⁴⁷ Moreover, the Maltese coastline is predominantly high and steep⁴⁸ and the lower parts of the coast were already occupied by prehistoric settlements, some

⁴⁴ Trump 2002, 296-297.

⁴⁵ Some scholars (Vidal González 2003, 260-261; Bonanno 2005, 35-38) called into question the unreliability of these archaeological strata, introducing the hypothesis of a decline of the Bronze Age inhabitants prior to the Phoenicians' arrival, also considering the non-presence of local items at the most ancient Phoenician tomb at Malta, Ghajin Quajjet, and the lack of Phoenician imports in Late Bronze Age contexts (see also Brusasco 1993; van Dommelen 2008; Gómez Bellard 2020). The recent reassessment of Borġ in-Nadur and Bahrġa materials proposed by Tanasi - Cardona eds. 2020 has confirmed the non-presence of strata overlapping Bronze Age and Phoenician pottery, at least at the current state. However, the scarcity of archaeological evidence in the crucial centuries between the 11th and the 8th century BC can't be read with certainty as a decline of Bronze Age local culture, nor it can exclude a plausible encounter between local people and Phoenicians.

⁴⁶ Moscati - Schembri - Frendo 1993, 287.

⁴⁷ Saliba 2002, 10.

⁴⁸ For an insight on the geology of the Maltese islands see, Pedley - Clarke - Galea 2002.

dating back to the Temple Period: settling in places already existing or inhabited wasn't only a choice for Phoenicians but also a necessity.

The suggestion of the megalithic structures of the Temple Period was so strong that it was impossible not to confront them. This may have determined the choice to settle next to these religious structures: the population of the Late Bronze Age may have decided to reuse them to participate in a past religious sentiment of which they were not fully aware,⁴⁹ while the Phoenicians may have felt the need to legitimize their presence in the islands, showing the same respect for the ancient religious structures. However, it is also possible to suggest that settlements' locations responded to good adaptation strategies to the territory that worked since the Temple Period throughout the Bronze and Iron Age. The site of Borġ in-Nadur, for example, is apparently influenced by the presence of the preexistent temple, but the position of the village on a lower part of the Maltese coastline responds to a strategic way to inhabit the territory. To name others, the central and high areas of Mdina in Malta and Victoria in Gozo were immediately identified and turned into established settlements. Then, by the end of the 6th century BC, the Phoenicians came to occupy most of the Maltese landscape, as testified by the wide area of distribution of rock cut tombs.

To sum up the many and variegated data needed to reconstruct the Maltese archipelago urban development during the Bronze and the Iron Age, one can ultimately say that we are facing a complex framework. It consists, in the Late Bronze Age, of numerous settlements mostly located inland, on naturally defended plateaus, sometimes rounded by fortification walls, based on an agro-pastoral subsistence economy. With the beginning of the Iron Age, some of the main settlements were abandoned, with the consequent formation of one or two large urban centers. These centers had a fertile hinterland dotted with smaller villages: they were still economically dependent on the products of the territory and linked by a network of roads to the main trading harbors, that became important outposts in the "Route of the Great Islands" of the Phoenician and Punic period.

⁴⁹ Spagnoli - Bonanno, in this volume (C.4.4.).

REFERENCES

- ARMSTRONG, S. - BROGAN, C. - BONANNO, A. - FRENCH, C. - McLAUGHLIN, R. - PARKINSON, E.W. - STODDART, S. - MALONE, C.
 2020 In-Nuffara: C. MALONE - R. GRIMA - R. McLAUGHIN - E.W. PARKINSON - S. STODDART - N. VELLA (eds.), *Temple places. Excavating cultural sustainability in prehistoric Malta, Fragility and Sustainability* (Studies on Early Malta 2, the ERC-funded FRAGSUS Project), Cambridge 2020, pp. 245-264.
- BALDACCHINO, J.G. - DUNBABIN, T.J.
 1953 Rock-tomb at Ghajn Qajjet, near Rabat, Malta: *Papers of the British School at Rome* 21 (1953), pp. 32-41.
- BONANNO, A.
 1990 The Archaeology of Gozo: from Prehistoric to Arab Times: C. CINI (ed.), *Gozo the roots of an Island*, La Valletta 1990, pp. 10-45.
 2005 *Malta, Phoenician, Punic and Roman* (Malta's Living Heritage), La Valletta 2005.
 2008 Maltese Wine Pressing in Antiquity: *Melita Historica* 15.1 (2008), pp. 1-18.
 2017 From Prehistoric to historic Malta: a discussion of the sources: D. MIZZI - N.C. VELLA - M.R. ZAMMIT (eds.), "What Mean these Stones?" (*Joshua 4:6, 21*): essays on texts, philology, and archaeology in honour of Anthony J. Frendo (Ancient Near Eastern Studies 50), Leuven 2017, pp. 243-254.
- BRUSASCO, P.
 1993 Dal Levante al Mediterraneo centrale: la prima fase fenicia a Tas-Silg, Malta: *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 3.1 (1993), pp. 1-29.
- CARDONA, D.
 2020 Il Qlejgħa tal-Bahrija, the story: D. CARDONA - D. TANASI (eds.), *The Maltese Archipelago at the dawn of History*, Oxford 2020, pp. 3-18.
- CUTAJAR, N.
 2001 Recent discoveries and the archaeology of Mdina: *Treasures of Malta* VIII, 1 (2001), pp. 79-85.
- DOCTER, R.F. - VELLA, N.C. - CUTAJAR, N. - BONANNO, A. - PACE, A.
 2012 Rural Malta: First Results of the Joint Belgo-Maltese Survey Project: *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 87 (2012), pp. 107-149.
- GÓMEZ BELLARD, C.
 2020 The Bronze Age Phoenician transition and the Phoenician/Punic landscape: C. FRENCH - C.O. HUNT - R. GRIMA - R. McLAUGHLIN - S. STODDART - C. MALONE (eds.), *Temple landscapes. Fragility, change and resilience of Holocene environments in the Maltese Islands* (McDonald Institute Monographs), Cambridge 2020, pp. 246-250.
- GRIMA, R. - MALLIA, J.
 2011 A tale of two ridges: topography, connectivity and use at Borg in-Nadur and Tas-Silg: D. TANASI - N.C. VELLA (eds.), *Site, artefacts and landscape. Prehistoric Borg in-Nadur* (Praehistorica Mediterranea 3), Milano 2011, pp. 225-250.
- JACCARINI, C.J. - CAUCHI, M.N.
 1999 The Enigmatic Rock-Cut Pans of Mgarr ix-Xini: *Melita Historica New Series* 12.4 (1999), pp. 1-106.
- LANCI, M.
 1855 *Ragionamento di Michelangelo Lanci intorno a una nuova stela fenicia scoperta in Malta*, Roma 1855.

- MOSCATI, S. - SCHEMBRI, A. - FRENDI, A.J.
 1993 Some reflections on Malta in the Phoenician World: *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 3.2 (1993), pp. 286-290.
- PEDLEY, M. - CLARKE, M.H. - GALEA, P.
 2002 *Limestone Isles in a Crystal Sea. The Geology of the Maltese Islands*, San Gwann 2002.
- PEET, T.E.
 1910 Contributions to the Study of the Prehistoric Period in Malta: *Papers of the British School at Rome* 5.3 (1910), pp. 141-163.
- SAGONA, C.
 1999 Silo or Vat? Observations on the Ancient Textile Industry in Malta and Early Phoenician Interests in the Island: *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 18.1 (1999), pp. 23-60.
 2002 *The Archaeology of Punic Malta* (Ancient Near Eastern Studies 9), Leuven 2002.
 2004 Land use in prehistoric Malta. A re-examination of the maltese 'cart ruts': *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 23.1 (2004), pp. 45-60.
 2014 Phoenician settlement. How it unfolded in Malta: A. LEMAIRE (éd.), *Mélanges Josette Elayi: Phéniciens d'Orient et d'Occident* (Cahiers de L'institut du Proche-Orient Ancien du Collège de France - II), Paris 2014, pp. 351-372.
 2015 *The Archaeology of Malta. From the Neolithic through the Roman Period* (Cambridge World Archaeology), New York 2015.
- SAID-ZAMMIT, G.A.
 1997a *Population, Land Use and Settlement on Punic Malta: A Contextual Analysis of the Burial Evidence* (British Archaeological Reports, International Series 682), Oxford 1997.
 1997b The Punic tombs of the Maltese islands: *Rivista di Studi Fenici* 25 (1997), pp. 67-80.
- SALIBA, P.C.
 2002 Phoenician-Punic Gozo: M.N. CAUCHI (ed.), *Gozo Past and Present*, Gozo 2002, pp. 7-22.
- STODDART, S. - PACE, A. - CUTAJAR, N. - VELLA, N.C. - McLAUGHLIN, R. - MALONE, C. - MENEELY, J. - TRUMP, D.
 2020 Cultural landscapes from 2000 BC onwards: C. FRENCH - C.O. HUNT - R. GRIMA - R. McLAUGHLIN - S. STODDART - C. MALONE (eds.), *Temple landscapes Fragility, change and resilience of Holocene environments in the Maltese Islands* (McDonald Institute Monographs), Cambridge 2020, pp. 241-249.
- TANASI, D.
 2008 *La Sicilia e l'arcipelago maltese nell'età del Bronzo Medio* (Officina di Studi Medievali Kasa 3), Palermo 2008.
- TANASI, D. - VELLA, N.C. (eds.)
 2015 *The Late Prehistory of Malta: Essays on Borġ in-Nadur and other sites*, Oxford 2015.
- TANASI, D. - CARDONA, D. (eds.)
 2020 *The Maltese archipelago at the dawn of history. Reassessment of the 1909 and 1959 excavations at Qlejgha tal-Bahrija and other essays*, Oxford 2015.
- TRUMP, D.H.
 1961 The Later Prehistory of Malta: *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 27 (1961), pp. 253-262.
 2002 *Malta Prehistory and Temples* (Malta's Living Heritage), La Valletta 2002.
- VAN DOMMELEN, P.
 2008 Sicily and Malta: between Sea and Countryside: P. VAN DOMMELEN - C. GÓMEZ BELLARD (eds.), *Rural Landscapes of the Punic World* (Monographs in Mediterranean Archaeology 11), London 2008, pp. 1-19.
- VAN DOMMELEN, P. - GÓMEZ BELLARD, C. (eds.)
 2008 *Rural landscapes of the Punic World* (Monographs in Mediterranean Archaeology 11), London 2008.

VELLA, N.C.

2007 Unravelling past agricultural landscapes in the Maltese islands: making a case for the Phoenician and Punic phases: A.M. ARRUDA - C. GÓMEZ BELLARD - P. VAN DOMMELEN (eds.), *Sítios e Paisagens rurais no Mediterrâneo Púnico. Actas do VI Congresso Internacional de Estudos Fenícios e Púnicos* (Cadernos de UNIARQ 3), Vol. 1, Lisboa 2007, pp. 69-85.

VELLA, N.C. - ZAMMIT, M.E. - BUGEJA, A.

2011 Borg in-Nadur: the excavations of Margaret A. Murray and David H. Trump: N.C. VELLA - D. TANASI (eds.), *Site, artefacts and landscape, Prehistoric Borg in-Nadur, Malta*, Vol. 3, (Praehistorica Mediterranea 3), Milano 2011, pp. 45-60.

VIDAL GONZÁLEZ, P.

2003 Ecología y paisaje fenicio-púnico de la Isla de Malta: C. GÓMEZ BELLARD (ed.), *Ecohistoria del paisaje agrario. La agricultura fenicio-púnica en el Mediterráneo*, València 2003, pp. 255-270.

ZAMMIT, M.

2006 *An Archaeological Survey of Baħrija*, degree of Master of Arts in Archaeology the Faculty of Arts of the University of Malta.

ZAMMIT, T.

1922 *Excavations in Malta* (Antiquaries Journal 2), London 1922, pp. 131-134.



Fig. 1 - Late Bronze Age settlements of Malta and Gozo (after Tanasi 2008, 113, fig. 14).



Fig. 2 - The fortification wall and the two huts of the Late Bronze Age site of Borg in Nadur (after Tanasi - Vella eds. 2015, 26, fig. 1).



Fig. 3 - The In-Nuffara hill in Gozo seen from the North; from the Ġgantija temples site.



Fig. 4 - Phoenician and Punic tombs' distribution (after Said-Zammit 1997b, 78, fig. 1).